United States of America

# Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 83d CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

## SENATE

MONDAY, FEBRUARY 8, 1954

Msgr. Béla Varga, president of the Hungarian National Council, offered the following prayer:

O Lord Almighty Father, protector of the weak and ruler of the strong, Thy humble servants lift their prayer to Thee.

In our prayer we join the imploring millions whose silent invocations rise to Thee from the dark dungeons of the Iron Curtain, from the most obscure corners of the slave camps, and from the horror chambers of the secret police. Hear these prayers, O Lord, and deliver them from evil.

O Lord give us strength as Thou hast given strength to Thy servant, Cardinal Mindszenty. He defied the tyrant's wrath until condemned to prison 5 years ago today. On this anniversary help us to dedicate ourselves with renewed firmness and a sure hope to work for Thy peace on earth and for Thy love among men.

On this anniversary, standing in this mighty bastion of freedom's strength, we invoke Thy providence, O Ruler of Nations, that we may justify the confidence of millions of Thy children, who are now bent but unbroken under the scourge of despotism and in the darkness of slavery. Have mercy on them and let us be led by Thy mighty hand that we may strengthen their unquenchable hope to see the end of all tyranny.

We entreat Thee, O Father in Heaven. Lend Thy wisdom in all our deliberations and extend the light of Thy grace when we ponder the fate of centuries to come. Bestow upon us the endowments of Thy divine benevolence that this Chamber, that this Capitol remain the fortress of man's God-given right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, a beacon to dispel the dark forces of death, tyranny, and the very denial of Thy Holy Name.

Almighty Creator who hast made all men in Thine image and likeness free, give us strength to drive out the abominations of tyranny which defile Thy kingdom on earth.

God bless you all. Amen.

### THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. KNOWLAND, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Friday, February 5, 1954, was dispensed with.

### MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

### PROGRAM FOR TODAY

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that immediately following the remarks by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] raising a question of personal privilege, there be a call of the calendar, as previously announced, for the consideration of measures to which there is no objection, to start from the point reached at the last call of the calendar, order of business 857, Senate bill 1647, which appears on page 10 of the calendar. The consideration of measures to which there is no objection will continue to the end of the calendar, and when the last of the bills on which reports are available has been considered, the Senate will return to the first order of business on the calendar, Order No. 19, Senate bill 242, and the call will continue to the point it began today.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

### READING OF WASHINGTON'S FAREWELL ADDRESS

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair designates the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HUNT] to read Washington's Farewell Address on February 22, 1954, under authority of the order of the Senate of January 24, 1901.

### BOARD OF VISITORS TO UNITED STATES MILITARY ACADEMY, 1954

The VICE PRESIDENT. In accordance with the provisions of Public Law 816, approved June 29, 1948, the Chair appoints as members on the part of the Senate of the Board of Visitors to the United States Military Academy for 1954, the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], and the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON].

### BOARD OF VISITORS TO UNITED STATES NAVAL ACADEMY, 1954

The VICE PRESIDENT. In accordance with the provisions of Public Law 816, approved June 29, 1948, the Chair appoints as members on the part of the Senate to the Board of Visitors to the United States Naval Academy for 1954, the Senator from Idaho [Mr. DWORSHAK], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], and the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER].

### BOARD OF VISITORS TO MERCHANT MARINE ACADEMY, 1954

The VICE PRESIDENT. In accordance with the provisions of Public Law 301, approved May 11, 1944, the Chair appoints as a member on the part of the Senate of the Board of Visitors to the United States Merchant Marine Academy for 1954, the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES].

### BOARD OF VISITORS TO COAST GUARD ACADEMY, 1954

The VICE PRESIDENT. In accordance with the provisions of section 194 of Public Law 207, approved August 4, 1949, the Chair appoints as a member on the part of the Senate of the Board of Visitors to the United States Coast Guard Academy for 1954, the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH].

### BOARD OF REGENTS OF SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair appoints the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] to be a member of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution, to fill the vacancy caused by the death of the late Senator Robert A. Taft.

### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

REPORT ON PROVISION OF WAR-RISK AND CERTAIN OTHER INSURANCE FOR AMERICAN PUBLIC

A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the provision of war-risk insurance and certain marine and liability insurance for the American public, as of December 31, 1953 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

REPORT ON DISPOSAL OF EXCESS NAVAL PROPERTY IN FOREIGN AREAS

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Navy, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the disposal of excess naval property in foreign areas, dated January, 1954 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORT ON COOPERATION WITH MEXICO IN CONTROL AND ERADICATION OF FOOT-AND-MOUTH DISEASE

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, a



AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

confidential report on cooperation of the United States with Mexico in the control and eradication of foot-and-mouth disease, for the month of December, 1953 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

REPORT ON EXCHANGE OF CERTAIN LANDS

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, reporting, pursuant to law, that no exchanges of land were consummated between the States, counties, and municipalities and the Federal Government relating to lands classified chiefly valuable for recreational purposes in exchange for lands of equal value or equal quantity; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REPORT ON WITHDRAWALS AND RESTORATIONS OF PUBLIC LANDS IN CERTAIN CASES

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, tabulations showing the withdrawals and restorations of public lands in certain cases (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

PROPOSED AWARD OF CONCESSION PERMIT, GLACIER NATIONAL PARK, MONT.

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a proposed award to operate a saddle horse concession within Glacier National Park, Mont. (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REPORT OF SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

A letter from the Chairman, Securities and Exchange Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Commission, for the fiscal year 1953 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

## PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

Resolutions of the General Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts; to the Committee on Public Works:

"Resolutions memorializing the Congress of the United States relative to certain legislation seeking Federal financial aid for flood control and pollution abatement

"Whereas legislation is now pending or will be introduced before the Congress of the United States seeking an appropriation by the said Congress for the purpose of further flood control and pollution abatement in the Connecticut River and its tributaries, said legislation being requested by the Connecticut Valley Water Control Association; and

"Whereas such flood control and pollution abatement can be undertaken only by the Federal Government: Therefore be it

"*Resolved*, That the Commonwealth of Massachusetts hereby lends its full and complete support and endorsement to the end that the recommendations and request of the Connecticut Valley Water Control Association be favorably considered by the Congress; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That copies of these resolutions be sent forthwith by the secretary of the commonwealth to the presiding officer of each branch of Congress and to the members thereof from this Commonwealth."

Resolutions of the General Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts; to the Committee on Finance:

"Resolutions memorializing the Congress of the United States against granting concessions on textile imports from foreign countries

"*Resolved*, That the General Court of Massachusetts hereby urges the Congress of the United States not to pass any legislation granting concessions on textile imports from foreign countries; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That copies of these resolutions be sent forthwith by the secretary of the commonwealth to the President of the United States, to the presiding officer of each branch of Congress, and to the Members thereof from this commonwealth."

A resolution adopted by the Medford (Oreg.) Central Labor Council, protesting against any special exemption on income derived from dividends; to the Committee on Finance.

## ORDER FOR TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that immediately following the remarks of the Senator from Minnesota, and prior to the call of the calendar, there may be the customary morning hour for the transaction of routine business under the usual 2-minute limitation.

The VICE PRESIDENT. That will be in order under the rule, because the Senate is meeting after an adjournment.

## CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the call of the roll be rescinded, and that further proceedings under the call be dispensed with.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

## PNEUMATIC TUBES OF NEW YORK CITY POST OFFICE—QUESTION OF PERSONAL PRIVILEGE

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BUTLER of Maryland in the chair). The Senator from Minnesota is recognized.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, first of all I desire to thank the majority leader for his cooperation last Friday in agreeing to the arrangement whereby I am permitted to make a statement at this time. I rise to a question of personal privilege.

Before I begin my prepared remarks, I should like to say that we are now in the period of the year known as Lincoln week, during which we commemorate the great life, great purposes, and great idealism of the immortal Abraham Lincoln. It is in the spirit of nonpartisanship which characterized Mr. Lincoln that I have compiled a series of Lincoln statements which I believe to be quite appropriate to the discussion I am about to undertake.

It seems to me that the Lincoln statements would certainly set a high standard for political conduct in the United States. I pray that we may rally to that standard and that American politics may be placed on the high level of decency and responsibility, a place which politics in a democracy justly deserves.

I regret that signs of the times indicate that American politics is degrading itself. This can only damage for many years to come the success and strength of free government.

I shall conduct myself now and in the days to come, as I have in the past, as a responsible United States citizen and as a responsible Member of this body.

The great Lincoln had this to say on truth as a vindication against slander:

Truth is generally the best vindication against slander.

That statement was contained in a letter to Secretary Stanton on July 14, 1864. How right the immortal Abraham Lincoln was in that statement.

On the subject of the danger of unjust suspicion of one another, the great Lincoln said:

I believe we need nothing so much as to get rid of unjust suspicion of one another.

That statement was contained in a letter to Charles L. Wilson, on June 1, 1858.

In referring to the need of furnishing proof of any charge, the great Abraham Lincoln said:

A man cannot prove the negative, but he has a right to claim that when one makes an affirmative charge he must offer some proof to show the truth of what he says.

That statement was made during a debate at Ottawa, Ill., on August 21, 1858.

On the subject of falsity of accusation without foundation, the great Lincoln said:

Never add the weight of * * * character to charge against a fellow man, without knowing it to be true. I believe it is an established maxim in morals that he who makes an assertion without knowing whether it is true or false, is guilty of falsehood, and the accidental truth of the assertion does not justify or excuse him. This maxim ought to be particularly held in view when we contemplate an attack upon the reputation of our neighbor.

This was in a letter to the editor of the Illinois Gazette, Springfield, Ill., on August 11, 1846.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Let me complete this series of quotations, and I shall be delighted to yield.

The great President Lincoln also said:

Persisting in a charge which one does not know to be true is simply malicious slander.

This was from the Cooper Institute address in New York City, N. Y., on February 27, 1860.

It is in this spirit and with these rules of conduct and decency in mind that I approach the subject matter which is weighing so heavily on my heart.

I now yield to the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. MAYBANK. Is the Senator about to discuss the subject matter of the pneumatic tubes in the New York post office?

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is the subject to which I am about to address myself.

Mr. MAYBANK. I may say that that subject arose at the first meeting of the Treasury-Post Office Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I understand so.

Mr. MAYBANK. I happen to be a member of that subcommittee. For-

merly I was chairman of it, as the Senator knows.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes.

Mr. MAYBANK. While I do not know as much about the Post Office Department as do members of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, nevertheless, in the years gone by, I was chairman of the Treasury-Post Office Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations. I believe I told the Senator that the subject had been brought up.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator did.

Mr. MAYBANK. I thought it only fair and just to my colleague to so inform him.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the Senator for giving me that information.

Mr. MAYBANK. I understand that nothing was said in that meeting against the Senator. It is my understanding that the charges which were made with respect to losses of money insofar as the tubes were concerned were to be investigated.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes.

Mr. MAYBANK. Does not the record show that?

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is what the record shows.

Mr. MAYBANK. I believe the record will further show, in the statement of the present chairman, that in view of the fact that the Appropriations Committee did not have sufficient investigators or sufficient funds to investigate this subject, the Committee on Government Operations would investigate it.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That was my understanding.

Mr. MAYBANK. Has there been any investigation?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Not that I know of.

Mr. MAYBANK. Does the Senator mean to tell me that after that understanding was reached in the committee nothing has been done? I am certain that all the members of the subcommittee who were present will recall the understanding to which I have referred. I believe the junior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON] was present. I believe there were 4 or 5 Senators present. I was left with the distinct impression that before any charges were made the subject would be investigated by the Committee on Government Operations.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That was my understanding.

Mr. MAYBANK. I do not wish to involve any other Senator, but I believe that the distinguished former chairman of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], introduced the first bill dealing with this subject, at a time when I happened to be chairman of the Treasury-Post Office Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is true.

Mr. MAYBANK. The distinguished Senator from North Dakota merely introduced a bill to continue the activity provided for by his bill, because the cost had increased in the meantine.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am going into this subject in great detail. The Senator's statement is accurate. I shall appreciate it if I may be permitted to develop this point. As I go along I am sure the memory of the Senator from South Carolina, who is a responsible member of the Committee on Appropriations, will be refreshed.

Mr. MAYBANK. When the question arose I did not have before me the records. At that time I understood that the Congress had unanimously passed the bill introduced by the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct.

Mr. MAYBANK. There was no dissenting voice in this body on the passage of that bill.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator is correct.

Mr. MAYBANK. So the subcommittee recommended to the full committee that the money be appropriated.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. I wish to emphasize the fact that the distinguished Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK] is absolutely correct.

Mr. MAYBANK. I thank the Senator.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. As former chairman of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, it is my recollection that the reason for the increased cost at that time was the change from one kind of current to another in New York. The bill which was introduced was to take care of the additional cost.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the Senator for that observation. I am sure that I shall be able to develop this subject to the satisfaction of my colleagues. I have before me information which I have carefully reviewed, as a result of what I consider to be a completely unfounded attack.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. HILL. In connection with what has been said, the Senator from Alabama happens to be a member of the Senate Committee on Appropriations. I am sure that each year that committee has recommended, and the Senate has approved, appropriations for this purpose. Is not that true?

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is absolutely true.

Mr. HILL. That has been true not only under Democratic administrations, but also in the Republican 80th Congress. Each year the Committee on Appropriations has reported an appropriation bill carrying an appropriation for these pneumatic tubes. The Senate has approved such an appropriation, just as the House has done, and the appropriation has been passed upon by both Senate and House Appropriations Committees, and by both the Senate and the House of Representatives.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I think it should be stated for the information of the public that the bill of the Senator from Minnesota and the bill of the Senator from North Dakota were only enabling acts. After an enabling act is passed, it is necessary to appropriate the money to carry out the purpose of the enabling act.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator is correct.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Each year the Committee on Appropriations passes upon the appropriations necessary to carry out the functions of the Post Office Department.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. I should like to make one additional observation. I may be in error. If so, I wish to be corrected. I have never heard any voice raised on either side of the aisle against this appropriation during all the years in question. If I am mistaken, I shall be glad to be corrected.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I have examined the record very carefully, and as far as I know, there has never been the slightest whisper of opposition.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. The senior Senator from South Carolina is entirely correct. Both the senior Senator from South Carolina and the junior Senator from South Carolina serve on the Treasury-Post Office Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations. I have never heard any opposition to the appropriation during my service as a member of the subcommittee.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I will yield once more, and then I should like to develop my case.

Mr. LANGER. I am sure the distinguished Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON] who has just spoken will remember that the subcommittee went to New York and engaged rooms in one of the leading hotels. Witness after witness appeared before us. We went to the post office and discussed the subject with the postmaster. We made the fullest and most complete examination before we reported back to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the Senator. That is an accurate statement, which I shall document as I proceed.

Within the past few weeks—yes, even as late as last Sunday—the newspapers of my State have prominently printed in their pages a series of deliberately misleading and politically inspired attacks against my record, my judgment, and my integrity as a Member of the United States Senate and as a citizen of the United States. I hold in my hands various issues of such newspapers. My colleagues can see the nature of the headlines.

These attacks are an outrageous demonstration of irresponsible politics, with no attempt to confirm the facts. They

have been made by a group of Republican national committeemen of my State with the assistance of the United States Postmaster General, Mr. Arthur Summerfield, in connection with the bill I introduced during the 81st Congress, S. 4102, authorizing the Post Office Department to contract for the use of pneumatic tubes in the New York Post Office.

I hold in my hand a newspaper with the headline "HUMPHREY Charges Smear. MCCARTHY Will Probe His Role in Postal Contract."

The second headline hints at "Possibility of Graft."

These are words which I do not take gently or without putting up an outright battle and resistance to expose the kind of attack which is being leveled against me.

I wish my colleagues to know that I have before me photostatic copies of various newspapers published in my State. Here is one, the Duluth Herald, of Duluth, Minn., under date of January 6:

Humphrey-sponsored bill may start another Demo scandal.

In one newspaper article after another in the weekly press of my State a deliberate and wholesale attempt is being made to besmirch the character of the junior Senator from Minnesota and, I may say to my colleagues, the character and integrity of the Congress of the United States. Make no mistake about it. The measure which I am about to discuss was passed unanimously by the House and Senate in the 80th Congress; it was passed unanimously by the House and Senate in the 81st Congress.

The measure which I introduced was first submitted to the then Vice President, Honorable Alben Barkley, by the Postmaster General, with the clearance of the Budget Bureau, and was referred by the then chairman of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, the distinguished Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], to the junior Senator from Minnesota in his responsibility as chairman of the Postal Affairs Subcommittee of the full Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

It may be a mere coincidence that while the Republican National Committee is meeting in Washington, the Minneapolis newspapers should carry a headline to the effect that the Republican National Committee will level its guns at me. It may be mere coincidence that the Postmaster General and the Minnesota Republican National Committeeman should launch their criticisms of me at about the same time, or that the Senate subcommittee should at this time undertake an investigation of this subject, which has been referred to by the distinguished Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK]. That, I say, may be a mere coincidence, but I ask the question: Could it be that the Republican National Committee is leveling its barrage in order to attempt to soften up the junior Senator from Minnesota, in the hope that the Minnesota Republican leadership may at long last be able to find a candidate who will run against him? Possibly that is the case.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. LEHMAN. Is it not a fact that the present Postmaster General, Mr. Summerfield, was until a year ago chairman of the Republican National Committee?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Of course, that is a fact.

Mr. LEHMAN. Is it not probable that when the Postmaster General, Mr. Summerfield, who was until quite recently chairman of the Republican National Committee, makes these unsupported and unfounded charges against the junior Senator from Minnesota, he is speaking in his former capacity as chairman of the Republican National Committee, instead of in his capacity as Postmaster General of the United States, a highly important position, in which he should show responsibility, but which he has failed to do in this case?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I shall give some attention to that observation. However, I want to say to my colleagues that we are not discussing a controversial bill. We are discussing a measure which has been before the Congress since 1898, with the exception of 2 years. We are discussing a measure which was passed unanimously in the 80th Congress, as one very recent example, and was also passed unanimously in the 81st Congress.

Nevertheless, not only has the integrity and the character of the junior Senator from Minnesota been assailed, but, I say to my colleagues, as each of us has the responsibility to examine fully every piece of legislation which comes before this body, and as each of us is held accountable for every piece of legislation which is passed by Congress, when someone undertakes to cry graft or scandal or dereliction of duty in relation to a bill sponsored by the junior Senator from Minnesota, at the request of the executive branch of the Government, at the request of the responsible officer of the Post Office Department, and at the request of the chairman of my committee, then, indeed, politics has come to such a pass that not only is a rifle pointed at the back of an individual Member of this body, but at the Senate as a whole and, indeed, at the House of Representatives, and, indeed, at the President of the United States, who signed the bill, and, indeed, at the Bureau of the Budget, which approved the bill, and at the Comptroller General of the United States, Mr. Lindsay Warren, who registered no objection to the bill.

If I speak with just indignation, I speak from the heart, Mr. President. I do not intend to have any Member of this body or any leader of any political party brand me with the stigma of scandal or of graft.

We are all of us concerned in this matter, and the time is at hand to call a halt to such tactics, and, as decent and God-fearing and God-respecting men, to stand forthright against them, instead of going down into the gutter in order to win an election.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the releases and newspaper articles to which I have alluded be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. HUMPHREY. Therefore I rise to expose with documented facts this political fraud, and to serve notice upon the Republican Party of my State and upon the Postmaster General of the United States and upon the Republican leadership—I am not referring to the Republicans in my State, because they are decent people—that I will not sit idly by and let the Republican hierarchy introduce into the politics of my State half-truths, innuendoes, and the big lie technique. I am confident that the people of Minnesota will join with me in repudiating this smear attack and its political use and its political currency in a decent community of the United States of America.

I have replied to these attacks through the medium of a letter which I have sent to the editors of newspapers in Minnesota.

Therefore, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD, at the conclusion of my remarks, a copy of the letter which has been sent to many editors of weekly newspapers in the State of Minnesota.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 2.)

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, this attack has been carried on in dozens of weekly newspapers, week after week, in the State of Minnesota, in an attempt to discredit a Member of this body who is trying to do his duty.

The Republican Party leadership and the political irresponsibles in my State are using the word "scandal" and the word "graft" and the words "dereliction of duty" in connection with my sponsorship of the pneumatic tube bill in 1950, and they are basing their charge on an announcement by the Postmaster General canceling the pneumatic tube contract on the ground that the service is obsolete, unnecessary, and excessively expensive.

Mr. President, I hold in my hand, and have available for Members of the Senate to peruse, a copy of a recent statement made by the Postmaster General, as quoted in the Sunday edition of the Minneapolis newspaper to which I have referred. I should like to read a short excerpt from the article. I quote from page 16 of the Minneapolis Morning Tribune of Sunday, February 7. I ask my colleagues to listen to this:

It is apparent that the Senator "doth protest too much." I think it is most unfortunate that Senator HUMPHREY should attack us for saving money. I emphatically refute the suggestion that the pneumatic tube contract was canceled for any other reason than to save the taxpayers money.

Note, Mr. President, that he says it was canceled only to save money. But note also that the headline talks about a scandal, and graft, and attaches the name of the junior Senator from Minnesota to that kind of language.

Those are not polite words that are being used, and the Senator from Minnesota indeed does protest.

As a citizen of the United States and as a Senator of the United States I will not, so long as I can stand on the floor of the Senate, allow anyone to accuse me of graft or accuse me of a scandal.

I have served as the mayor of a large city, and my most vicious critics never accused me of corruption. In fact, perhaps, I am a Member of the Senate today because I gave honest service. I do not intend to have the former chairman of the National Republican Committee or the present chairman of the National Republican Committee in Minnesota, directly or indirectly, accuse me of graft, scandal, or dereliction of duty.

Mr. President, the Postmaster General, Mr. Summerfield, went on to say that the Government of the United States can replace the tube service now costing the Government, according to Mr. Summerfield, $1 million a year, "by the addition of two trucks at a yearly cost of about $25,000."

Mr. President, I just checked over the Postmaster General's report for 1952, the most recent available report, and I find that in the year 1952 the cost of the pneumatic-tube service under the Humphrey bill was $351,802. That was at the rate of $14,067 a mile, and there are approximately 27 miles of pneumatic tubes.

Where does the Postmaster General get the figure of $1 million and the figure of two trucks at $25,000 a year? This morning I had my staff check with the New York Post Office and I find that instead of two new trucks, they are buying 70 new trucks. They are not as yet delivered, but they have been ordered. I am not in position to say what make of truck they are.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. The Senator from Minnnesota mentioned 70 trucks. Can he tell us the type of trucks they are? Are they General Motors trucks?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I will say to the distinguished Senator that in 1951 the trucks purchased were International trucks. I do not know what trucks are being purchased this year.

I consider the Postmaster General to be an honest man; I consider him to be trying to conduct an honest administration; and I ask him to give other persons the benefit of the same charitable judgment.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Postmaster General referred to 2 trucks at a cost of $25,000 each?

Mr. HUMPHREY. That was the total cost.

Mr. MANSFIELD. According to the Senator's statement, the Department is purchasing 70 trucks.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes.

Mr. MANSFIELD. If we split the number 70 in two the expense involved is far beyond the figure $300,000 and closer to the figure $1 million; so that what the Postmaster General is talking about may apply to his expenditures rather than to the figure which the Senator has given.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am not going to try to discuss the Postmaster General's figures, except to state what I have been told by the Post Office Department. I am sure the Postmaster General will give a good accounting for the use of these trucks, but it is ridiculous and ludicrous to say that 6 million pieces of mail could be moved with 2 trucks.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. LEHMAN. I wonder if the Senator realizes, as I do, that there are many occasions during the course of the year when trucks are almost unusable for several days. I recall a snowstorm in New York 2 or 3 years ago when there was a fall of 22½ inches, and neither mail trucks nor any other vehicles moved freely during that period of time.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The mail moved through the pneumatic tubes.

Mr. LEHMAN. Exactly. The trucks did not move.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I shall go into the question of the full operation of the pneumatic tubes as against the operation of trucks. But the issue here is not even pneumatic tubes versus trucks. I am not an expert, but one thing I do know, namely, that no man living can put the brand of scandal on my brow or my back, and I do not intend to let anyone try to do it.

Mr. LEHMAN. I think perhaps the Senator has not emphasized sufficiently what he said with reference to the total cost of the operation of the movement of mail by pneumatic tubes, which I have been informed is approximately $352,000.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is according to the Postmaster General's report for 1952.

Mr. LEHMAN. And that is an official document. The Postmaster General made the statement that there would be a saving of $1 million in the change which he proposed.

Mr. HUMPHREY. A saving of $1 million a year. That is correct.

Mr. LEHMAN. The figure of $352,000 was a yearly figure, and he claims the saving will result in $1 million yearly. He may be a wizard, a miracle man, but I cannot see how there could be any basis for the statement he has made, that he can save $1 million, when the total expenditures up to the present time have been, if I am truthfully informed, $352,000 a year. If that should be completely wiped out he still could not possibly make a saving such as he claims.

I think that is a further demonstration that this is purely a political charge, with the single purpose of injuring the distinguished junior Senator from Minnesota in his race for reelection this coming November. I can see no other reason for making such a completely unjustified, and unverified charge as that which has been made by the Postmaster General, who was formerly the chairman of the Republican National Committee.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. I have followed the Senator from Minnesota very closely, but do I correctly understand that the Postmaster General said the tube system would cost, in round figures, $1 million a year, and that the mail could be handled with 2 trucks at a total cost of some $25,000 a year?

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct.

Mr. MORSE. If I understood the Senator correctly he said his staff had called the New York Post Office this morning and found out that they are going to purchase 70 trucks, or that they have placed an order for 70 trucks. Is that correct?

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct. What the 70 trucks are going to be used for I do not know.

Mr. MORSE. That is the question I wanted to ask the Senator, because I think the record is a little confused with reference to that.

Did the New York post office indicate to the Senator's staff whether or not the 70 trucks were being purchased to do the job that Summerfield said 2 trucks could do, or are they being purchased to replace trucks used for the entire business section of the city of New York?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I do not think there is any separation; I understand they are to be used in connection with the general mail which is moved. When the Postmaster General says he can move the pneumatic-tube mail with 2 trucks, and that the 2 trucks would cost no more than $25,000, I am interested in the fact that there is now a purchase of 70 trucks conincidentally with the cancellation of the pneumatic-tube contract.

Mr. MORSE. Am I correct in my understanding that at this point in the Senator's argument he is not seeking to leave the inference that it would take 70 trucks to handle the tube business which the Postmaster General said in his release to the Minnesota newspapers could be done by 2 trucks?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I pointed out that it would take many more than that.

Mr. MORSE. The Senator will now proceed with proofs to show that, irrespective of how many trucks the Post Office is ordering for the New York post office, they could not possibly, with two trucks, do the work the tubes are now doing.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I shall show that.

The New York City post office has been serviced by pneumatic tubes for 56 years, since 1898. They have been in existence ever since, with only two exceptions. Congress failed to make the necessary appropriations available in 1901 and in 1918. The appropriations were restored, however, by Republican-controlled Congresses in 1902 and in 1922. The original contract was authorized by a Republican Congress and was twice restored by a Republican Congress and repeatedly renewed by Republican administrations.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an article summarizing the history of the pneumatic-tube system,

published in the New York Times of January 3, 1954, be printed in the body of the RECORD following my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD.

(See exhibit 3.)

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, in 1948, during the Republican-controlled 80th Congress, the Republican-controlled Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee undertook an investigation of the efficiency of the pneumatic tube mail service system. Two Republican Senators, the distinguished present chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, my warm friend and able associate, the distinguished senior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], who was chairman of the subcommittee, and the former junior Senator from Montana, Mr. Zales Ecton, were members of a subcommittee which personally investigated the system by an on-the-spot hearing in New York. This took place before I became a Member of the Senate.

The two distinguished Senators in making the investigation took the testimony of witnesses on every aspect of the entire service, witnesses from the New York City post office, from the company that rendered the service, and from the Post Office Department in Washington, including postal inspectors and experts in the field. Following the investigation, the subcommittee submitted a report.

Mr. President, I now ask unanimous consent that the hearings on the pneumatic tube mail service before a subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, dated March 29, 1948, be printed in the body of the RECORD following my remarks.

There being no objection, the hearings were ordered to be printed in the RECORD.

(See exhibit 4.)

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the report represents the findings of the subcommittee and also was the basis for legislation recommended by the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service of the 80th Congress. The report was agreed to by Congress without a single dissenting vote.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I hope the Senator from Minnesota will not object to the interruptions, because if this case should turn out as I believe it will, as I sit and listen to the Senator from Minnesota, I think it highly desirable that during the course of the argument points should be emphasized, so that Senators may observe the proof as the case unfolds.

With the permission of the Senator from Minnesota, I now ask him this question: Am I to understand that the argument which he has just made draws the conclusion that in the Republican-controlled 80th Congress, the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, in charge of Republicans, conducted hearings on the pneumatic tube system in the city of New York, and that, as a result of the hearings, the committee recommended such a system for the city of New York?

Mr. HUMPHREY. The committee recommended continuation of such a system.

Mr. MORSE. And recommended the appropriation of funds?

Mr. HUMPHREY. The committee recommended an authorization at the rate of $12,000 a mile, which was a fair rate.

Mr. MORSE. Am I correct, then, in drawing the conclusion that the able junior Senator from Minnesota subsequently introduced a bill to provide funds for such a tube system to be used in the New York City post office, thus carrying out the recommendation of a Republican-controlled committee in the 80th Congress?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I may say to the distinguished Senator from Oregon that the bill which has my name attached to it did but one major substantive thing: It increased the rate from $12,000 a mile to a maximum of $15,500 a mile, because of the necessity of changing the electrical system from direct current to alternating current.

I may say to Senators that hundreds of thousands of dollars are being spent in the Senate Office Building itself to convert the electrical system from direct current to alternating current.

It costs money to convert from direct current to alternating current, and since the Government was the sole, exclusive user of the pneumatic tube lines, as I shall develop, the Government worked together with the manufacturing company to effect a conversion for the purpose of maintaining efficient service.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. SYMINGTON. As I understand, in the Senator's mind there are two aspects. One relates to the efficiency of the service.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator is correct.

Mr. SYMINGTON. The other is the accusation with respect to graft.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator is eminently correct. There are two aspects. One is the accusation and innuendo concerning the junior Senator from Minnesota; the second is the whole matter of the technical nature and efficiency of the service provided by pneumatic tubes as compared with other means of transportation.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I have read some of the exhibits. As a former businessman, it would be difficult, in my opinion, for the Post Office Department to move 6 million pieces of mail with 2 trucks.

With respect to the second aspect, I note that the senior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE], for whom I am certain I have as high regard as does the junior Senator from Minnesota, was one of the Senators who unanimously recommended, in 1950, exactly what the junior Senator from Minnesota recommended in 1952. Is not that correct?

Mr. HUMPHREY. My distinguished colleague, the senior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE], was a member of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service in 1948 and also in 1950. He always has been a responsible Member of the Senate, and I say it is to his credit that he voted in 1948 for the Langer bill and in 1950 for the Humphrey bill.

Mr. SYMINGTON. No Member of the Senate has greater respect for the distinguished senior Senator from Minnesota than have I. What I was attempting to say was that any accusation made by any newspaper in the State of Minnesota on this particular subject against the junior Senator from Minnesota would also, in effect, be an accusation against the senior Senator from Minnesota. Am I not correct?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Surely that would seem to me to be the case. Certainly, I do not even wish to bring my senior colleague into this mess. I want to say that there is not a more honest man in my State than the senior Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I asked the senior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] if the conditions under which both he and the senior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE] and the other members of the committee unanimously agreed to act in previous years and those under which the junior Senator from Minnesota acted in later years were identical, and he has told me they were identical without any reservations.

Mr. HUMPHREY. With the exception of the rate.

Mr. SYMINGTON. That is correct; with the exception of the rate.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the Senator from Missouri very much.

Following the unanimous favorable report of the 80th Congress Senate subcommittee, the full Committees of Post Office and Civil Service of both the Senate and House of Representatives in the Republican-controlled 80th Congress voted to continue the pneumatic tube mail-service system. I read to the Senate from Senate Report 1241 of the 80th Congress, 2d session, from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, which had this to say about the pneumatic tube mail-service system:

> Today when mail matter must move quickly to meet all kinds of timetable deadlines—plane, railroad, and steamers—to insure its early delivery, the underground pneumatic-tube system is invaluable. (P. 3, Rept. No. 1241, 80th Cong., 2d sess.)

It is to this very fact that the junior Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN] was referring a while ago.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Is it not correct that the United States Government through the Post Office Department, has been using the pneumatic-tube service since 1922?

Mr. HUMPHREY. The United States Government has been using it since 1898.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. There was a break in the use of the service from 1918, when the Democrats were in office, until 1922, when the system was reinstated.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes, there was. The service was reinstated, I believe the record will reveal, by a unanimous appropriation vote after full hearings and recommendations of the Post Office Department, and it has never been a subject of controversy. I may say that no one ever has raised as much as a

word of doubt until all at once, in the year of our Lord 1954, an election year, the junior Senator from Minnesota is attacked.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. There is one other point which I think should be brought out. Are the rates now being paid out of line with the rates which were paid in 1922?

Mr. HUMPHREY. No. The rates in the bill sponsored by me provided for $5,000 a mile less than the rates in 1922, according to a letter I received the other day from the distinguished Senator.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. MONRONEY. I wonder if the junior Senator from Minnesota would not agree that the personal attack which has been made upon him in connection with this matter was not a bit unusual and can only have been politically motivated, since the big item of news was that the Postmaster General had decided to change the mail transportation system in New York City.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator is correct.

Mr. MONRONEY. The Postmaster General could not have failed to have known that the junior Senator from Minnesota would be running for reelection this year; and having been a former chairman of the Republican National Committee, the Postmaster General went out of his way, did he not, to drag in the name of the junior Senator from Minnesota in an effort to discredit him and his service in the United States Senate?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I may say to the distinguished junior Senator from Oklahoma that I have been told, not once, but a dozen times, in the last month and a half, that the pneumatic tube bill issue was to be wrapped around my neck. This was to be the beginning of a political attack upon HUBERT HUMPHREY. I could see the attack as it developed, as it progressed from one little news story to another. First it related to a simple matter, as to which every Member of the Senate agreed. All at once it built itself into a great public issue, which necessitated front-page headlines in the leading newspaper of my State. I may say it has been a long time since the junior Senator from Minnesota has been on the front page—a long time. [Laughter.]

Mr. MONRONEY. Would it not also be fair to say that if there is responsibility on the junior Senator from Minnesota for the service being continued as it has been operating for some 50 years the responsibility is equally shared by every member of the Committee on Appropriations of both Houses and by every Member of the House and every Member of the Senate, which passed the bill unanimously? Yet, when the news release was made, only one Member of the United States Senate, one who happened to be a candidate for reelection, was considered sufficiently important by a politically minded Postmaster General to try to connect him by innuendo with the idea of graft or scandal.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I may say to the Senator from Oklahoma that there is a strange coincidence here. The Postmaster General gives out a release on pneumatic tubes. Then the Republican national committeeman of the State of Minnesota follows it up. Then newsmen call me on the telephone. Mr. Hayden, the distinguished Washington reporter of the North American Newspaper Alliance, called me on the day I arrived from my State of Minnesota to be with my family for the Christmas holidays and asked about the pneumatic-tube bill. It was one of thousands of bills I handled as a member of the Committee on Post Office and Post Roads; and, Mr. President, I gave my time to that committee. I worked diligently on that committee. I think my colleagues in the Senate will testify to the diligence of my service. Then I find all at once that this bill, which has been rolling through the Congress for 56 years, suddenly takes on a new significance. It is interesting, is it not? All at once it becomes a matter of great national importance.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield to the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. MONRONEY. In the stories on this matter which I read in newspapers of my home State no mention was made of the fact that the pneumatic-tube system had been in use for 50 years.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Of course not.

Mr. MONRONEY. Does the Senator from Minnesota think that is a fair way for a department to handle news? Is that not the suppression of a vital, important factor? In the news stories there was no mention of the fact that the use of pneumatic tubes had been approved for 50 years by the Congress, and that they were regarded to be a valuable means of transmitting packages and mail in crowded New York, which has congested traffic arteries. Not one story which I read referred to the historic use of such mail transportation methods. It seems to me that he who would, in a news release, suppress a vital item is guilty of deliberately trying to have read into the story something which is not there.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I may say to the Senator from Oklahoma that I cannot read men's motives, and I do not desire to be uncharitable or unkind. All I say is that the emphasis was upon the 10-year contract which was approved, or authorized, by the Humphrey bill, when, in truth, the enabling legislation—the final enabling legislation—was passed in 1922. Ten-year contracts have been authorized ever since that time. The story is just about as new as Ben Franklin's almanac.

Mr. MONRONEY. There has not been anything in the newspaper stories announcing that such a practice had been followed for the period the Senator has mentioned.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I desire to say to the Senator from Oklahoma, who is a former newspaperman, that it is very peculiar that with the cancellation of a contract such as the one involved in this matter, my telephone has been ringing day after day. Reporters have said to me, "We have been tipped off that this is a hot news story. What is your explanation, Senator HUMPHREY?" as if I were a suspected criminal.

Mr. President, such a thing just does not happen of itself. Contracts are being canceled day after day in many areas of the Government. Many defense contracts have been canceled recently. Are we therefore to hold a distinguished Senator who was chairman of the Committee on Armed Services in the 83d Congress accountable for the fact that we may have overappropriated some funds? Are we to hold somebody who was the sponsor of a bill accountable because someone in authority may have gone wrong on mutual security?

Frankly, there is not a bit of evidence that anything has gone wrong with the pneumatic-tube service. The whole question is as printed in the Minneapolis Tribune on February 7, quoting the Postmaster General:

> I emphatically repudiate the suggestion that the pneumatic-tube contract was canceled for any other reason than to save the taxpayers money.

Mr. President, if that is the reason why the contract was canceled, then how did the words "scandal" and "graft" and "dereliction of duty" get into the story?

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. LEHMAN. If the Postmaster General has said he was canceling the contract in order that he could make a reasonable and realistic saving by eliminating the use of the pneumatic-tube service, it might make sense, but when he makes a statement that he is going to save a million dollars on a contract which amounts to only $352,000——

Mr. HUMPHREY. In 1952.

Mr. LEHMAN. In 1952—then I say he is doing that for the sake of headlines. He would not have received headlines any other way in order to discredit the Senator from Minnesota, who is a candidate for reelection next November.

I desire to ask the Senator from Minnesota if he does not think it is extremely strange that in the Minneapolis Sunday Tribune, published yesterday, the headline is as the Senator read, "HUMPHREY Charges 'Smear'; MCCARTHY Will Probe His Role in Postal Contract," and on the same day or the day before, Mr. Hall, Chairman of the Republican National Committee, appeared on a television program, or elsewhere, and stated that the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY] was going to be one of the Republican spearheads in the next campaign. Almost at the same time there was a statement in the press by the Senator from Wisconsin again implying that there was graft and corruption in the introduction and passage of this bill by the distinguished Senator from Minnesota.

Those three statements came out so nearly simultaneously, and are so closely related, that I think the implication

is clear that the action taken was not for the purpose of saving the money of the taxpayer—a purpose of which I am in favor just as strongly as is Mr. Summerfield or anyone else. I believe that the statements were made merely for the purpose of making political capital, and injuring the chances of reelection of the distinguished junior Senator from Minnesota, who for the past 6 years has given devoted and intelligent service which few other Members of the Senate have ever surpassed.

I think what happened was outrageous, and that it should be brought to the attention of the American people as further evidence of smear tactics, and political guerrilla warfare. The Senator from Minnesota is fully justified in resenting such accusations, and in throwing the lie right back into the teeth of those who have attempted to discredit him. I desire to congratulate the Senator on what he has done.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I desire to thank the Senator from New York.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am glad to yield to my friend and colleague, the distinguished Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. BUSH. I am certainly sympathetic with the Senator's indignation. If he feels he has been smeared unjustly, I think he should be resentful of that kind of treatment.

I noted what the Senator said about the Postmaster General, that he believed he was an honest man.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes, I do.

Mr. BUSH. The matter the Senator is discussing is pretty serious, inasmuch as it involves a member of the Cabinet of the President of the United States.

The Senator from Minnesota just read the statement of the Postmaster General, wherein the Postmaster General said:

> I emphatically repudiate the suggestion that the pneumatic tube contract was canceled for any other reason than to save the taxpayers money.

Again in the same statement the Postmaster General said:

> We would welcome with open arms a congressional investigation not only of our action in canceling a 10-year contract that has cost us $1 million a year for services which we can duplicate for just $25,000, but also of the motives and circumstances that led to the signing of such a disastrous contract by the former administration in the first place.

The Postmaster General has invited a congressional investigation of the matter. It seems to me it is only fair that such an investigation take place, so that we may see whether the Postmaster General means what he says when he emphatically repudiates the suggestion that the contract was canceled for any reason other than to save the taxpayers money.

I wish to emphasize that I am entirely sympathetic with the indignation of the Senator from Minnesota that his name has been connected with charges of graft or scandal. I find nothing in what he said or nothing in the documents he has been kind enough to circulate among us to indicate that the Postmaster is responsible for having the name of the Senator from Minnesota connected with those charges.

Therefore, I think it only fair to ask the Senator from Minnesota, if he is going to make charges against the Postmaster General, that he be specific about them, and not make them by innuendo. I say that with all due respect to my good friend from Minnesota, having confidence in his integrity.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, let me say that I am not charging the Postmaster General with a single thing. I am simply saying there is a big pass play going on which raises my suspicions. The Postmaster General begins with a release on a bill I introduced—a bill continuing an authorization, by the way, which has been in effect since 1898—then, with a peculiar, timely coincidence, the Republican national committeeman in Minnesota catches the pass; and on the same day my telephone rings repeatedly when I am called by persons who say, "Senator HUMPHREY, what is this bill that you have your name attached to?"

I have been in politics long enough to know what is going on. Sometimes it is not the printed word, but the spoken word, that has the real impact and meaning. To be sure, the releases of the Postmaster General are carefully guarded, except to say he wants to find out the motives which led to the contract.

Mr. President, if he wants to find that he had better find it from William McKinley, who signed the first pneumatic-tube bill in 1898. It would be a rather large assignment to find that from him. Or the Postmaster General could go back to 1922, and find why the Postmaster General at that time signed the authorization for 10-year contracts, which the junior Senator from Minnesota in bipartisan spirit introduced a bill to have continued; that is all. Then let the Postmaster General ask the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] the chairman of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, why the contracts have been renewed.

This matter is ridiculous.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield further to me?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. BUSH. I do not blame the Senator from Minnesota for being concerned or puzzled, as he said, about the chain of circumstances.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am very puzzled.

Mr. BUSH. However, I think certainly the Senator from Minnesota should be careful not necessarily to jump to the conclusion that the Postmaster General in his official capacity is taking some action which, although he says he is taking it in the interest of the taxpayers, he is actually taking for some other reason—which he has already denied.

Inasmuch as we wish to be entirely fair to the Senator from Minnesota, and I repeat that I myself have the utmost confidence in him—I suggest that we must also be fair to the members of the Cabinet of the President of the United States, and not allow to stand the innuendos which have been made here today.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, let me make the RECORD crystal clear. I am not contesting at this time the honesty or the basic integrity of the Postmaster General. I do contest the figures he has presented to the committee. As one who has been in politics long enough to know how it operates, I wish to make it quite clear that it is very, very much of a puzzling coincidence or, that just as the Postmaster General cancels the contract, which was one of many contracts, I am sure, that he has been canceling—including star-route contracts, and many others—all at once the big guns open up in the State of Minnesota, and suddenly the junior Senator from Minnesota finds that there may be graft or corruption. How does all this tie in? It ties in suspiciously.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield to me?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I should like to say to my distingished colleague that I would feel remiss if I did not tell him that I, also, have full respect for the character and integrity of the Postmaster General. However, men of integrity can make misstatements of fact. I am sure a statement to which I intend to refer later, on the floor of the Senate, with respect to Democrats in Washington, and made by the Postmaster General on January 21, is both false in fact and false in implication.

I simply wish to call that to the attention of the Senate because the Senator from Connecticut may be interested in what I shall say with respect to these comments made by the Postmaster General. They have nothing to do with the efforts on the part of my distinguished colleague, the junior Senator from Minnesota, to protect his own good name. With respect to the question of graft, did the Senator from Minnesota ever discuss with any member of the organization which supplies the pneumatic tube service, the terms or conditions under which the service would be rendered?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I can assure the Senator from Missouri that not only did I not discuss it with them, but I do not know who they are, by name; and I never knowingly have seen either their profiles or character sketches.

I accepted the reports of the 80th Congress. I accepted the original basis of the contract, beginning with William McKinley. I figured that if it was good enough for William McKinley, Teddy Roosevelt, William Howard Taft, Calvin Coolidge, Harding, Hoover, Roosevelt, and Truman, it should be good enough for HUBERT HUMPHREY.

Mr. SYMINGTON. In other words, the Senator from Minnesota had no telephone conversation, verbal conversation, or letters, or any other relationship with respect to the persons who benefited by the contract, in any way or form: It that correct?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Never were truer words spoken.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I thank the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield to me?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Indeed I do yield to the majority leader.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I wish to say to the distinguished Senator from Minnesota that, as he knows, when he came to me on Friday and said he had a question of personal privilege he wished to submit to the Senate, I immediately cooperated with him to the fullest—even to the extent of laying aside a unanimous-consent agreement—so that he would have an opportunity to make the presentation at the time and under the circumstances he wished.

Frankly, I have not had any information on this matter, other than that the distinguished Senator from Minnesota was to make the speech.

When he began his speech today; and when it became apparent what the subject matter was, I sent for the testimony taken before the Senate Appropriations Committee on the Treasury and Post Office appropriation bill. I have read the testimony as it was given there. I can say to the Senator from Minnesota that I can find no indication that in the testimony of either the Postmaster General or anyone else, any reflection was cast upon the integrity of the Senator from Minnesota.

The only thing I find is that question was raised as to why the former Postmaster General—having had a report, apparently, as I understand, from the Post Office inspectors—had acted contrary to their report, and had signed a 10-year contract.

But in no case do I find the slightest reflection upon the character or integrity of our distinguished colleague from Minnesota.

I should like to ask a question, because in a matter of this kind I think it important that the Senate have the facts: When the former Postmaster General or his assistants had requested the distinguished Senator from Minnesota to introduce the bill—which is a customary practice, regardless of which administration happens to be in power—did they advised the distinguished junior Senator from Minnesota that there was a report from the postal inspectors, raising doubts as to whether such a contract should be signed?

I ask that question because it seems to me it goes at least to the heart of this situation, namely, why, beginning in 1896, or whatever the first date was, there was a whole series of renewals; and whether at any time prior to the last time there had been an adverse report from the postal inspectors to the Postmaster General; and that subsequent to an adverse report, proposed legislation on the subject had been introduced.

Perhaps the Senator could give some light to the Senate on that subject. First, does he know whether or not there had ever before been an adverse report from the inspectors? Secondly, in view of the fact that a reading of the testimony apparently shows that there had been an adverse report the last time, did those who spoke to him about introducing the bill have the courtesy at least to inform him that there was such an adverse report?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the majority leader. He is always fair. It is indeed a wonderful tribute to the Senate that we have a man as majority leader who is as fair as is the Senator from California.

First, I am delighted that he has made the statement which he has made. It should dispose once and for all of what I have been reading in the newspapers, namely, the intimation that the junior Senator from Minnesota should in any way be under attack because of the bill to which reference has been made. I think the issue is quite clear.

The next point about the postal inspectors' reports is this: At the time the junior Senator from Minnesota introduced the bill he introduced it at the request of the Postmaster General, with the concurrence of the Bureau of the Budget, and with a letter from the Comptroller General, Mr. Lindsay Warren, saying that he had no objection to the measure. That is the language customarily used by the Comptroller General.

A member of my staff discussed this subject with former Postmaster General Donaldson, and I find that he discussed it with the Bureau of the Budget. I find that, while some postal inspectors felt that the pneumatic-tube service could be discontinued, the study which was made was on the basis of the possibility that it would be discontinued, and on the basis of the extra cost which would be involved in that event in the use of trucks and other forms of replacement transportation.

The former Postmaster General has assured my staff that there was no negative report by any full committee of departmental officials or postal inspectors with respect to the pneumatic-tube proposal.

As a Member of the Senate, I accepted the report of the Postmaster General on a strictly technical subject. I wish to make it quite clear that this measure had already been approved in 1948. The Humphrey bill provided only for an increase in the rate of payment, so that there could be conversion from direct current to alternating current.

The basic investigation of the efficiency of the service, the investigation as to the necessity for the pneumatic tubes, had been made in the 80th Congress. At the time our committee considered the bill we had before us the reports made during the 80th Congress, the recommendation of the Bureau of the Budget, the recommendation of the Postmaster General, and the concurrence or, at least, the letter from the Comptroller General indicating that he had no objection. The bill was unanimously passed. So in 1950 I had no information that anyone was opposed to the bill. The Congress had unanimously approved the pneumatic-tube service.

Let me say to my colleagues that I am not intimately acquainted with the postal service in New York City. I was not actuated by any particular desire to introduce a bill for the benefit of New York City. I introduced the bill on my responsibility as chairman of the subcommittee, as the majority leader has made quite clear. The bill was an administration bill referred through channels until it came to the "low man on the totem pole," the chairman of the subcommittee.

If Mr. Summerfield wishes to have this subject thoroughly investigated, that is exactly my recommendation, as will be apparent as I proceed with my speech.

There are two points involved. The first is the matter of headlines such as this: "Humphrey-Sponsored Postal Bill Starts New Democratic Scandal."

Are such headlines fair and accurate?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I am sure the distinguished Senator from Minnesota will not hold the Postmaster General responsible for newspaper headlines in Minnesota or in any of the other States of the Union. I am sure the Postmaster General has enough to do in endeavoring to operate the Post Office Department. He certainly is not calling up newspapers and suggesting headlines. So I think in all fairness the Senator should realize that a headline in a particular newspaper is not necessarily chargeable to the Postmaster General. As the distinguished Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH] has pointed out, in the statement which the Postmaster General released there is nothing which would indicate on the part of the Postmaster General any charge of lack of integrity or character, directed toward the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The junior Senator from Minnesota is talking about a fact which is very obvious to every Member of this body, and that is that Members of this body are not appointed. They are elected.

The Postmaster General refers to a bill of which the junior Senator from Minnesota was the sponsor as though it involved new legislation, as though it involved a new contract, as though an innovation in the postal service were being made. He then makes certain representations as to facts, in connection with savings of $1 million a year, as compared to a cost of $25,000 for trucks.

Subsequently, the attack upon the junior Senator from Minnesota begins with words such as "dereliction of public responsibility," "graft," and "scandal." When events happen in that sequence, something more than mere coincidence is involved. I think that is quite clear.

There are members of the Press Gallery present today who have telephoned my office, and who know that it is quite clear that this is a premeditated, planned offensive against the junior Senator from Minnesota. It must be pretty difficult for some people to find issues if they must use the pneumatic-tube bill in order to start the attack.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Of course, the Senator ought to be aware of the fact that this is only the beginning.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Wait until the campaign really gets under way.

What did the Postmaster General mean when he said that the Senator protested too much? What was the implication behind that statement?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I have been trying to figure that out. I suppose if accusations were to be made against any Member of this body which he felt to be unfounded or untrue, no matter from whence such accusations came, he would feel it his duty to protest, if not on behalf of himself and his colleagues, at least on behalf of his family. I do not intend to have my name dragged down into the mud and attached to something with respect to which the Postmaster General says we ought to inquire so as to ascertain the motives behind this contract.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The reason I ask the question is that in a well-known play by Shakespeare we find the words, "The lady doth protest too much, methinks." The implication is that she is guilty of something.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator is absolutely correct. He is not only a good student of Shakespeare, but he is also a factual observer of politics.

Mr. MORSE and Mr. LEHMAN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Minnesota yield and if so to whom?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield first to the Senator from Oregon, and then, if I may, I should like to pursue the development of this case, because I told the majority leader that I wished to cooperate today and dispose of this question promptly.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, it is not the fault of the Senator from Minnesota that so much time is being spent on this subject. The time is being spent because a considerable number of Senators on the floor of the Senate feel that the subject is worthy of the attention of the Senate.

I should like to ask the Senator from Minnesota 2 or 3 clarifying questions. I am following the presentation very closely, and I wish to be sure that I understand it.

The majority leader pointed out, as I understood, that the transcript of testimony before the appropriate Senate committee showed that a negative report was filed by a post office inspector, recommending against the continuation of the tube system. I listened to the rejoinder of the Senator from Minnesota. I am not quite clear whether, at the time the Senator from Minnesota introduced the bill at the request of the Postmaster General in 1950, he was advised by anyone as to the existence or nonexistence of a negative report on the part of anyone concerning the continuation of the tube system.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I was never so advised. I may say to the Senator from Oregon that I was advised that the whole matter was thoroughly discussed at departmental levels by those who were responsible for policy, had been thoroughly discussed by the Bureau of the Budget, and had been given approval by the Bureau of the Budget.

Mr. MORSE. That is what I wish to emphasize. At this point in the presentation of his case in chief, it is the statement of the Senator from Minnesota, is it not, that, irrespective of what may be said in the transcript concerning the testimony before any committee in regard to a proposal now to discontinue the tube system, when the Senator was chairman of the subcommittee and introduced a bill for the administration—which is a common practice on the part of a chairman of a committee or subcommittee—it was the Senator's understanding that the recommendations of the parties in interest favored the continuation of the system?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I may say——

Mr. MORSE. The answer to that question is yes, I assume.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct. I may say to the Senator from Oregon that we have discussed the matter with the former Postmaster General, and I point out furthermore that the members of the subcommittee, the Senator from Delaware [Mr. FREAR], and former Senator Ecton, in the 81st Congress were likewise of the same opinion. A report was made to the 80th Congress on the pneumatic tube service. The report included the result of the investigation made by the Post Office Department's inspectors and top officials and representatives, and by members of the Senate subcomittee. It was on the basis of that report, which was a thorough, completely, and total system report, that the subcommittee, of which the junior Senator from Minnesota was chairman, proceeded. It was on that basis that the whole committee proceeded.

I see the Senator from Delaware [Mr. FREAR] on his feet.

Mr. FREAR. I merely wish to confirm what the Senator stated, if he will yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. FREAR. I recall the situation very well, and I am sure the former Senator from Montana, Mr. Ecton, would also recall it if he were present.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the Senator. We worked hard on that subcommittee, and I believe we processed about as many bills as any subcommittee ought to process.

Mr. FREAR. I believe we did.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the report, Report No. 1241, be printed in the RECORD following my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 5.)

Mr. HUMPHREY. As the result of this investigation and these unanimous recommendations, the Republican-controlled 80th Congress unanimously—and I underscore the word "unanimously"—passed a bill, S. 2510, in 1948 authorizing the Postmaster General to contract pneumatic tube facilities in New York at a rate not to exceed $12,000 per mile.

I ask unanimous consent that Public Law 848, 80th Congress, chapter 761, 2d session, S. 2510, approved June 30, 1948, be printed in the body of the RECORD following my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 6.)

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent that the conference report on this bill, Report No. 2431, 80th Congress, 2d session, dated June 19, 1948, be printed in the body of the RECORD following these remarks, as well as a statement of the managers on the part of the House in support of this conference report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 7.)

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, many of the present Members of the Senate were Members of the Senate of the 80th Congress which unanimously passed S. 2150. These include the senior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE]. The same can be said of many Members of the House of Representatives of both political parties, including one of our incumbent Members of Congress, Representative HAROLD HAGEN, of the Minnesota Ninth Congressional District, a Republican, who is the chairman of the House Committee on Post Offices and Civil Service.

I have in my hand a photostatic copy of the rollcall vote in the Senate Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, dated April 27, 1948, on S. 2510, the bill authorizing the continuation of the pneumatic tube mail service system.

It was at this time that the full investigation was made. It was at this time that the postal inspectors, the top officialdom, the Postmaster General, the Assistant Postmaster General, the Superintendent of Mails, and the Members of Congress were called upon to investigate the whole system, and as the result of that investigation a report was published, which was adopted by Congress, and the bill was subsequently introduced to continue the system.

I ask unanimous consent that the vote be printed in the body of the RECORD following my remarks.

Mr. MORSE. I would suggest to the Senator from Minnesota that it be printed at this point in the RECORD.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I amend my request accordingly.

There being no objection, the vote was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Yeas: Mr. Flanders, Mr. Thye, Mr. Ecton, Mr. McKellar, Mr. O'Daniel, Mr. Johnston, Mr. O'Conor, chairman.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, it will be noted that the vote was unanimous, with eight members present. There are check marks next to the names of the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE], the then Senator from Montana, Mr. Ecton, the then Senator from Tennessee, Mr. McKellar, the then Senator from Texas, Mr. O'Daniel, the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], the then Senator from Maryland, Mr. O'Conor, and the chairman, the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER].

Thus the pneumatic tube system, which began operating in 1898 received a unanimous vote of Congress by both the Democrats and Republicans in 1948 to continue operating.

In 1949, the Post Office Department was informed that that Consolidated Edison Company of New York which serviced the penumatic tube mail service system with power could no longer serv-

ice the nonstandard current for which this system was equipped.

Mr. President, we were confronted with the same situation in the Capitol. We had to spend hundreds of thousands of dollars to convert from direct current to alternating current. As a result walls had to be torn out, and conduit lines had to be taken through walls and under floors. That was the situation which obtained when the Consolidated Edison Co. in New York said to the company which had the pneumatic tube contract, "We are stopping our direct-current service which you have been receiving. You must now change to alternating current." That was 1 year after the contract had been renewed, and 1 year after the full investigation of the system was had.

What happened, Mr. President?

New equipment, therefore, was necessary to install standard alternating current. The cost for the new equipment was estimated at $350,000. It was also deemed desirable to add a number of booster stations to strengthen the system at an additional nominal cost.

The figures were laid before the Bureau of the Budget. As all of us know, the Bureau of the Budget is not exactly a charity institution. The Bureau weighed the figures very carefully. The Postmaster General asked the Bureau of the Budget to accept responsibility with him for the recommendation. As a result of their recommendation and as a result of further investigation, the Postmaster General sent to the Vice President of the United States a letter asking that appropriate legislation be introduced to amend the contract.

The Postmaster General and Budget Bureau came to the Congress in 1950 and asked for an increase in the rate authorization in the contract, so that extra sums necessary could be amortized over a 10-year period.

It should be remembered that the pneumatic-tube system was used exclusively by the United States Post Office Department.

I ask unanimous consent that a letter from the Postmaster General of the United States addressed to the Vice President of the United States, dated August 25, 1950, be printed in the body of the RECORD following my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 8.)

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the Vice President of the United States referred the letter from the Postmaster General to the chairman of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee, our colleague and my friend, the distinguished Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON]. The chairman in turn referred the letter to me as chairman of the Senate subcommittee on Post Office Affairs.

Therefore, if anyone should ask why I introduced the bill, I point out that it was done, at the request of the Post Office Department, the Vice President, and the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, as part of my responsibility as chairman of the subcommittee.

In connection with my responsibilities as chairman, I introduced S. 4102 on August 28, 1950. This bill substantively altered the law passed by the Republican controlled 80th Congress only to the extent of authorizing the extra expenditure of $3,500 per mile so that the equipment could be amortized over a 10-year period. Our report estimated that the extra expenditure would add no more than $53,000 a year.

In the fantastic figures of the national budget I want this figure to stand out. The Humphrey bill, which is now being so roundly attacked and critically analyzed, calls for the expenditure of $53,000 a year over and above what had been authorized in 1948, and I may say that in between those years there had been a slight inflation in the United States. The actual extra expenditure during the first year of operation was less than $53,000.

Mr. President, I repeat that every year the Postmaster General, in order to get funds to continue the contract, must come before the Appropriations Committees of the House and the Senate, and if at any time the Appropriations Committees do not provide the funds for carrying out the contract, the contract is null and void.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, as far back, at least, as 1937, Congress made annual appropriations to pay for the tube service. I was aware of the investigation which was made of the tube service by the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads. Congress could at any time have cut off the money. If it did not appropriate for the service, of course, it would have stopped the tube system from operating.

There is one question I should like to ask. If the Post Office Department made an agreement—and, of course, money would have to be appropriated to carry out the agreement—and it was understood in the agreement that the increased cost the company must incur over a period of 10 years would be amortized, would there be any legitimate basis for the company to say that, acting under authorizing legislation and under appropriations year after year, it had expended money which it would have lost if it could not continue the operation?

Would that be a basis of a claim against the United States?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I understand that is why the cancellation was referred to the Justice Department. That is the issue which the Postmaster General raised, as to whether the company would have a claim. I think I can quote some interesting material which would be helpful.

The president of the company, at the time the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] was holding hearings in New York City on the contract, appeared and stated that the contract was for a number of years, but that if at any time Congress failed to appropriate money, the contract would be null and void. The Congress, by acting through appropriations every year, kept reaffirming the contract.

Mr. HAYDEN. Congress would be justified in not appropriating money upon a showing that a better way of doing the work had been devised.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct.

Mr. HAYDEN. That is a question to be passed upon by the Congress.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct. I came to the Congress in 1949, and in 1948 and 1949, in 1951, 1952, and 1953, Congress appropriated the funds. Apparently, Congress must have thought the tube service was a valuable service.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. HILL. It is true that Congress appropriated funds not only in 1949, 1950, and 1951, but also in 1947 and 1948. Is not that correct?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes; and also in the 78th and 79th Congresses, and away back to the 66th Congress.

Mr. HILL. In other words, Congress appropriated money for the tube service for many years. That meant that the appropriations had to be approved by the House Committee on Appropriations, the House itself, and by the Senate Committee on Appropriations and the Senate itself.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct.

Mr. HILL. The funds had to be approved by those four different branches of the Congress.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the Senator from Alabama. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, dated August 30, 1950, to the chairman of the Senate Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, as well as a letter dated August 25, 1950, addressed to me from the chief clerk of the Senate Committee on Post Office and Civil Service be printed in the body of the RECORD following my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit No. 9.)

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield to the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, the Senator from Minnesota is making a very good record. I wonder if he desires to have placed in the RECORD Senate bill 4102.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I do.

Mr. President, Senate bill 4102 was unanimously approved by the Senate Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. On that committee were both Democrats and Republicans. They included:

Republicans: William Langer, North Dakota; Ralph E. Flanders, Vermont; Edward J. Thye, Minnesota; Zales N. Ecton, Montana; Henry C. Dworshak, Idaho; Harry Darby, Kansas.

Democrats: Kenneth McKellar, Tennessee; Russell B. Long, Louisiana; Matthew M. Neely, West Virginia; J. Allen Frear, Jr., Delaware; Hubert H. Humphrey, Minnesota; Edward L. Leahy, Rhode Island.

That committee accepted the findings of the thorough investigation by the Republican-controlled Senate committee in 1948.

The bill passed the Senate unanimously, with both the Republican and Democratic leadership giving their approval to it. It was also unanimously passed by the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee. It was unanimously passed by the House of Representatives and became public law.

Mr. President, I digress for a moment to ask, what more could one ask in terms of approval? The bill passed the Senate unanimously, and it was unanimously passed by the House of Representatives and became law. It is clear from these facts that any criticism of the law is a criticism not only of myself but of every Member of the Senate and of the House, Republicans and Democrats alike.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senate bill 4102 and the committee report on that bill Senate Report No. 2504, 81st Congress, 2d session, be printed in the body of the RECORD following my remarks, together with House Report No. 3144, 81st Congress, 2d session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit No. 10.)

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, my political opponents are attempting to smear my reputation with their criticism, but to succeed in this absurd effort is in fact to reflect upon the integrity of the Congress which unanimously supported the legislation, and which has supported the pneumatic-tube mail system since 1898. The Minnesota Republican leadership following the lead of Mr. Summerfield, the political boss of the Neanderthal wing of the Republican Party, neglected to confirm the facts.

Mr. President, since this smear attack is leveled against me, I have thoroughly investigated the history, development, and record of the pneumatic-tube mail service system. I wrote letters to the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], chairman during the 80th Congress of the Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee, and to the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], chairman in the 81st Congress of the Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that these letters be printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JANUARY 26, 1954.

The Honorable WILLIAM LANGER,
*The United States Senate,*
*Washington, D. C.*

DEAR SENATOR LANGER: Within the last few weeks as a result of an announcement made by Postmaster General Summerfield canceling a contract under which the New York City Post Office is serviced by pneumatic tube system, a number of statements have been made in the Minnesota press reflecting upon the propriety and the legality of the legislation authorizing that contract. I am enclosing for your information copies of the editorials and newspaper articles to which I refer. You will notice that I am personally being criticized by my political opponents because I sponsored during the 81st Congress a bill, S. 4102, relating to the pneumatic tube contracts which passed the Congress and became Public Law 889 in 1950.

You were a member of the Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee during the 81st Congress which unanimously approved the bill, S. 4102. You were, also, chairman, during the 80th Congress, of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. You were likewise chairman of the special subcommittee which held hearings in New York on March 29, 1948, on the pneumatic-tube mail service and you sponsored a bill, S. 2150, during the 80th Congress relating to this pneumatic tube service. Your bill became Public Law 848 in 1948.

In view of the fact that you have very thoroughly and carefully considered the problem of pneumatic-tube mail service in New York and recommended that the Post Office Department sign new contracts to strengthen that system, I would appreciate it very much if you could review for me your views with regard to that contract as well as your experiences and the results of your investigations. You will recall that I was not a Member of the Senate during the 80th Congress, and hence I am not in a position to know the full background and facts with regard to this legislation and investigation.

Sincerely yours,

HUBERT H. HUMPHREY.

---

JANUARY 26, 1954.

The Honorable OLIN D. JOHNSTON,
*The United States Senate,*
*Washington, D. C.*

DEAR SENATOR JOHNSTON: The enclosed newspaper clippings and editorials will show you that I am under political attack by some leaders of the Republican Party in my State as a result of a bill, S. 4102, which I introduced during the 81st Congress relating to contracts for the transmission of mail by pneumatic tube. You were chairman of the Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee during the 81st Congress and appointed me chairman of the Subcommittee on Post Office Affairs, which led to my sponsorship of the bill in question.

You were also a member of the Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee during the 80th Congress and are thus undoubtedly acquainted with the background of this legislation because of the fact that it was the Republican-controlled 80th Congress that established the pattern which we followed in 1950 with regard to the pneumatic-tube service.

I would appreciate it very much if you would read the attached criticisms and give me your views with regard to them. I would, also, appreciate your views with regard to the decision of Postmaster General Summerfield to cancel the contract authorized by legislation of both the 80th and 81st Congresses, and unanimously approved by both Democrats and Republicans in 1948 and again in 1950.

It was not my intent to trouble you with this request, because I did not take the original criticisms seriously and considered them merely a feeble attempt to distort the facts for political gain. In view of the fact that these distortions have received wide circulation in my State, I am determined to reveal the facts. I am, therefore, anxious to have in my possession whatever information you may have with regard to this issue.

I look forward to hearing from you.

Sincerely yours,

HUBERT H. HUMPHREY.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I also have in my possession replies which I received from the Senator from North Dakota and the Senator from South Carolina. The reply of the letter of the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] dated January 30, 1951, contains a splendid description of the hearings held by the Langer subcommittee under the chairmanship of the Senator from North Dakota. I shall not take the time of the Senate to read it.

Much of the report of the Senator from North Dakota is taken from the 80th Congress report, and I have asked that that report be printed in the body of the RECORD, so I see no need to further develop it.

I ask unanimous consent that the letters from Senator LANGER and Senator JOHNSTON of South Carolina be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JANUARY 30, 1954.

Hon. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
*United States Senate,*
*Washington, D. C.*

DEAR HUBERT: Your letter of January 26 troubled me a great deal because I recall vividly the study which we undertook in the Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee during the 80th Congress when I was chairman of that committee. I have asked my staff to refresh my memory further with the actual official documents which I have carefully examined. The criticism of you and your activities in connection with S. 4102 is totally unfounded.

On March 29, 1948, Senator Ecton of Montana and I held hearings in New York City on the pneumatic-tube service. We made a thorough investigation of this service as a means of transporting the mails in New York. We went into all phases of this question including the cost of the contract, the value of the tube service, and the advisability of continuing that service. Our conclusion was unanimous that the pneumatic-tube mail service was advisable, necessary, and economical as a service in the New York post office. Our conclusion took the form of a bill, S. 2510, which I introduced and which was unanimously approved by our committee, Republicans and Democrats alike, by the United States Senate, Republicans and Democrats alike, and by the House of Representatives, Republicans and Democrats alike. This bill became Public Law 848, 80th Congress, 2d session. The Senate report on that bill, which I submitted to the Senate on May 5, 1948, is report No. 1241, 80th Congress, 2d session. The conference report dated June 19, 1948, is report No. 2431, 80th Congress, 2d session. It is signed by me, Senators Ecton and O'Conor, and by Representatives Rees, St. George, and Murray. I am attaching for your information a copy of the official rollcall of the Senate Committee on Post Office and Civil Service dated April 27, 1948, in support of our bill. You will notice upon examining it that it had unanimous, bipartisan support, including the support of your senior colleague, Mr. THYE.

Now, let me give you the background of the pneumatic-tube problem based on the hearings and studies we made during the 80th Congress. The pneumatic-tube system began operation in the New York post office in 1898—56 years ago. When we held our hearings it was 25 miles long, and connected the main post office with 21 branches. We were told by the postal experts that a mail count was kept on March 27, 1947—an average business day—and that on that day 5,871,546 pieces of mail were handled through the pneumatic tubes, which were operating 17 hours a day. (See pp. 8, 33, of our printed hearing—March 29, 1948.)

The pneumatic-tube service has been operating constantly in New York from 1899 until this year with two exceptions. Congress failed to make the necessary appropriations available in 1901 and in 1918. In both cases, however, the appropriation was restored by subsequent Congresses, in 1902 and in 1922.

During the hearings we were told by Mr. Charles H. Carle, assistant superintendent of the New York City post office, that—

"The tubes are important to the service at New York because of traffic density, because

they afford a means of obtaining a steady flow of mail to mail-handling employees at the point where they work it, thereby making the entire operation more flexible, and because they have proven to be dependable and speedy as compared with any method of surface transportation." (Pp. 8 and 9 of the hearings.)

Senator Ecton in commenting on this testimony said at the hearings:

"It not only saves time but isn't it also true that it saves a lot of transportation expenses." (P. 10 of hearings.)

We, also, had an official report from the postmaster of the New York post office recommending the continuance of the pneumatic tube mail service. I quote from his report:

"Today when mail matter must move quickly to meet all kinds of timetable deadlines—plane, railroad, and steamer—to insure its early delivery, the underground pneumatic-tube system is invaluable. Without it the post office would have to operate a larger fleet of trucks to transport the mail." (P. 24 of hearings.)

"Pneumatic-tube service is dependable inasmuch as it is not affected generally by street surface traffic or by weather conditions." (P. 24 of hearings.)

"Experience had with the pneumatic tubes as a medium for the transportation of mail at New York, N. Y., since their establishment, has proven their value as an essential auxiliary to the motor-vehicle service. They have been operated efficiently, thereby affording a reliable and dependable means for a more expeditious dispatch of mails for train connection and interchange of mail for delivery by carrier than could be obtained by the exclusive use of motor-vehicle service. Because of advantages in the time of transit, the fact that they can be used at any time during the period of operation, and the large volume of mail being transported through the pneumatic-tube system, it is advisable that in the interest of good service in New York, N. Y., and Brooklyn, N. Y., that this service be continued." (P. 29 of hearings.)

"The advantage of the pneumatic-tube service for the expeditious dispatch and handling of mail has been heretofore shown. The advantage of this service over motor-vehicle service, other than the speed of transmission, is the fact that it may be used at any time, whereas the motor-vehicle service necessarily is scheduled at regular intervals for trips; in other words, mail destined for transportation by motor-vehicle service must be held from one trip to the next, whereas the use of the tubes is available at any time during the hours of service.

"Its advantage in reducing to a minimum the possibility of missing train connections or a delivery of mail is apparent. The tubes also afford a means for feeding mail to a distribution unit in a continuous stream, rather than forwarding the mass by motor-vehicle service. By using the tubes, special-delivery matter and other matter of this type may be forwarded to the point of distribution for delivery each few minutes. If this service were not available the mail could not be forwarded until the dispatch of the next regularly scheduled motor-vehicle trip, and in consequence there is the possibility that mail which now connects with outgoing airplane or train connection and delivery trip might fail to connect if dispatched by motor-vehicle service." (P. 38 of hearings.)

"The volume of postal business transacted and the vast quantity of first-class mails, out-bound and in-bound, handled daily by the New York post office justifies the use of the best transportation facilities obtainable for the movement of the mails interchanged between the general post office, New York, N. Y., and the stations, and the general post office, Brooklyn, N. Y., in order to insure the most expeditious dispatch and delivery of the mails." (Pp. 44 and 45 of hearings.)

Our subcommittee in addition to investigating this evidence and other similar evidence made a study of the traffic congestion problem in New York. The portion of the City of New York which is being served by the New York post office is built upon a long, narrow island. Practically the entire portion of the Island of Manhattan south of 59th Street has become a business district and is characterized by constant traffic congestion. This problem has been complicated by the replacement of streetcar traffic in almost every section of the city by motorbuses. It was our feeling that the use of pneumatic tubes by the New York post office has proved to be a valuable auxiliary in the handling of the mails by helping to relieve the traffic congestion and by saving a great deal of time lost in traffic.

Our subcommittee, also, carefully explored the cost factor in comparing mail service via the use of pneumatic tubes over and as against the use of motor vehicles. Mr. Carle, speaking for the New York post office, gave our committee the following information in reply to my questions:

"The CHAIRMAN. How does the cost of pneumatic-tube service compare to delivery with trucks?

"Mr. CARLE. The cost at the present rate of rental, according to the latest figures we have, is $57,000 a year less than comparable truck service would cost.

"The CHAIRMAN. Pneumatic-tube service is $57,000 a year less?

"Mr. CARLE. At the present rate of rental; yes, sir." (P. 17 of hearing.)

The Postmaster confirmed this statement and provided our committee with a detailed cost analysis of additional expenditures which would be necessary to substitute a motor-vehicle service for the pneumatic-tube service. The total cost estimate for the use of motor vehicles came to $423,945.90. (See p. 41 of hearings.)

In addition to this estimate of the cost of motor-vehicle service that would be required we were informed that it would, also, be necessary to engage additional personnel to handle the mails and to perform operations connected with pouching, movement from the pouch racks to the trucks, checking into the vehicle, receipt of the mail at destination, removal of the mails, and delivery to workroom points. It was estimated that 90 additional employees would be required to replace the services and the personnel now provided for the pneumatic-tube service (pp. 42 and 43 of hearings). The total cost for this added personnel would be $255,000. In addition to the additional motor-vehicle service and additional personnel needed (totaling $678,945.90) there would be additional items of cost including the purchase of trucks, additional garage facilities, and 19,582 additional pouches.

These figures indicated to us in 1948 that a substitute motor-vehicle service replacing the pneumatic-tube service would cost a minimum of $57,747.14 more than the cost of the existing pneumatic service.

The conclusion of the New York postmaster in his recommendation to us was as follows:

"The surface transportation in the city of New York is seriously interfered with and subject to interruptions and delay because of the acute congestion caused by the vast number of vehicles operating over the city streets, and by the density of population; and the pneumatic-tube system provides a subsurface medium for the prompt exchange of outbound and inbound first-class mails between the general post office and carrier stations and the distribution centers for dispatch to trains or transmission to stations of delivery, free from street congestion or delay caused by traffic or inclement weather.

"The transportation via pneumatic tubes permits of later closings and the use of supplementary dispatches after the final closing time for out-bound mails and the rapid transmission of in-bound and local mails for delivery.

"The availability of the pneumatic-tube service, when used for the transmission of mails at any time during the hours of operation, has a decided service advantage over the motor vehicle, since mail must necessarily accumulate between the schedule time of departure of a motor-vehicle trip and the departure of the subsequent motor-vehicle trip.

"To provide the same motor-vehicle service which was in operation when the tube service was discontinued, it would be necessary to schedule motor vehicles on a half-hourly frequency between the points connected by the pneumatic tubes. Additional employees would be required at all these points to perform the duties incident to the handling of pouches and the loading and unloading of vehicles.

"The estimated annual cost for additional motor vehicles and the additional personnel that would be required as a substitute for pneumatic-tube service would be $678,945.90, which would be $57,747.14 more than the present cost of the pneumatic-tube service, which is $621,198.76." (P. 45 of hearings.)

"Superior service is provided through the medium of the pneumatic-tube service as compared with the motor-vehicle service, on a basis of availability, speed of transmission, and dependability, considering the obstacles prevailing against a more rapid surface transportation, and the freedom of movement of the subsurface medium of transportation." (P. 45 of hearings.)

Our committee shared that conclusion and in our unanimous bipartisan report to the Senate we further added the fact:

"The value of the pneumatic-tube system was dramatically brought into bold relief during Christmas week of 1947 when a 22.8-inch snowfall all but paralyzed New York City but in no way interrupted the orderly distribution of mails through this well-established pneumatic-tube device.

"Today when mail matter must move quickly to meet all kinds of timetable deadlines—planes, railroad, and steamer—to insure its early delivery, the underground pneumatic-tube system is invaluable." (P. 3, Rept. No. 1241, 80th Cong., 2d sess.)

I trust the above information is helpful to you and gives you the background and the facts which transpired before you became a Member of the Senate. You will recall that our hearings were brought to your attention in 1950 and provided the basis for the legislation you introduced, S. 4102, and which I voted for as a member of the Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee.

If I can provide you with any further information, do not hesitate to communicate with me.

With kind regards and best wishes, I am,

Sincerely,

WILLIAM LANGER.

---

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON POST OFFICE
AND CIVIL SERVICE,
*February 1, 1954.*

The Honorable HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
*United States Senate,*
*Washington, D. C.*

DEAR HUBERT: The partisan political attacks upon you are a reflection upon the integrity of the Congress. The bill, S. 4102, for which you are being criticized, was unanimously approved by our full committee, the Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee, on September 1, 1950, during the period when I was chairman of the committee. The other members of our committee who voted for the bill are as follows:

Republicans: William Langer, North Dakota; Ralph E. Flanders, Vermont; Edward J. Thye, Minnesota; Zales N. Ecton, Montana; Henry C. Dworshak, Idaho; Harry Darby, Kansas.

Democrats: Kenneth McKellar, Tennessee; Russell B. Long, Louisiana; Matthew M. Neely, West Virginia; J. Allan Frear, Jr., Delaware; Hubert H. Humphrey, Minnesota; Edward L. Leahy, Rhode Island.

S. 4102 was also unanimously approved on December 5, 1950, by the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. You will find that one of your Minnesota colleagues, Congressman HAROLD C. HAGEN, Republican, was a member of that committee which approved the bill. The bill passed the Senate on September 30, 1950, passed the House of Representatives on December 18, 1950, and became Public Law 889 in 1950.

I regret very much that this bill has been made a partisan issue by the announcement of the Postmaster General and by criticisms you have received from the Republican National Committee. They are to be condemned for allowing their partisanship to outweigh their responsibility to the public interest.

During the 81st Congress, a Democratic-controlled Congress, we passed S. 4102 based upon the investigations and hearings conducted by the Republican-controlled 80th Congress. Our action was unanimous and free of partisanship. A partisan examination of the pneumatic-tube issue would demonstrate that it came into being during the Republican-controlled 55th Congress, 1898, and was discontinued in 1918 by the Democratic-controlled 65th Congress. The decision to authorize the pneumatic-tube service once again was made in 1922 by the Republican-controlled 67th Congress.

In 1948, the 80th Congress, the Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee, undertook an investigation of pneumatic tubes in New York. As a result of a unanimous decision made by that Republican-controlled Congress, a contract between the United States Government and the New York Mail & Newspaper Transportation Co. was authorized under which an annual rental contract payment rate was established not to exceed $12,000 per mile. Following the passage of that bill, the pneumatic-tube company was faced with an added expense not contemplated for under the original bill. They were informed by the Consolidated Edison Co. of New York that they could not be serviced unless they changed from direct current to alternating current. This required an additional expenditure of $350,000 for the alterations, plus added expenses for a number of new booster stations. After conferences between the company and the Post Office Department the Postmaster General submitted a letter to the Vice President of the United States requesting the passage of legislation which would authorize the Post Office Department to help pay for this added expense by increasing the contract price and amortizing the expense over a 10-year period. I am attaching a copy of the letter for your information. I am also attaching a copy of a letter which I received August 30, 1950, signed by the Comptroller General of the United States with regard to this bill, S. 4102.

At my request the staff director and chief clerk of the Senate Committee on Post Office and Civil Service requested you on August 25, 1950, to introduce the legislation sponsored by the Post Office Department, in view of your position as chairman of the Subcommittee on Post Office Affairs.

My records show that you and the members of your subcommittee, Senators FREAR and ECTON, referred the bill to the full committee for approval.

The purpose of the bill, therefore, was to increase the $12,000 per mile rate authorized by the 80th Congress, of which you were not a member, by an additional $3,500 per year for 10 years to cover the extra cost of converting the pneumatic tube from nonstandard direct current to standard alternating current. Your bill did nothing more, therefore, than authorize the expenditure of $53,000 per year for 10 years. This expenditure seemed wise from the point of view of the Congress. It was based on facts and study. As a Member of the Congress during the 81st Congress and as a chairman of the committee which had jurisdiction over the bill, I resent any attempt to cast aspersions upon Members of the Congress, all of whom supported the bill, for the sake of monetary political expediency.

I should like to remind you of one other thing insofar as both of the bills approved by the 80th and 81st Congresses are concerned. They were merely enabling acts. Following passage of these acts, the Senate and House Appropriations Committee considered this matter very thoroughly and approved the expenditure of the necessary funds to allow the Postmaster General to sign the contract.

I am also attaching for your information a copy of the managers' statement prepared by our full committee in 1950 for use on the floor of the Senate in support of Senate bill 4102.

Incidentally, I notice from the editorial criticism against you that you are being attacked for authorizing the signing of a 10-year contract by the Post Office Department for the use of pneumatic tubes. This strikes me as being strange indeed. Our study shows that it was the Republican-controlled Congress which authorized in 1922 the signing of a 10-year contract. This contract expired June 30, 1932.

This 10-year contract entered into by the Republican-controlled Congress, by the way, was for "not exceeding $19,500 per mile," as compared to the bill which our 81st Congress authorized for the amount not to exceed $15,500. The 1922 contract cost our Government $526,500 a year for 10 years, as compared to $351,802 per year for 1952, the first year of operation under the contract which we authorized.

Even though our bill permitted the expenditure up to $15,500 per mile, the first year's contract for 1952 came to $14,067 per mile, and I am informed by Postmaster General Donaldson the cost was decreasing for 1953.

My staff is keeping a file on this case and on other instances of political manipulation by the Post Office Department. You may not have seen a newspaper clipping quoting Mr. Carl F. Dietz, president of the New York Mail & Newspaper Transportation Co. I, therefore, want to quote from it. He says: "I never discussed the contract with a Congressman, have never met Senator HUMPHREY, and did not know he introduced the bill."

Also, from a newspaper story interviewing Postmaster General Donaldson which says: "I checked with businessmen, however, and found that particularly in Wall Street, they wanted the tube service because of its comparative speed over trucks. I wouldn't take the responsibility alone so I told the story to both the Budget Bureau and Congress. They both agreed the tubes should stay."

I have further learned some very interesting statistics which affect this question. Under the pneumatic-tube system special-delivery mail, for which extra postage is paid, can be delivered from the train to the consignee in 45 minutes, as compared to 3 to 5 hours if trucks are used. Trucks, of course, also only make their deliveries two or three times a day. The records also show that the pneumatic-tube system carried between 5 and 6 million letters a day. To say that this volume of mail can be effectively and efficiently carried by two trucks, as Postmaster General Summerfield implies, is ridiculous. It would take a fleet of trucks at tremendous expense to serve this need.

I would like to talk to you more about this. I consider the tactic outrageous.

With kindest personal regards.

Sincerely,

OLIN D. JOHNSTON.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I know the Senator from Minnesota desires to be fair, and he has the right to expect the Senate and the country to be fair with him. But just before completing his remarks, as I recall his statement, he made a charge that these attacks had been made as a result of collusion between the Postmaster General and, presumably, certain party officials in Minnesota. Of course, the Senator from Minnesota is making a serious charge. So far as I know, at least during his remarks today, he has not furnished any evidence which would indicate or support a charge of collusion. At least, I have not heard it. He has said nothing which would, I think, indicate to the average person that those whom he has charged had conspired together and were responsible for the stories.

In glancing over the stories furnished to certain Senators by the distinguished Senator from Minnesota, I observed a photostatic copy of the Minneapolis Tribune of Sunday, February 7, 1954. At the bottom of column 2 there appears a statement by a Mr. Etzell, which reads as follows:

> Etzell also denied he had any contact with Summerfield before writing his editorial. He said he obtained his information from newspaper dispatches about the tube contract.

I think that in order to make the RECORD fair both to the junior Senator from Minnesota and to the Postmaster General, if the Senator from Minnesota has any evidence of collusion in the making of the charge, he should present it, because such an accusation goes beyond the general statement the Senator from Minnesota has been making.

Mr. HUMPHREY. My evidence would be that when the Postmaster General says, "The Senator doth protest too much," when the Postmaster General selects a particular item such as this out of all items incident to the reorganization of the Post Office Department, with contract after contract being canceled, with post office after post office being changed, with entire new systems being inaugurated, it is a very peculiar thing that HUBERT HUMPHREY, from the State of Minnesota, should be singled out for this specialized treatment.

There are 96 Members of the Senate. I may say that every Member of the Senate has, at one time or other, voted upon postal legislation. Many Senators have introduced bills pertaining to the postal service. Some of the legislation has now been counteracted or countermanded. Fourth-class post offices are being closed. I am not saying whether it is for good or for bad, but fourth-class post offices are being closed. With all the reorganization of the post office that is now under way, it is indeed peculiar that it ends up with Senator HUMPHREY under political attack.

I shall put it this way: The Postmaster General, by some coincidence, finds himself in cooperation with the Republican national committeeman within the State of Minnesota; or, to put it the other way, the Republican national committeeman

seems to have a sensitive nature, which causes him to find himself in cooperation with the Postmaster General. I say it is rather peculiar and suspicious.

I repeat: Out of all the activities of the Post Office Department, out of all the investigations conducted by the Post Office Department, out of all the reorganization proposed and effected by the Post Office Department, one United States Senator, who performed his duty, in reliance upon reports from his committee and of reports from a trained Postmaster General, a man who came up from the ranks in the postal service, having been a former civil-service employee in the Post Office Department—and in accordance with requests of the Bureau of the Budget, of the Vice President of the United States, of the Postmaster General, of the chairman of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, is singled out to receive this treatment. It seems to me to be a little peculiar and suspicious. I cannot be blamed for my suspicions, knowing, as I do, that the Postmaster General not so long ago wore the cloak of the chairman of the Republican National Committee.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I am glad the junior Senator from Minnesota has at least clarified the situation to that extent, because I think a charge made by a responsible Member of the United States Senate—and each Member of the Senate is a responsible Member, and holds a high position within the gift of the people of the respective States—of collusion between the Postmaster General, who is a member of the Cabinet of the President, and some party official presents an entirely different situation from that of a party official in an individual State who, based on testimony of the Cabinet member before a committee, may have on his own volition picked up and made some use of the charges. I think that is an entirely different thing.

If I may pursue my statement, it seems to me that the Senator from Minnesota, in his original statement charging collusion—and, of course, the Postmaster General himself does not have the privilege of the floor to make a speech in which to answer the Senator from Minnesota—was speaking of something far different than the act of somebody who may have used the testimony of the Postmaster General in which he might properly have expressed concern as to why a contract for 10 years had been entered into by a former Postmaster General, or his assistant, when apparently there had been advice in the Post Office Department that such a contract was unwise. That, as I say, is far different from a charge of collusion, which is a pretty serious charge.

Although I am a member of the Committee on Appropriations, I am not a member of the Subcommittee on the Treasury and Post Office Department Appropriations, and I have not had a chance to read the complete hearings. But, as I gather, from quickly going over the testimony, this was merely one of a large number of subjects dealing with the Post Office budget.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator is correct.

Mr. KNOWLAND. At least so far as this hearing was concerned, the Postmaster General did not, apparently, go before the committee merely to open up the subject either of the bill referred to or the tube contract, but the testimony related generally to Treasury and Post Office operations and budgetary problems. I think that in fairness to the Postmaster General that situation should be pointed out.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I wish to thank the Senator from California. But, in fairness to the junior Senator from Minnesota, this is the one item that is being referred to the McCarthy subcommittee. In fairness to the junior Senator from Minnesota, it should be said that the chairman of the Republican senatorial campaign committee, who is sitting now in this Chamber, asked that the matter be referred to the Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations. It could well have been referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, where it belongs.

I may say that it is very peculiar that this story should have broken in the Detroit newspapers, the home of the Postmaster General. That is where the first news story on this matter appeared.

A reporter came to my office and said, "Senator Humphrey, there is a big news story about you in Washington. All the good Republican folks out here are very anxious to get the information."

Call it "collusion" or call it "friendly cooperation." It has the same effect.

It is amazing to me that out of all the testimony of the Postmaster General with respect to his reformations of the postal service, one Member of the Senate is selected for charges. I might remind my colleagues that, with the elections, the loss of one Member of the Senate on this side of the aisle is significant. This is more than coincidence. The charge is political.

I am not a babe in the woods. I have been in politics long enough to know how it operates; and I am not going to stand idly by and have someone tell me this is not politics. It is politics in its most open manner, and, let me add, in one of its most unsavory manners.

What an issue, Mr. President. It is simply a portrait of things to come. The start is made on a pneumatic-tube bill, a bill that had been approved unanimously. It is a poor start. The Republicans will not succeed in this tactic.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. Is the Senator from Minnesota aware of the fact there never was but one meeting of the Senate Committee on Post Office and Civil Service?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am aware of that.

Mr. MAYBANK. Is the Senator from Minnesota aware of the fact that we had one meeting, but never had another meeting?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am.

Mr. MAYBANK. Day after day I called the former chairman of the committee to ascertain when there would be another meeting, but there was never another meeting. That is one of the peculiar aspects of the whole situation.

Mr. HUMPHREY. There are some very interesting developments and events in connection with the matter. I have no crystal ball; I cannot look into the future; but I can well understand the past. I simply say again: Why is it that a bill which was unanimously approved, had a unanimous report in its favor, and was unanimously passed by both Houses, has suddenly become a political issue? I will tell Senators why. It is because the junior Senator from Minnesota is up for reelection in 1954. It is very obvious why the junior Senator from Minnesota is the target.

I think it is interesting to note that in the State of Minnesota there has been a bit of trouble in getting someone to be a candidate against the junior Senator from Minnesota. Possibly it is desired to plow the soil a little, to loosen it up, to see whether some doubt cannot be cast upon the political scene.

I welcome such attention. Really I did not feel I was so important. I wish the charge had been made with respect to a somewhat more important bill. It is somewhat humiliating to me to be picked on with reference to a little bill like this. I really do not like to be identified with something that happened away back in the McKinley administration, when the first bill pertaining to the pneumatic-tube system was introduced. I do not like to be identified with the Harding administration, when a similar bill reappeared in 1922. But I may say there is some consolation in that the appropriations for the tube service were made in the Roosevelt administrations, the Truman administrations, and in the Eisenhower administration, when the 1st session of the 83d Congress of the United States appropriated funds for the pneumatic-tube system.

Congress and the administration last year found time to reduce the size of the Air Force and found time to discharge some 2,000 persons who were supposedly security risks. But they did not find time in 1953 to determine that the pneumatic-tube contract was not any good. But they found out in 1954. Let me see. The last election was in 1952. Yes; every 2 years we have an election. This is 1954. I do not want to read into the future, because if I could, I would be a great optimist. I have a pretty good idea of what the people of Minnesota are thinking at this time. If we conduct the campaign on the issues of the day, rather than digging down into the bowels of New York, perhaps we will have a sensible campaign.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield to the Senator from Montana.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Does the Senator think it is a possibility that the same newspapers in the State of Minnesota which carried the charges against the Senator will carry the statement made by the Senator on the floor of the United States Senate today?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I hope they will. "Hope springs eternal in the human breast." I hope.

We learn that the tube system is 27 miles long and in 1948, when the hearings were held, connected the main post office with 21 branches.

Mr. President, what I am stating comes from a report submitted in the 80th Congress. It is officially estimated that during an average business day nearly 6 million pieces of mail are handled through the pneumatic tubes, operating 17 hours a day. Does Mr. Summerfield expect the Congress and the American people to believe that he can transport this tremendous volume of mail every day by purchasing and using two trucks? I ask any man of sound mind, within reasonable distance of my voice, if he thinks two trucks can distribute 6 million pieces of mail a day. Let me remind the Postmaster General that the pony express would save him more money. The Postmaster General said that his only reason for canceling the contract was to save money. If that was the only reason for it, why does not the Postmaster General cancel the airmail contracts? They cost vast sums of money. But we keep airmail service, because it is good service, and we keep other kinds of equipment because they give good service. That is exactly what the pneumatic-tube system gave—good service.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield to the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I am at a disadvantage, because I have not had a chance to study the record completely and read the testimony which has been adduced. But is it a fact that the Postmaster General said that all the mail he mentioned could be carried by only two trucks, or did he say that with the purchase of two additional trucks, which would cost approximately $25,000, or whatever the amount was, the mail which is now carried through the pneumatic tube system could be handled by the post office in New York? I do not know the technical operation of the delivery system, but it is quite possible that mail is being sent through the tubes which might otherwise be handled by trucks not now running to capacity in the city of New York, and that if they could obtain two trucks to add to the number they now have, they could handle all the mail by truck.

I think it is important to determine whether the Postmaster General stated that all the mail could be handled by two trucks, or that the addition of two trucks to what the New York post office had would make it possible to handle all the mail.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The distinguished majority leader has made a good point, and I thought of that until I ascertained that the New York City post office is obtaining 70 new trucks. If the New York City post office needs 70 new trucks, it cannot do the work required with two trucks.

Mr. KNOWLAND. New York City is a large city.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am quite well aware of that.

Mr. KNOWLAND. It is the greatest city in the United States, and I suppose it has the largest post office.

Mr. HUMPHREY. It also has the heaviest traffic in the world.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Yes; probably the heaviest traffic in the world. I suppose any city the size of Chicago, Los Angeles, Philadelphia, or any other large city in America, where there is no pneumatic tube system, in the normal course has many trucks in operation. Because of obsolescence, it would be both good business and good judgment to replace trucks no longer capable of being operated economically. Such replacement is taking place all over the country. It takes place under Democratic administrations as well as Republican administrations, because there comes a time when it is no longer economical to operate motor equipment. So I wondered whether or not the statement the Senator referred to had anything to do with the pneumatic system as such, or whether it referred to normal replacement of obsolescent equipment which would normally take place in any great post office in the country.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I desire to say to the majority leader that I now have the Post Office Department release, and I think I can answer his question.

I quote from the release of the Post Office Department made on December 30, 1953:

> That the tube service is obsolete, unnecessary and excessively expensive is shown by the fact that the mail can be satisfactorily handled by the addition of two trucks at a yearly cost of about $25,000 a year.

Now listen:

> These two trucks will adequately replace the tube service which now costs the Government a total outlay of approximately $1 million a year.

I did not say that; the Postmaster General did. He says these two trucks will adequately replace the tube service, which now costs the Government a total of approximately $1 million a year.

I know there are a lot of fancy public-relations people working for the Government; I am not up to date on their methods; but I submit that anyone reading the release can come to only one conclusion, namely, that the Postmaster General said, "It costs $1 million a year to move the tube mail, and I will move it now for $25,000." We can argue from now to doomsday about it, but the public has been led to believe that two trucks will move the mail which the pneumatic tubes previously moved. One would have had to drink something besides ice-cold water to believe that.

By the way, the Postmaster General frankly tells the Congress of the United States that it did not know what it was doing in 1948, because the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] was a Member of the Congress in 1948 and, whether he remembers it or not, he voted for the bill, based on a report that the system was not obsolete, was not expensive, and was not unnecessary. The report said, in effect, that the system was necessary, that it was efficient, and that it was vital to the mail service.

All of a sudden the Postmaster General says that when the Congress voted for it, the Congress did not know what it was doing. He says that every Member of Congress, 531 in number, was wrong. The presumption is, of course, that we all know what we vote on when we act on the reports of committees but, nevertheless, we were wrong, he says.

In 1950 when the junior Senator from Minnesota introduced the bill, it was the practice of the then minority to have two Senators present at every calendar call in this body, and every single bill was examined. I remember the fine work of the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HENDRICKSON] and of the Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL]. Every bill was examined. Alongside of those two distinguished Senators sat a competent research man or clerk of the Republican policy committee, and every bill to which there was objection was objected to.

I make note of the fact that the Republican policy committee did not object to the Humphrey bill. I make note of the fact that the bill went through the committee.

I say it is very peculiar that I have been selected for the honor being paid me. The honor is not due me. I want to return it from whence it came. There is no more sense in this attack on me than there is trying to fly to the moon.

Mr. President, I have learned from the records that there is overwhelming expert testimony to the effect that the pneumatic-tube mail service system is vital to efficient service in New York; and that is what the Congress thought, or why did it pass the bill? That is what the Committee on Appropriations thought, or why did it grant the request for appropriations? Are we all going to sit idly by and hear it said that we were all wrong and did not know what we were doing? That is what the Postmaster General says. He has a vision no one else has.

Why is the tube service important? As the report on the bill in 1948 said:

> Because of traffic density, because of its flexibility, its speed, and its dependability regardless of the street surface, traffic, or adverse limitations.

Mr. President, if all the Postmaster General wants to do is to save money, I will tell him how he can do it. I am not advocating this, however. Rural free delivery does not pay its way; rural free delivery is expensive; but it is a vitally needed service. If the only desire of the Postmaster General is to save money, that is one avenue of approach. Cutting down the airmail service is another. We keep airplanes in the skies and pay large airmail subsidies. Airmail service has never paid its way. If the Postmaster General merely wishes to save money, why does he not cancel the airmail contracts? There are many ways by which he can save money, if he wishes to do so.

However, his duty is to provide efficient mail service. That is what the subcommittee headed by the distinguished senior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] found the pneumatic tubes were doing.

The report of that subcommittee, as made to the full committee, was eventually made to the Senate itself. Mr. President, if I have to take my choice between the report of a governmental agency or a report of the Congress, I shall choose the report of the Congress. I have been here long enough to have that clubby spirit. [Laughter.] Members of Congress are elected by the people, not appointed.

Let me read some of the items stated by the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] regarding the findings of the subcommittee in 1948:

It was our feeling that the use of pneumatic tubes by the New York post office has proved to be a valuable auxiliary in the handling of the mails by helping to relieve the traffic congestion and by saving a great deal of time lost in traffic.

Mr. President, at this time I wish to read from page 39 of the report, on which we find a breakdown regarding regularity of the service. This is the report of the subcommittee headed by the senior Senator from North Dakota, in the 80th Congress, 2d session. The subject is dependability of service:

Pneumatic-tube service is dependable in that it is not affected generally by street-surface traffic or weather conditions, and this may be best illustrated by the following comparative statistical statement showing irregularities, including interruptions, delays, and failures of service in the pneumatic-tube and motor-vehicle services from January 1 to December 31, 1946, divided into quarterly periods.

Let us look at it:

The data presented in the statement are taken from the official records of the motor-vehicle service and reports to the Department covering irregularities in tube service.

Comparative table showing service irregularities in the motor-vehicle service and pneumatic-tube service in quarterly periods from January 1 to December 31, 1946.

Here is what the report shows for 1946:

March: Motor-vehicle irregularities or breakdowns, 1,886.

Breakdowns in service by pneumatic tubes, 8.

June: Motor-vehicle irregularities or breakdowns, 1,833.

Breakdowns in the pneumatic tube service, 7.

September: Motor-vehicle irregularities or breakdowns, 2,507.

Breakdowns in the pneumatic tube service, 13.

December: Motor-vehicle irregularities or breakdowns, 10,734.

Breakdowns in the pneumatic tube service, 7.

That is why use of the pneumatic tubes was continued. It was continued because by means of the use of the tubes, the mail went through promptly, and that is generally the purpose of the postal service, even though recent studies show that today the service is poorer than it used to be.

I understand that Colonel McCormick, of the Chicago Tribune, who is not exactly a New Dealer, has made a study of the matter, and finds that in the Chicago area, this year, the mail service is 4 percent worse than it was last year. I understand that will be alluded to later today. That was shown in a recent survey conducted by the Chicago Tribune, because of some of the matters I have mentioned today.

At this time I should like to read from page 41 of the report to which I just referred:

If the pneumatic tube service were not in operation—

By the way, Mr. President, in the 1948 study the entire matter of substitution of service by the pneumatic tubes for service by trucks was gone into intensively by the Post Office Department, by the postal inspectors, by the top officialdom, by the Bureau of the Budget, and by the Senate committee. They went into that matter from top to bottom. This report is the only published official study of cost estimates regarding the pneumatic-tube service, as compared to the cost of truck service. The report was made in 1948. Of course, since that time, the cost of all trucks has increased, whether they be Chevrolet trucks or International trucks.

I read further from the report:

The following estimate of the cost thereof is submitted, with such additional items of cost as would necessarily be involved in this proposition.

In other words, Mr. President, the committee asked the postal inspectors and the New York Post Office Department to submit estimates of what would be needed if use of the pneumatic tubes were discontinued. I point out that it was a committee of the 80th Congress, a Republican Congress.

I now ask unanimous consent to have this portion of the report printed at this point in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SCHOEPPEL in the chair). Is there objection?

There being no objection, the portion of the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Pneumatic-tube service is dependable in that it is not affected generally by street surface traffic or weather conditions, and this may be best illustrated by the following comparative statistical statement showing irregularities, including interruptions, delays, and failures of service in the pneumatic-tube and motor-vehicle services from January 1 to December 31, 1946, divided into quarterly periods. The data presented in the statement are taken from the official records of the motor-vehicle service and reports to the Department covering irregularities in tube service.

Comparative table showing service irregularities in the motor-vehicle service and pneumatic-tube service, in quarterly periods from January 1 to December 31, 1946.

Motor-vehicle irregularities include delays and failures. Pneumatic-tube irregularities include all interruptions of the service.

| Year and quarter | Motor vehicle | Tube |
|---|---|---|
| 1946: | | |
| March | 1,886 | 8 |
| June | 1,833 | 7 |
| September | [1] 2,507 | 13 |
| December | [1] 10,734 | 7 |
| Total | 16,960 | 35 |

[1] Abnormal irregularities due to trucking strike, Christmas period, shortage, and the condition of trucks.

The pneumatic-tube service is in operation daily from 5 a. m. to 10 p. m., covering a range of 17 hours. The contract specifies service for a period not to exceed 18 consecutive hours daily, Monday to Friday, inclusive, and 6 consecutive hours on Saturday, provided, however, the Postmaster General may extend the hours of operation for a total of not exceeding 36 additional hours during each and every month of December occurring during the contract period or any extension thereof.

During the period of operation, from 5 a. m. to 10 p. m. daily, approximately 61.49 percent of all first-class matter is handled on an average day. The following table showing the quantity by weight, each hourly period, showing disposition under appropriate classification, and also indicating the percentage transmitted by pneumatic-tube service, is submitted for the purpose of illustrating that the present range of pneumatic-tube service is desirable.

| | Incoming, originating and transit letter mails transmitted through pneumatic tube | Incoming, originating and transit letter mails transported by motor vehicle service | Incoming and originating letter mails delivered at station of origin or at point of original receipt | Originating and transit letter mails sent direct to trains (tube or motor vehicle not required) | Total incoming, originating and transit letter mails | Percentage transmitted through pneumatic tubes |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | *Pounds* | *Pounds* | *Pounds* | *Pounds* | *Pounds* | |
| 12:01 to 1 a. m. | | 26,087 | 1,879 | 5,599 | 33,565 | |
| 1 to 2 a. m. | | 26,602 | 2,316 | 4,986 | 33,904 | |
| 2 to 3 a. m. | | 21,574 | 1,905 | 5,459 | 28,938 | |
| 3 to 4 a. m. | | 12,358 | 2,670 | 2,660 | 17,688 | |
| 4 to 5 a. m. | | 2,794 | 3,818 | 2,301 | 8,913 | |
| 5 to 6 a. m. | 4,983 | 2,613 | 2,743 | 1,661 | 12,000 | 41.53 |
| 6 to 7 a. m. | 6,159 | 3,730 | 2,653 | 4,191 | 16,733 | 36.81 |
| 7 to 8 a. m. | 5,386 | 6,757 | 3,765 | 2,983 | 18,891 | 28.51 |
| 8 to 9 a. m. | 6,138 | 2,481 | 5,522 | 2,427 | 16,568 | 37.05 |
| 9 to 10 a. m. | 5,507 | 5,273 | 3,267 | 542 | 14,589 | 37.75 |
| 10 to 11 a. m. | 8,557 | 2,402 | 3,707 | 649 | 15,315 | 55.87 |
| 11 to 12 a. m. | 7,100 | 2,688 | 3,177 | 1,414 | 14,379 | 49.38 |
| 12:01 to 1 p. m. | 8,309 | 3,922 | 1,617 | 1,350 | 15,198 | 54.67 |
| 1 to 2 p. m. | 6,166 | 3,721 | 807 | 955 | 11,649 | 52.93 |
| 2 to 3 p. m. | 5,122 | 4,359 | 807 | 2,035 | 12,323 | 41.56 |
| 3 to 4 p. m. | 5,721 | 5,271 | 550 | 1,447 | 12,989 | 44.04 |
| 4 to 5 p. m. | 5,158 | 6,067 | 885 | 2,716 | 14,826 | 34.79 |
| 5 to 6 p. m. | 5,559 | 6,060 | 659 | 2,641 | 14,919 | 37.26 |
| 6 to 7 p. m. | 6,564 | 12,024 | 612 | 4,236 | 23,426 | 27.98 |
| 7 to 8 p. m. | 8,864 | 17,781 | 1,042 | 5,909 | 33,596 | 26.38 |
| 8 to 9 p. m. | 12,050 | 13,523 | 870 | 4,287 | 30,730 | 39.21 |
| 9 to 10 p. m. | 11,765 | 17,091 | 1,847 | 7,548 | 38,251 | 30.76 |
| 10 to 11 p. m. | | 25,324 | 1,735 | 8,747 | 35,806 | |
| 11 to 12 p. m. | | 32,325 | 1,674 | 8,007 | 42,006 | |
| Totals | 119,098 | 262,827 | 50,527 | 84,750 | 517,202 | |
| Percentage of mail | 23.03 | 50.82 | 9.77 | 16.38 | 100.00 | |

The following table, showing the number of trucks assigned to interstation and depot service, and capacity of same as of March 31, 1947:

| Make | Capacity (tons) | Depot | Interstation | Prepaid and collection | Active reserve | Reserve for Mondays and emergencies | Service | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| International | 1 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 6 | | 2 | 13 |
| International D15 | 1 | | | 36 | | | | 36 |
| Chevrolet | 1 | | | 10 | | | | 10 |
| Ford | 1 | | | 199 | 11 | | 1 | 211 |
| White | 2 | 37 | 4 | 4 | 5 | | | 61 |
| International | 2 | 3 | 37 | 5 | 8 | | | 53 |
| White | 3 | 64 | 16 | | 17 | | | 97 |
| White Super | 3 | 19 | 1 | | 4 | | | 24 |
| Autocar | 3 | 3 | 15 | | | | | 18 |
| Mack | 5½ | | | | 12 | | 1 | 13 |
| Ford Cargo body | 1½ | | | 5 | 35 | | | 40 |
| Chevrolet Cargo body | 1½ | | | | 8 | | | 8 |
| Total | | 111 | 103 | 260 | 106 | | 4 | 584 |

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the report also points out the total increase in cost if trucks were used, rather than if the pneumatic-tube service were used. The report points out that it would cost $57,000 more to give service by truck, rather than to provide service by means of the pneumatic-tube system.

Let me say that I am not the one who made that statement; it is contained in the report of the committee in the 80th Congress, after the committee's study had been made. That Congress was a Republican-controlled Congress. The report is the reason why the pneumatic-tube service was continued. The "Johnny Come Lately" information which has come to us recently did not help us at all in 1950. The report I now have before me is all we had to work on at that time.

The total cost figures are listed on pages 41 to 44 of the report. I now ask unanimous consent that they be printed at this point in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the excerpts from the report were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

If the pnenumatic tube service were not in operation, additional motor vehicle service, similar to that which was operated in the former instance, would necessarily have to be provided as a substitute service for the transportation of those mails now transmitted through pneumatic tubes. The following estimate of the cost thereof is submitted, with such additional items of cost as would necessarily be involved in this proposition. The substitute motor vehicle service on which the estimate is based includes the following items:

| | |
|---|---|
| Additional interstation service: | |
| Daily: | |
| 312 hours of truck service performed daily by 39 drivers over 39 8-hour runs operating 2-ton White trucks for 253 days or 78,936 hours at $2.16 per hour | $170,501.76 |
| Saturdays: | |
| 18⅓ hours of truck service for 52 Saturdays performed on 2-ton White trucks at $2.16 per hour or 954 hours | 2,060.64 |
| Total | 172,562.40 |
| Additional interstation service—Continued | |
| Daily: | |
| 224 hours of truck service performed daily by 28 drivers on 28 8-hour runs operating 3-ton White trucks for 253 days or 56,672 hours at $2.19 per hour | $124,111.68 |
| Saturdays: | |
| 13 hours of truck service for 52 Saturdays performed on 3-ton White trucks or 676 hours at $2.19 per hour | 1,480.44 |
| Total | 125,592.12 |
| Daily: | |
| 192 hours of truck service performed daily by 24 drivers on 24 8-hour runs operating 2-ton White trucks for 253 days or 48,576 hours at $2.16 per hour | 104,924.16 |
| Saturdays: | |
| 11 hours of truck service for 52 Saturdays performed on 2-ton White trucks or 572 hours at $2.16 per hour | 1,235.52 |
| Total | 106,159.68 |
| Additional service between Brooklyn and New York, N. Y.: | |
| Daily: | |
| 46 hours of truck service performed daily by 6 drivers on 6 8-hour runs operating 1-ton Ford trucks for 253 days or 11,638 hours at $1.65 per hour | 19,202.70 |
| Saturdays: | |
| 5 hours of truck service performed each Saturday for 52 Saturday's or 260 hours at $1.65 per hour | 429.00 |
| Total | 19,631.70 |
| Total cost additional motor vehicles service | 423,945.90 |

The present motor-vehicle service generally operates on an hourly frequency between the general post office and the 21 points of the New York, N. Y., post office now connected by pneumatic tubes, and would be supplemented by the establishment of a half-hourly motor-vehicle service between the hours of 5 a. m. and 10 p. m. An express route would be established to operate on a half-hourly frequency between 5 a. m. and 10 p. m. from Church Street Station via Grand Central Station to Station L, to Station J, and return over the same route.

Motor-vehicle service, now operating from Morgan Station to Stations J and L and the stations north of these points, would be routed out of the general post office in addition to the present trips now scheduled from the general post office to Stations J and L and stations north of these points, which would establish a 20-minute frequency motor-vehicle service on trips between the general post office and Station J.

There would also be established two express routes, operating from 5 a. m. to 10 p. m., to transport pouch mails from Church Street Station for train connections at the general post office and Grand Central Station, and interstation connections at these points.

The motor-vehicle service between the Brooklyn, N. Y., post office and points in the New York, N. Y., post office would necessarily have to be increased to provide for adequate transportation service in lieu of the tube service now performed.

In addition to the estimate of the cost of motor-vehicle service that would be required, consideration has been given to the effect that would be had upon the personnel engaged at present in the handling of mails, performing operations connected with the pouching, tubing, receiving, and dispatching operations inside the stations and on the mailing platforms.

It should be understood that mails dispatched and received via the pneumatic-tube service are usually handled within the workrom area adjacent to the apparatus used, and the tube operators are required to open and empty the in-bound tube carriers and to close the out-bound tube carriers and dispatch them. The mail forwarded via motor-vehicle service must be enclosed in pouches and moved from the pouch racks to the tailboard of the truck and must be checked into the vehicle; and, in reverse order, mail received must be checked and removed from the tailboard of the truck and delivered to points in the workroom area where the mails are opened.

Taking the factors relating to the subject under consideration and based upon the quantity and character of this work as performed under the present arrangement it is estimated that 90 additional employees would be required to replace the services and personnel now provided for the pneumatic-tube service.

There is transmitted with this report a number of photographs of the pneumatic-tube equipment at the general post office and the various stations, which photographs have been marked "exhibit K."

The following tabulation is presented to show the work performed and the number of post-office employees required at present; the number of pouches that would have to be made up and handled if the tube service were not available and the number of post-office employees that would be required to perform the work incident thereto:

| | Number of pouches now originating on an average day at tube stations or transferred at these points | Number of pouches that are handled in dispatching-receiving sections and mailing platform at tube stations | Number of employees handling pouches in dispatching-receiving sections and mailing platform at tube stations | Number of tube carriers containing mail dispatched | Number of employees engaged in handling mails in tube section (tube operators) | Estimated number of additional pouches that would have to be established if tube service were not available | Estimated number of pouches that would be handled in dispatching and receiving section if tube service were not available | Estimated number of employees required to handle pouches if tube service were not available |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| General post office | [1] 9,147 | 18,202 | 93 | 5,562 | 33 | 2,098 | 23,864 | 148 |
| Grand Central | [1] 5,942 | 10,429 | 31 | 6,170 | 19 | 6,750 | 22,000 | 94 |
| Church Street | [1] 3,175 | 3,599 | 25 | 2,617 | 19 | 4,290 | 10,000 | 71 |
| A | 44 | 122 | 2 | 206 | 4 | 418 | 795 | 4 |
| Cooper | 95 | 255 | 2 | 612 | 4 | 210 | 657 | 5 |
| Murray Hill | 39 | 233 | 2 | 479 | 3 | 189 | 577 | 4 |
| Radio City | 51 | 358 | 2 | 793 | 4 | 231 | 847 | 6 |
| H | [1] 32 | 92 | 1 | 402 | 3 | 418 | 897 | 3 |
| J | [1] 717 | 1,365 | 9 | 1,408 | 5 | 532 | 3,931 | 10 |
| L | [1] 271 | 504 | 6 | 864 | 3 | 532 | 3,071 | 9 |
| O | 51 | 179 | 2 | 460 | 4 | 231 | 624 | 7 |
| Hell Gate | 14 | 58 | 1 | 128 | 2 | 342 | 695 | 3 |
| Ansonia | 40 | 115 | 1 | 261 | 3 | 418 | 922 | 4 |
| Bowling Green | 41 | 240 | 2 | 912 | 2 | 210 | 639 | 4 |
| Canal Street | 88 | 285 | 3 | 399 | 4 | 231 | 2,339 | 10 |
| Gracie | 17 | 90 | 1 | 301 | 2 | 342 | 725 | 4 |
| Lenox Hill | 14 | 88 | 1 | 292 | 2 | 342 | 716 | 4 |
| Madson Square | 449 | 713 | 5 | 1,305 | 5 | 750 | 1,601 | 11 |
| Morningside | 13 | 42 | 1 | 120 | 2 | 210 | 425 | 3 |
| Plannetarium | 29 | 107 | 1 | 278 | 3 | 418 | 885 | 3 |
| Times Square | 48 | 312 | 2 | 632 | 4 | 210 | 602 | 6 |
| Wall Street | 67 | 319 | 1 | 394 | 2 | 210 | 609 | 5 |
| Total | 20,384 | 37,707 | 194 | 24,595 | 132 | 19,582 | 77,421 | 416 |

[1] Transfer of pouches in transit included.

Total personnel required under existing methods of transportation, pneumatic tube service and motor vehicle service combined (194 plus 132) ---------- 326
Total personnel required if motor vehicle service were used exclusively---- 416
Total additional employees that would be required---------- 90

The above tabulation, based on careful estimates, shows that 20,384 pouches made up under existing methods require 37,707 handlings in course of transit between points of origin and destination; and that without the use of the pneumatic tubes, which transmitted 24,595 originating carriers containing mail between the points connected by tubes on an average day, 19,582 additional pouches would have to be made up making a total of 39,966 pouches, for transportation via motor-vehicle service, which would require 77,421 handlings between the points of origin and destination, representing an increase of approximately 105 percent over that required with the combined use of the present motor-vehicle service and pneumatic-tube service.

It is estimated that the additional work involved in a substitution of motor-vehicle service to replace the service now performed by the pneumatic-tube system would require the utilization of the services of 90 additional employees, and that this additional personnel would include 60 clerks and 30 mail handlers. Based on the average rate of pay at the New York post office as of July 1, 1946, the cost is estimated as follows:

| | |
|---|---|
| 60 clerks, at $3,000 per annum---- | $180,000 |
| 30 mail handlers, at $2,500 per annum ---------- | 75,000 |
| Total cost (90 employees)--- | 255,000 |

The summary of the items and the estimated annual cost referred to in the foregoing is submitted:

| | |
|---|---|
| Additional motor-vehicle service---------- | $423,945.90 |
| Additional personnel---------- | 255,000.00 |
| Total estimated cost----- | 678,945.90 |

There would be additional items of cost not included in the above, such as the original investment for six 1-ton trucks for the Brooklyn, N. Y., post office, and forty-six 2-ton trucks for the New York, N. Y., post office, at an approximate cost of $1,250 for the 1-ton trucks and $2,300 each for the 2-ton trucks, making a total of $113,300. The existing garage facilities at New York, N. Y., are inadequate to accommodate the forty-six 2-ton trucks; therefore additional garage facilities would be required.

It has been estimated that 19,582 additional pouches that would be made up daily would have a bearing upon the cost of the substitute for the pneumatic-tube service, since such a large increase in the use of mail equipment to replace the equipment now furnished by the contractor would be an element of considerable expense.

Taking into consideration the principal items, motor-vehicle service and personnel, which would be required, it is estimated that such service would cost $678,945.90 compared with the cost of the pneumatic-tube service of $253,023.15 for the rent of the tube system, plus $320,700 at New York, N. Y., and $8,403.09 at Brooklyn, N. Y., for the salaries of the tube operators now on the Post Office Department's pay roll; plus $37,433.19 at New York, N. Y., and $1,639.33 at Brooklyn, N. Y., for electric current used in connection with the pneumatic-tube service for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1946, making a total of $621,198.70 for tube operation. These figures indicate that a substitute motor-vehicle service, replacing the pneumatic-tube service, would cost $57,747.14 more than the cost of the existing pneumatic-tube service without considering any of the other elements of expense maintained.

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Rental of tube system---------- | | $253,023.15 |
| Salaries of tube operators at New York, N. Y---------- | 320,700.00 | |
| Salaries of tube operators at Brooklyn, N. Y---------- | 8,403.09 | |
| Total salaries of tube operators ---------- | 329,103.09 | |
| Electric current at New York, N. Y---------- | 37,433.19 | |
| Electric current at Brooklyn, N. Y---------- | 1,639.33 | |
| Total electric current---- | 39,072.52 | |
| Total for tube operations---------- | | 621,198.76 |

| | |
|---|---|
| Estimated motor-vehicle and personnel cost---------- | $678,945.90 |
| Cost of pneumatic-tube service- | 621,198.76 |
| Total more than present cost of pneumatic-tube service---------- | 57,747.14 |

On page 45 of the same report we find the following:

To provide the same motor vehicle service which was in operation when the tube service was discontinued, it would be necessary to schedule motor vehicles at half-hourly frequency between the points connected by the pneumatic tubes. Additional employees would be required at all these points to perform the duties incident to the handling of pouches and the loading and unloading of vehicles.

The estimated annual cost for additional motor vehicles and the additional personnel that would be required as a substitute for pneumatic-tube service would be $678,845.90, which would be $57,747.14 more than the present cost of the pneumatic-tube service, which is $621,198.76

Mr. President, there are the facts on which we worked.

I would say Mr. Summerfield does not need to argue with me. Let him argue with the committee of the 80th Congress which made the study, and let him argue with the report of the Post Office Department. Many of the men who served in the Department in 1948 are still there today.

What the New York postmaster pointed out to the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] certainly should be controlling in this matter. The New York postmaster said:

Today, when mail matter must move quickly to meet all kinds of time-table deadlines—plane, railroad, and steamer—to ensure its early delivery, the underground pneumatic-tube system is invaluable. (P. 3, Rept. No. 1241, 80th Cong., 2d sess.)

Mr. President, that is what we were told when we passed the bill.

As I have already read from page 45 of the report, it was found at the time that it would cost an additional $57,000 a year to convert the service from the pneumatic tubes to automobile trucks, rather than to continue to use the pneumatic tubes.

The 80th Congress subcommittee shared the conclusion of the New York postmaster to the effect that the pneumatic-tube mail service was necessary, desirable, and economical. In its unanimous bipartisan report the subcommittee commented as follows:

The value of the pneumatic-tube system was dramatically brought into bold relief during Christmas week of 1947 when a 22.8-inch snowfall all but paralyzed New York City but in no way interrupted the orderly distribution of mails through this well-established pneumatic-tube device.

Mr. President, if Mr. Summerfield is able to predict with accuracy that it will not snow, perhaps it will be satisfactory for the New York mail service to rely exclusively on the use of automobile trucks. However, in December 1947, when there was almost 23 inches of snow in New York City, the mail would not have moved very well, if at all, if truck service had been relied upon exclusively. After all, New York City is a metropolis of considerable size, and its postal busi-

ness amounts to more than $200 million annually. So in this instance we are not talking about a small fourth-class post office, but we are talking about the largest movement of mail in the world, in the greatest financial and merchandising center in the world, with the greatest concentration of population in the world. We are talking about a density of traffic the life of which the rest of the world cannot even dream. We are talking about crowded and congested streets which constantly are becoming more crowded and more congested.

Mr. Summerfield says that the answer to the question of better mail service is to put more trucks on the streets. Mr. President, in New York City there is a subway. The subway is a quick means of transportation for the people of New York, but it costs the city of New York many thousands of dollars every year. If New York City merely wishes to save money, it can close the subway. I do not know what would happen to the people, but the subway could be closed.

If it is smart to move people underground in order to get where they want to go, it seems to me that it might be reasonable to try to move a little mail underground in New York City. That is exactly what the Post Office Department was trying to do. If the post office in New York City was busy in 1898 and President McKinley thought the pneumatic-tube system was needed; if the post office in New York was busy in 1922, and if it was busy in 1932, under Mr. Hoover, certainly it was busy enough in 1950 and 1952 for the junior Senator from Minnesota to support the continuation of the pneumatic-tube service, which has worked for 50 years, through all forms of politics. It is tried and true.

Is it not interesting that the only time it becomes a political issue, after 56 years of successful operation, is when the Republican National Committeeman out in Minnesota decides to attack the junior Senator from Minnesota? They cannot find anything else on the basis of which to attack him. They do not dare attack him on the issue of farm price supports. They are unwilling to attack him on the issue of labor-management relations. They are unwilling to attack him on the issue of taxation. So what do they do? They find a little issue involving pneumatic tubes up in New York City, and they ask: "How did Senator HUMPHREY become involved in this thing?" They say: "Cancel the contract. It looks bad."

The newspapers say that the subject was referred to the Department of Justice. What does that indicate in this day and age of fear? It indicates to the popular mind that something is wrong. What the Postmaster General referred to the Department of Justice was the question of whether or not he could cancel the contract.

Now the subject is to go to the McCarthy subcommittee. That looks bad in the newspapers. There must be something wrong, in the implication they foster.

Of course we have a Post Office and Civil Service Committee in the Senate. The newspapers of my State carry certain headlines. Then someone says, "You do not want anybody to think that there is any politics involved in this issue, do you?" If there is no politics in this issue, there are no prayers in the Bible. There is plenty of politics—too much.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I just entered the Chamber. I heard the distinguished Senator say something about the Investigations Subcommittee. Has some charge been filed with that subcommittee, or has any action been taken by the subcommittee with respect to the subject matter which the Senator is discussing?

Mr. HUMPHREY. No. I merely have in my hand a statement from the Minneapolis Morning Tribune of February 7, which says:

MCCARTHY will probe his role in postal contract.

The Senator from Minnesota is to be probed.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Has that been announced?

Mr. HUMPHREY. That has been announced.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I do not believe the subject has come before the subcommittee as a subcommittee.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the Senator.

Mr. McCLELLAN. At least, as a member of the subcommitee I have had no notice of it. Neither have I had any information regarding it. I was surprised when I heard the statement made.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I was a bit surprised myself.

Let me say that this newspaper has a circulation of between 575,000 and 600,000. I think every Member of this body is sufficiently familiar with politics to know that when he sees headlines like that, they are not intended to promote him for merit badges. It does not make me any happier when I take my boy to the father-and-son banquet of the Boy Scouts tonight, to see the headline, "Hints at Possibility of Graft." I have a 15-year-old daughter and a 12-year-old son. They can read such headlines. There is their daddy's picture. I do not intend to take this from anyone. I will fight it. And I will win and will rewin the support of the people of Minnesota who are decent folks and resent character assassination as a political weapon.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Has the Senator stated whether any charges have been laid before the Investigations Subcommittee?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Not that I know of.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I am not advised of any.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am sure that I know of no particular charges, except that it was said in the Senate Appropriations Subcommittee on Post Office and Treasury that this subject might very well be referred to the Senate Permanent Investigations Subcommittee. That is as far as it has gone.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Who made that statement?

Mr. HUMPHREY. That was the record which was read here today.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I apologize to the Senator from Minnesota. I have not been able to be present during his entire address. I was very much interested when I entered the Chamber just now. The Senator from Minnesota referred to the Investigations Subcommittee, intimating that possibly that subcommittee was taking some action, or had taken action, or was about to take action. I became curious to know what the facts are.

Mr. HUMPHREY. If anyone has the right to be curious on that subject, it is the distinguished Senator from Arkansas, who is the ranking minority member of the committee.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I thought I might be entitled to a little information on the subject.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I wish to give the Senator all the information I have.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I think the RECORD should show clearly that the chairman of the Subcommittee on Post Office and Treasury Department appropriations is also the chairman of the Subcommittee on Investigations.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I suppose a member might refer something to himself in a committee hearing if he so desired, if he were the chairman of both subcommittees.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is true.

Mr. President, the letter from the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], which I have inserted in the RECORD without reading, reminds us of one additional fact. He reminds us that insofar as both bills approved by the 80th and 81st Congresses were concerned, they were merely enabling acts, or authorization acts. Following passage of such acts, the Senate and House Appropriations Committees very carefully considered the matter of the pneumatic-tube mail system and approved the appropriations of these funds to allow the Postmaster General to sign the contract. The bipartisan composition of the Appropriations Committees and their support for the pneumatic-tube system is further testimonial to the effectiveness of that system and to the desirability of Senate bill 4102, the bill I introduced. Let me bring to the attention of the Senate the distinguished list of both Democrats and Republicans who were members of the Post Office Subcommittee of the Senate Appropriations Committee. This list was prepared by the staff of the Appropriations Subcommittee.

Post Office Subcommittee:

In the 80th Congress: Senators Maybank, Hayden, Kilgore, McClellan, McKellar, Ellender, Robertson, Cordon, Bridges, Saltonstall, Johnston, Long, and Langer.

In the 81st Congress, 1st session: Senators Kilgore, Maybank, McClellan, McKellar, Robertson, Ecton, Bridges, Saltonstall, Johnston, Neely, and Langer.

In the 82d Congress, 2d session: Kilgore, chairman; Maybank; McClellan; McKellar; Robertson; Zales Ecton; Bridges; Saltonstall.

Ex officio: Olin D. Johnston, Neely, Langer.

In the 83d Congress, 1st session; McCarthy, chairman; Bridges; Saltonstall; Cordon; Margaret Chase Smith; Dirksen; Kilgore; Maybank; McClellan; Robertson; Magnuson.

Ex officio: Frank Carlson, Duff, O. D. Johnston.

The Senators who are on this list are all distinguished men. We trust their judgment. The Appropriations Committee is one of the most respected committees of this body; but up to date it has yet to register any feeling against the pneumatic tube bill.

That subcommittee certainly had an opportunity to go into the pneumatic tube bill. It was necessary for the Department to ask for money. The majority leader is a member of that subcommittee. The Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK], who has spoken today, is a member of that subcommittee.

The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] was the ranking member of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. That committee knew about the pneumatic tube system. Let us be frank about it. Everyone knew about this system. This is no news flash, like the development of the hydrogen bomb—and it is not going to explode quite so loud, either.

Let me bring additional facts to the attention of the Senate. My irresponsible political opponents in Minnesota are attempting to distort my bill and to capitalize on the fact that it authorized signing of a contract "for terms not exceeding 10 years." This criticism is another example of political irresponsibility. The authorization of a 10-year contract was part of the basic authorization or enabling act passed by the Republican-controlled Congress in 1922. That statute was the law of the land when my bill, Senate bill 4102, was introduced. My bill does not in the slightest change that law. It merely authorized the Postmaster General to continue to enter into contracts not to exceed 10 years. That has been going on since 1922. In fact, in 1922 a Postmaster General signed such a contract which expired on June 30, 1932. He signed a 10-year contract. That 1922 contract, by the way, was for "not exceeding $19,500 per mile," according to the letter from Senator JOHNSTON, as compared to my bill authorizing the amount not to exceed $15,500. We did not have any investigation of pneumatic tubes after Mr. Hoover went out of office. We had other problems confronting us. The tubes were still working, and they carried the mails through Republican days and Democratic days, through rain and snow, and through frost and sleet. The mails went through in keeping with the full meaning of the statement chiseled on the facade of the New York Post Office Building. That statement was made a reality, not merely a hope.

Now let me read one final paragraph of the letter of the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON]:

> I have further learned some very interesting statistics which affect this question. Under the pneumatic-tube system special delivery mail, for which extra postage is paid, can be delivered from the train to the consignee in 45 minutes, as compared to 3 to 5 hours if trucks are used. Trucks, of course, also only make their deliveries 2 or 3 times a day. The records also show that the pneumatic-tube system carried between 5 and 6 million letters a day.

These are the letters which Mr. Summerfield is going to pile on two trucks.

> To say that this volume of mail can be effectively and efficiently carried by two trucks as Postmaster General Summerfield implies, is ridiculous. It would take a fleet of trucks at tremendous expense to serve this need.

Why does the Senator from South Carolina make that statement? Because the 80th Congress made the investigation, the result of which I put into the RECORD. I did not make the investigation. It was an investigation which was made by prominent officials of the Government, as well as by Members of Congress, and they said it would cost more to use trucks than to use tubes.

Mr. Summerfield, in condemning the pneumatic-tube mail-service system wants to go back to the 19th century. He does not want to go back too far in the 19th century, because at the end of that century the tubes were being used.

He says he can save money by doing so. I suggest that if that is his main interest rather than service he ought to go back to the pony express system of delivering mail. It would be much cheaper. The Post Office could save a great deal of money by eliminating the contracts for shipping airmail overseas. It would be much cheaper to do so. I would hope, however, before any contracts were canceled we would have an opportunity to look into the facts.

Mr. President, the facts are available. They demonstrate the need for a full investigation by the Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee to judge the competency and responsibility of the Postmaster General, and to determine if he is guilty of dereliction of his duties as a public officer. I ask that the committee subpena the postal inspectors and the postal officials who considered the whole pneumatic tube service system. If they are subpenaed, Mr. President, after my private conversations with certain members of the postal inspection service, I am confident it will be found that their testimony will corroborate the testimony taken in the 80th and 81st Congresses. I have not entered into this case lightly. If the investigators will come to me for some names, they will get them.

We need the facts, Mr. President. I want the committee to subpena the postal inspectors who investigated this question in 1948 and 1950, and again this year, to see whether anyone was derelict in his responsibility and to determine whether the subcommittee and the full committee of the Senate Committee on Post Office and Civil Service were given any information which would indicate that we ought not to have made the contracts.

The facts are crystal clear. If any member of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service had had the slightest doubt as to the wisdom of renewing the contract it would have raised a heated controversy and there would have been debate on the floor of the Senate and in the committee, but the contracts were unanimously approved.

It is clear to me that the announcement of the Postmaster General, followed as it was by the unfair partisan political attack made against me by the Republican national committeeman in Minnesota, was a political maneuver.

Mr. President, I have no more to say, except that I will be back later. I will be back later to make comment pertaining to the postal service to the extent that I feel it necessary to make such comment. I hope, to start with, that we can put this matter where it properly belongs, namely, in the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

As I tried to make clear to my colleagues, as the reports indicate, and as the comments of my colleagues have indicated, insofar as the junior Senator from Minnesota is concerned, he did his duty, and there rests upon him no taint whatsoever because of anything that is unusual or anything that could be considered unworthy of a Member of this body.

I am grateful for the sentiments which have been expressed on the floor.

As to whether or not the tube system is the most desirable means of handling mail is a question for policy determination by the Post Office Department and by the Congress. However, I hope that we may keep the high quality service our country is accustomed to and not in any way diminish it.

EXHIBIT 1

[From the Minneapolis Sunday Tribune of February 7, 1954]

HUMPHREY CHARGES SMEAR; MCCARTHY WILL PROBE HIS ROLE IN POSTAL CONTRACT

What was Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY'S part in the renewal of a New York postal tube contract? The question and the answers shaped Saturday into the first hot debate of the 1954 senatorial campaign in Minnesota.

Involved is whether a contract to send first-class mail between post offices in New York City by pneumatic tube should have been renewed. HUMPHREY sponsored the bill continuing the service in 1950.

Republican Postmaster General Summerfield canceled the pneumatic tube contract as wasteful at the end of 1953. Republican National Committeeman George Etzell of Clarissa, Minn., attacked the postal tube bill saying it looks like another Democratic scandal.

On Friday HUMPHREY reserved an hour for a speech to the Senate on Monday to rip the hide off Summerfield and Etzell.

On Saturday, Senator JOSEPH MCCARTHY, Republican, Wisconsin, disclosed his Senate committee is investigating. He'll not subpena Senator HUMPHREY, MCCARTHY said, but he thought the Minnesota Senator wants to testify.

Below is what Senator HUMPHREY told Wilbur Elston of the Minneapolis Tribune's Washington bureau about what he plans to say to the Senate Monday. Following that is what Senator MCCARTHY said about his investigation, and what Postmaster General Summerfield says in reply to HUMPHREY. At the end of the article is the text of publisher Etzell's editorial in the Clarissa Independent.

---

MINNESOTA TO STATE CASE ON MONDAY

(By Wilbur Elston)

WASHINGTON.—Senator HUMPHREY, Democrat, of Minnesota, Saturday accused Postmaster General Summerfield and George Etzell, Minnesota's Republican national committeeman, of collaborating in a political smear against him.

The Minnesota Senator, up for reelection this year, said he would take the Senate floor Monday to deny the Republicans' charges that a bill he introduced committed the Post Office Department to a 10-year, million-dollar-a-year operation that now can be handled for $25,000 a year or less.

The million-a-year contract has been canceled by the new administration.

HUMPHREY said he also is asking the Senate Postoffice and Civil Service Committee to make a full investigation of the facts, subpena the postal inspectors who investigated the question, and see if Summerfield is guilty of dereliction of his responsibility as a public officeholder.

At issue is the 1950 Humphrey bill that authorized the continuation of the use of a 25-mile-pneumatic-tube system that connects the main post office and 21 stations in New York City for transmission of first-class mail.

Summerfield canceled the contract December 31 after a Department survey showed that almost the entire cost of $1,007,150.24 a year could be saved by discontinuing the service and that two additional trucks costing $22,-168.44 could handle all the mail transmitted by the tubes.

After that, Etzell published an editorial in his newpapers, the Clarissa (Minn.) Independent, and later circulated to all papers in the State, saying that HUMPHREY's sponsorship of the postal-tube bill "looks like it might be another Democratic scandal."

HUMPHREY charged that the "decision of the Postmaster General went hand in hand with the unfair partisan political attack made against me by the Republican national committeeman" and was "designed to cause me political embarrassment in an election year."

"Mr. Summerfield has apparently forgotten that when he took the oath of office to become Postmaster General, he assumed a public trust and had left his position as chairman of the Republican National Committee," HUMPHREY declared.

HUMPHREY said Summerfield's estimate of the savings is "patently false" and "directly contradicts" the Republican 80th Congress, which found that to replace the tubes with trucks would cost $57,000 more than the expense of the pneumatic-tube service alone.

The Minnesota Senator explained that as chairman of a Senate Post Office Subcommittee, he had introduced the bill in 1950 at the request of the Department.

The purpose was to increase the payment for tube service by $53,000 a year to amortize the cost of new equipment over a 10-year period.

He said the bill was introduced only after unanimous approval of both my subcommittee and the full Senate committee, including both Democrats and Republicans. One was his Minnesota Republican colleague, Senator THYE, who also had been among the committeemen approving continuation of the service in 1948 before HUMPHREY was elected.

"Our committee accepted the findings of the thorough investigation which had been made by the Republicans in 1949," HUMPHREY said.

"Their judgment was confirmed by the reports and conversations we had with representatives of the Post Office Department, including postal inspectors and technicians."

HUMPHREY pointed out that New York post office has been serviced by pneumatic tubes for 56 years, since 1898, on contracts originally authorized by a Republican Congress, restored by a Republican Congress after being suspended by a Democratic administration and repeatedly renewed by Republican administrations.

He said Republican Senators LANGER, of North Dakota, and Ecton, of Montana (defeated for reelection in 1952), conducted the most recent investigation upholding efficiency of the tube system in 1948 before HUMPHREY entered the Senate.

Full membership of both Houses in the Republican 80th Congress voted unanimously to continue the tube service, and raise the payment for it beyond what the Democratic Postmaster General had recommended after the unanimously favorable recommendation from the committee, he added.

HUMPHREY made public copies of letters of support he had received from both LANGER and Senator OLIN JOHNSTON, Democrat, of South Carolina, who was chairman of the full Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee in 1950 when the Minnesotan offered the controversial bill.

"The criticism of you and your activities in connection with the bill is totally unfounded," LANGER said. "Our conclusion (after the 1948 Langer-Ecton hearings in New York) was unanimous that the pneumatic tube service was advisable, necessary, and economical as a service in the New York post office."

JOHNSTON said the "partisan political attacks upon you (HUMPHREY) are a reflection upon the integrity of the Congress."

He added that he "resents any attempt to cast aspersions upon Members of the Congress, all of whom supported the bill, for the sake of momentary political expediency."

JOHNSTON also said that while the Etzell editorial attacked HUMPHREY for approving a 10-year contract, the contract had been authorized on a 10-year basis for the first time back in 1922 when the Republicans controlled Congress.

In hearings of the House Post Office Committee just released, Summerfield said that the contract had been renewed January 1, 1951, for a 10-year period under the Humphrey bill despite the recommendation of post office inspectors against continuing to use the tubes.

He said a committee made up of post office officials reported on June 6, 1950, that the saving from replacing the tubes with trucks would amount to $449,403.23.

He quoted the committee as saying, "This adds further weight to the committee's recommendation of May 15, 1950, that the pneumatic tube service at New York be discontinued."

Summerfield said he didn't know what actuated the Democratic Postmaster General, Jesse Donaldson, to request renewal of the contract despite this recommendation.

But he added that he had been informed Donaldson felt that the "abandonment of a mechanical means of mail transportation would be considered as being a step backward, and would result in further criticism."

Representative CANFIELD, Republican, New Jersey, said this was an "amazing story," and asked for a complete, up-to-date report on the whole situation that was included in the published proceedings.

This report said the inspectors recommended discontinuance of the tubes because they carried only 32 percent of the letter mail when in operation; they operated only from 6 a. m. until midnight Monday through Friday; 68 percent of the letter mail and all the bulk mail still had to be carried by truck even when the tubes were running, and the capacity of the truck service was not being fully utilized anyway.

"It was estimated that almost the entire sum of $1,007,150.24 could be saved through discontinuance of the tube service and that 2 additional motor vehicles costing $22,-168.44 could handle all of the mail then being transported by the tube system," the report said.

---

MCCARTHY HINTS AT POSSIBILITY OF GRAFT

(By Wilbur Elston)

WASHINGTON.—Senator MCCARTHY, Republican, of Wisconsin, disclosed Saturday that his Senate committee staff is investigating the New York pneumatic-tube mail transmission contract authorized by a bill by Senator HUMPHREY, Democrat, of Minnesota, in 1950.

MCCARTHY said his staff will report to him on its preliminary investigations after he returns to Washington in about a week.

The 10-year million-dollar-a-year contract for pneumatic-tube service in New York City that was signed under the Humphrey bill was canceled recently by Postmaster General Summerfield on grounds that 2 trucks could replace the service at a cost of only about $25,000 a year.

"The decision on whether to hold public hearings will be up to the full Senate investigating committee," MCCARTHY said, "but I personally feel very strongly that the situation is so bad that public hearings are justified.

"It seems to me that something worse than stupidity was involved."

MCCARTHY said he thought his committee should make a complete and thorough investigation to see whether there was any possibility of graft or corruption in connection with letting the contract.

He emphasized he didn't know that HUMPHREY played any part in it except to introduce the bill that provides for an increase of payments of about $53,000 a year.

He said he wouldn't subpena HUMPHREY if the hearings were called, but thought the Minnesota Senator would want to testify.

He said the matter first came to the attention of the appropriations subcommittee, but that Senator DIRKSEN, Republican, of Illinois, and other Senators present decided his permanent investigating committee should look into the matter. MCCARTHY said it has a larger staff.

The disclosure from MCCARTHY came after HUMPHREY issued a summary of a speech he'll make on the Senate floor Monday against Republican attacks on the pneumatic tube bill.

In his statement, HUMPHREY bitterly attacked both Summerfield and George Etzell, Minnesota Republican national committeeman, who circulated an editorial criticizing the Democratic Senator for introducing the tube bill.

Asked for comment on HUMPHREY's attack, both Summerfield and Etzell issued statements accusing the Senator of criticizing the Republican administration's efforts to save money.

Summerfield also said he would welcome with open arms a congressional investigation of the cancellation of the contract as well as the motives and circumstances that led to the signing of the contract in the first place.

Summerfield's complete statement to the Minneapolis Tribune follows:

"It is apparent that the Senator doth protest too much.

"I think it most unfortunate that Senator HUMPHREY should attack us for saving money.

"I emphatically repudiate the suggestion that the pneumatic tube contract was canceled for any other reason than to save the taxpayers money without impeding the service.

"Not only does the Senator seem determined to associate his name with the expensive 1950 long-term lease renewal on the antiquated 56-year-old pneumatic tubes in New York City, but he apparently feels that our efforts in saving the taxpayers a million dollars a year in that city alone amount to 'dereliction' of my duty as a public office holder.

"If that is dereliction, then the post office could have used a great deal more of it in the past. If it had, the taxpayer would not be faced with a $3.8-billion deficit which has accumulated in the Post Office Department since the end of World War II.

"We would welcome with open arms a congressional investigation not only of our action in canceling a 10-year contract that has cost us $1 million a year for services which we can duplicate for just $25,000, but also of the motives and circumstances that led to the signing of such a disastrous contract by the former administration in the first place.

"It is our conviction that everything relating to the people's business, and particularly in the Post Office Department, since it touches nearly every citizen in the land, should be made available to the people.

"To that end I have already presented this matter to both the Senate and House Committees on Post Office Appropriations and have supplied the members with detailed information with reference to the pneumatic tube contract.

"We are delighted to let the facts speak for themselves. This is a characteristic of the present administration."

Etzel said in rebuttal that HUMPHREY still hadn't answered the question he had asked him in his editorial after press reports quoted the Senator as saying he "scarcely remembered the bill."

"I asked Senator HUMPHREY then and I ask him now how many millions does any bill have to authorize for expenditure before he feels it is worth remembering," Etzel inquired.

The Minnesota Republican committeeman pointed out that the bill passed by the GOP Congress in 1948 that HUMPHREY cited in his own statement still had been recommended by the Democratic administration running the Post Office Department at that time.

"But Postmaster General Summerfield wasn't talking about that 1948 bill," Etzel commented.

"He was talking instead about the 1950 bill that HUMPHREY himself introduced and that called for an outlay of more than $1 million a year until Summerfield canceled the contract."

"I feel that the Republicans have a responsibility to call this kind of a case to the attention of the American people."

Etzel also denied he had any contact with Summerfield before writing his editorial. He said he obtained his information from newspaper dispatches about the tube contract.

TEXT OF ETZELL ATTACK ON HUMPHREY BILL

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—George Etzell, Republican national committeeman for Minnesota, published the following editorial January 7 in his newspaper, the Clarissa Independent, under the heading "Senator HUMPHREY's $10 Million Lack of Memory.")

Back in 1950, Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY as a member of the Democratically controlled Post Office Committee of the Senate, sponsored a bill authorizing the Postmaster General to negotiate and sign a contract for the purpose of transmitting mail in New York City through pneumatic tubes.

The cost to the Post Office Department through a contract with the New York Mail and Newspaper Transportation Co., to handle only one-fourth of the total flow between the 22 offices in New York was $1 million a year.

The contract was signed by former Postmaster General Donaldson for 10 years, at $360,000 a year. But operating bills for personnel, power, and other items raised this amount to $1 million annually.

This contract last Thursday was canceled by Postmaster General Summerfield and instead, two trucks have been put on the job at a cost of $25,000 yer year.

According to the Washington Star, Mr. HUMPHREY, as author of the bill authorizing this excessive contract, said that he "scarcely remembered" the bill.

"I was a member of the Post Office Committee and as such I was asked to submit this purely technical bill for Senate consideration.

"I submitted to the Post Office Committee a letter from Postmaster General Donaldson urging that the measure be passed.

"You have to depend on the experts in those cases, and I did.

"If Mr. Summerfield now finds a cheaper way to do the job and save money, more power to him," Senator HUMPHREY is quoted as saying.

Well, Mr. Summerfield has found a cheaper way—$975,000 cheaper per year and $9,750,000 cheaper in a 10-year period.

There are a number of things that are amazing to us about Mr. HUMPHREY's sponsorship of the bill:

1. How many millions does any bill have to authorize for expenditure before Senator HUMPHREY feels it is worth remembering?

2. What experts did Senator HUMPHREY ask, if he did ask the opinion of anyone?

We do not know of course, that Senator HUMPHREY did not ask the opinion of the postal inspectors, because the former Postmaster General, Mr. Donaldson, has admitted signing the contract against the advice of the postal inspectors.

Mr. Donaldson said that he did so "in order to maintain an essential and desired service, particularly to the Wall Street district."

That's interesting, too. Never in any campaign speeches in Minnesota has the junior Senator indicated that he was interested in getting mail to Wall Street to the tune of $10 million of the taxpayers' money, when it could be done in that 10-year period for $250,000—that's 2½ percent.

But let's go into the background of this deal as reported by the Washington Star:

Mr. Summerfield learned of the 2 operations after he send 20 top postal inspectors into New York to survey the city's 200-million-a-year postal operation.

Searching for ways to reduce the use of space in the high-rental Manhattan district, the inspectors pointed out to Mr. Summerfield the amount of square footage required for tube openings, containers, and equipment.

His further cross-examination of the inspectors brought out their estimates of the excessive costs of the tube operation.

When he told the story to the House Appropriations Subcommittee last week, Mr. Summerfield was asked why the inspectors had not informed his predecessors of the wasteful operation.

He replied that they had on several occasions—but that the contract had been signed anyway.

Senator HUMPHREY has been diligently campaigning in Minnesota in these last few months. He has also written weekly letters on just about everything—except his sponsorship of the New York City postal tube bill, which looks like it might be another Democratic scandal.

We use the word "scandal" advisedly because the Post Office Department canceled the contract last Thursday, and the whole matter has been turned over to the Department of Justice.

As author of the bill authorizing the contract, Senator HUMPHREY either did or did not bother to learn about what he was proposing.

If he did not bother to investigate, he was derelict in his duty as a United States Senator.

If he did know about it, it is much worse.

In any case, we will be watching for his newsletters with a great deal of interest. He has some explaining to do.

---

[From the Duluth Herald of January 6, 1954]

HUMPHREY-SPONSORED POSTAL BILL MAY START NEW DEMO SCANDAL

(By Einar Karlstrand)

Minnesota's Republican national committeeman today declared the New York City postal tube bill, sponsored by United States Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, may become "another Democratic scandal."

George F. Etzell, publisher of the Clarissa Independent, in an editorial lashed out against the State's junior Senator and said "he has some explaining to do."

The attack on HUMPHREY marked the start of political fireworks expected to become intense during the 1954 election campaigns.

Etzell referred to a Congressional measure sponsored in 1950 by the Democratic-controlled Senate Post Office Committee of which HUMPHREY was a member. The bill authorized the Postmaster General to negotiate and sign a contract for the purpose of transmitting mail in New York City pneumatic tubes.

The cost to the Post Office Department through a contract with the New York Mail and Newspaper Transportation Co. to handle "only one-fourth of the total flow" between the 22 New York offices was $1 million a year, Etzell said.

Former Postmaster General Donaldson signed the contract for a 10-year period at $360,000 a year. Operating costs for personnel, power, and other items raised this figure to $1 million annually.

The Clarissa weekly newspaper publisher called attention to the fact that the present Postmaster General Arthur Summerfield canceled the contract a week ago and ordered two trucks on the job at a cost of $25,000 a year.

Senator HUMPHREY told a Washington newspaper that he "scarcely remembered" the bill.

He explained:

"I was a member of the Post Office Committee and as such I was asked to submit this purely technical bill for Senate consideration. I submitted to the Post Office Committee a letter from Postmaster General Donaldson urging that the matter be passed. You have to depend on experts in those cases, and I did.

"If Mr. Summerfield now finds a cheaper way to do the job and save money, more power to him."

Etzell replied to the Senator, "Well, Mr. Summerfield has found a cheaper way—$795,000 cheaper per year and $9,750,000 cheaper in a 10-year period."

The GOP national committeeman then said:

"There are a number of things that are amazing to us about Mr. HUMPHREY's sponsorship of the bill:

"1. How many millions does any bill have to authorize for expenditure before Senator HUMPHREY feels it is worth remembering?

"2. What experts did Senator HUMPHREY rely on if he did ask the opinion of anyone?

"We do know, of course, that Senator HUMPHREY did not ask the opinion of the postal inspectors, because the former Postmaster General, Mr. Donaldson, has admitted signing the contract against the advice of the postal inspectors. Mr. Donaldson said he did so 'in order to maintain an essential and desired service, particularly to the Wall Street districts.'"

Etzell commented that "never in any campaign speeches in Minnesota has the junior

Senator indicated that he was interested in getting mail to Wall Street to the tune of $10 million of taxpayers' money, when it could be done in that 10-year period for $250,000—that's 2½ percent."

The Clarissa publisher said that Summerfield learned of the tube operation after he sent 20 top postal inspectors into New York to survey the city's $200 million a year postal service. The inspectors searched for ways to reduce the use of space in the high-rental Manhattan district.

They found that there was excessive costs involved in tube operation. These facts were reported to authorities but the contract was signed anyway, the newspaperman said.

"Senator HUMPHREY has been diligently campaigning in Minnesota in the last few months," the editorial commented. "He has also written weekly letters on just about everything—except his sponsorship of the New York City postal tube bill, which looks like it might be another Democratic scandal.

"We use the word 'scandal' advisedly because the Post Office Department canceled the contract last Thursday, and the whole matter has been turned over to the Department of Justice.

"As author of the bill authorizing the contract, Senator HUMPHREY either did or did not bother to learn about what he was proposing. If he did not bother to investigate, he was derelict in his duty as a United States Senator. If he did know about it, it is much worse.

"In any case, we will be watching for his newsletters with a great deal of interest. He has some explaining to do."

---

[From the Dispatch of January 6, 1954]

HUMPHREY HIT BY ETZELL PAPER

George F. Etzell, Republican State chairman, in his newspaper, the Clarissa Independent, today attacks Senator HUMPHREY editorially in connection with the New York mail-tube contract.

The $360,000 contract for 10 years was canceled recently and two trucks now transport the mail at a cost of $25,000, he reported.

HUMPHREY authored the tube bill in 1950 and when asked about it recently said he "scarcely remembered" it as he was requested to introduce it as a member of the Post Office Committee.

Etzell asks editorially "how many millions does any bill have to authorize for expenditure before Senator HUMPHREY feels it is worth remembering?"

Etzell says HUMPHREY has "written weekly letters on just about everything except his sponsorship of the New York City postal tube bill." As author of the bill "Senator HUMPHREY either did or did not bother to learn about what he was proposing," Etzell continues. "If he did not bother to investigate he was derelict in his duty as United States Senator and if he did know about it, it is much worse," the editorial continues. "HUMPHREY has some explaining to do."

---

[From the Minneapolis Star of January 6, 1954]

SENATOR HUMPHREY RAPPED OVER MAIL CONTRACT

CLARISSA, MINN.—George Etzell, Minnesota GOP national committeeman, suggested today that Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY (Democrat, Minnesota) was derelict in sponsoring legislation for a contract to transmit New York City mail through pneumatic tubes.

Etzell, publisher of the Clarissa Independent, declared in an editorial that HUMPHREY "has some explaining to do" in connection with the 10-year contract, now canceled.

"The cost to the Post Office Department * * * to handle only one-fourth of the total flow between the 22 offices in New York was a million dollars a year," Etzell wrote.

"This contract last Thursday was canceled by Postmaster General Arthur Summerfield and instead, two trucks have been put on the job at a cost of $25,000 a year."

Etzell quoted press reports that HUMPHREY said he "scarcely remembered the bill."

"How many millions does any bill have to authorize for expenditure before Senator HUMPHREY feels it is worth remembering?" Etzell asked.

"As author of the bill authorizing the contract, Senator HUMPHREY either did or did not bother to learn about what he was proposing. If he did not bother to investigate he was derelict in his duty as a United States Senator.

"If he did know about it, it is much worse."

---

EXHIBIT 2

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS,
*February 8, 1954.*

DEAR MR. EDITOR: Within the last few weeks an editorial published in the Clarissa Independent has been distributed to all newspapers in Minnesota. It is a personal attack upon me and is a reflection upon my integrity and performance as a Member of the United States Senate. It was my original intention to ignore the editorial as a feeble attempt by the national committeeman of the Republican Party in our State to abuse his role as a journalist for partisan political advantage. In view of the wide circulation which the attack has been given I believe it necessary to set the facts straight. It is my hope that you will agree to publish this letter and thus present an accurate picture to your readers.

You will recall that I am being criticized by my political opponents for sponsoring and supporting in 1950, a bill, S. 4102, authorizing the Post Office Department to contract for the use of pneumatic tubes in the New York post office. My opponents have even gone so far as to use the word "scandal" in connection with this bill. This outrageous demonstration of irresponsible politics is being answered on the Senate floor on Monday, February 8, 1954. I am also calling for an immediate investigation of the Post Office Department's decision and the intrusion of the Postmaster General into the Minnesota political picture. In support of my decision, I have gathered the facts and the evidence from both Republicans and Democrats in the Senate. Here are the facts:

1. The New York City post office has been serviced by pneumatic tubes for 56 years—since 1898—authorized by the Congress and contracted for by the Post Office Department.

2. The most recent investigation of the efficiency of this system was made in 1948 by the Republican-controlled 80th Congress. This investigation was made by two able and experienced Republican Senators, WILLIAM LANGER, of North Dakota, and Zales N. Ecton, of Montana, along with high officials of the Post Office Department. I was not a Member of the Congress at that time.

3. The unanimous decision of the Senate subcommittee, the Senate full committee, and both the Senate and the House of Representatives in the 80th Congress was in support of continuing the pneumatic tube service. Report No. 1241 of the Republican-controlled 80th Congress had this to say about the system:

"Today when mail matter must move quickly to meet all kinds of timetable deadlines—plane, railroad, and steamers—to insure its early delivery, the underground pneumatic-tube system is invaluable." (Rept. No. 1241, 80th Cong., 2d sess, p. 3.)

4. As a result of this investigation, the Republican-controlled 80th Congress unanimously passed a bill, S. 2510, in 1948 authorizing the Postmaster General to contract for pneumatic-tube facilities in New York at a rate not to exceed $12,000 per mile.

5. In 1949 the Post Office Department was informed that the Consolidated Edison Co. of New York which provided the pneumatic tube system with power could no longer service the nonstandard direct current for which the system was equipped. It was necessary therefore to install new equipment accepting standard alternating current. Cost of the new equipment would be $350,000.

6. The Postmaster General and the Budget Bureau came to the Congress in 1950 and asked for an increase in the rate authorization to the pneumatic tube company so that the extra expense could be amortized over a 10-year period.

7. The Vice President of the United States referred the letter from the Postmaster General to Senator OLIN JOHNSTON, of South Carolina, chairman of the Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee. The chairman in turn referred the letter to me as chairman of the Senate Subcommittee on Post Office Affairs. In connection with my responsibility as subcommittee chairman I introduced a bill, S. 4102, on August 28, 1950. This bill did nothing more than change the existing 80th Congress law by authorizing the extra expenditure of $3,500 per mile, so that the cost of the new equipment could be amortized over a 10-year period.

8. S. 4102 was unanimously approved by the Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee. On that committee were both Democrats and Republicans. Voting for that bill was my distinguished colleague Senator THYE who had also voted for the 80th Congress bill, S. 2510. Our committee accepted the findings of the thorough investigation which had been made by the Congress in 1948. The results of that investigation were confirmed by the reports and conversations we had with representatives of the Post Office Department including postal inspectors and technicians.

9. The bill passed the Senate unanimously with Republican leaders, Senator Taft and Senator WHERRY, giving their approval to the bill. The bill was also unanimously passed by the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee of which Republican Congressman HAROLD HAGEN, of Minnesota, was a member. It was unanimously passed by the House of Representatives and became public law.

10. During the 80th, 81st, and 82d Congresses, and all other congressional sessions since 1898, the House and Senate Appropriation Committees provided funds to the Post Office Department to enter into the pneumatic tube contracts. These funds are appropriated only after careful examination.

11. It is clear from these facts that any criticism of S. 4102, is in effect a criticism not only of me but every Member of the Senate and House in both the 80th and 81st Congresses, Republicans and Democrats alike. My political opponents are attempting to smear my reputation with their criticisms, but, in this irresponsible and absured effort, are reflecting upon the integrity of the entire Congress.

12. The Postmaster General's claim of saving nearly a million dollars a year by canceling the pneumatic tube contract is in conflict with the 1948 Report of the Republican controlled 80th Congress. The Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee stated that to replace the pneumatic tube system in New York with trucks would in fact increase the cost by more than $57,000. The Senate committee, also, found the pneumatic tube service more efficient and vitally necessary for adequate postal service in New York City. Postmaster Summerfield's claims thoroughly were refuted by the 80th Congress.

I am attaching with this letter for your information and study copies of correspondence I have had with Senators LANGER and

JOHNSTON thoroughly confirming the facts as I have stated them and completely defending my position. Senator JOHNSTON after providing the background information concluded: "I consider the tactics outrageous."

Senator LANGER writes: "The criticism of you and your activities in connection with S. 4102 is totally unfounded."

It is clear to me that the decision of the Postmaster General went hand in hand with the unfair, partisan political attack made against me by the Republican National Committeeman through his newspaper editorial. This was designed to cause me political embarrassment in an election year. It is a display of political irresponsibility and disregard for the public interest. I am, therefore, asking the Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee to undertake an investigation of the full facts, to subpena the postal inspectors who investigated this question, and to see if the Postmaster General is guilty of dereliction of his responsibility as a public office holder.

Thank you for your fairness in opening your columns to me.

Sincerely yours,

HUBERT H. HUMPHREY.

P. S.—You will find enclosed for your own background information a brochure of materials with specific facts and photostatic documents.

---

EXHIBIT 3

[From the New York Times of Jan. 3, 1954]

MAIL TUBE SYSTEM GREW UP WITH CITY—DEVICE POST OFFICE NO LONGER WANTS OPENED IN 1897 WITH SOLEMNITY AND HIGH JINKS

The year was 1897. William McKinley was President, Brooklyn was still electing a mayor of its own, and in New York, where William L. Strong was mayor, crowds were gathering to find out all about a wonderful new device—a pneumatic mail tube, which the fast-growing city decided it needed to keep up to date.

The device, known as the New York Post Office Underground Pneumatic Tube System, is the one that has just fallen victim to an economy ax after serving 56 years as one of the city's most used, but least publicized, gadgets.

It was placed in operation on October 15, 1897, with a mixture of religious solemnity, old-fashioned patriotism and a brash dash of tomfoolery, if the stories handed down by historians are correct.

SOUVENIRS ON OPENING DAY

The tubes were designed to carry sealed containers of mail underground from one postal substation to another. Packed in that first container was a Bible, an American flag, and a copy of the Constitution.

In the second container was an imitation peach in tribute to Senator Chancey M. Depew, apparently a prime mover in the project, who was known affectionately as the "Peach." In the third container, as the story goes, went a black cat that scrambled out at the Custom House Substation and fled to a dark corner.

The pneumatic tube system now said to be more expensive to operate than mail trucks, is 27 miles in length. It is a pair of tubes which carry mail in opposite directions. The system originates at the general post office on 8th Avenue at 32d Street.

The tubes go north as far as the Manhattanville Substation on 125th Street, cut across town to the Triborough Substation, then swing downtown to Bowling Green, where they turn uptown again and terminate at the general post office.

The tubes are 8 inches in diameter and generally are 4 to 6 feet underground. They regularly carried 6 million pieces of mail a day in their "cars," or sealed steel containers.

MAIL SPED AT 30 MILES PER HOUR

The containers fit snugly in the tubes, are 24 inches long and weigh 21 pounds. Each container is addressed at the main post office to a specific substation. The cylinders are forced by air pressure at 30 miles an hour from one substation to the next.

At each station the tubes are examined. If their destination is further along, they are put back in the tube. The containers, which resemble the casings of artillery shells, rarely get stuck, because a lubricating container, perforated and loaded with oil, is sent through the system to keep the interior slick.

Since the Post Office Department canceled the contract of the owners and operators, the New York Mail & Newspaper Transportation Co., the question has arisen as to what possible use the tubes could be put to.

But apparently they have no alternative uses. The installations inside the main post office and the substations would have to be removed. What's left in the ground will probably stay there forever.

---

EXHIBIT 4

PNEUMATIC TUBE MAIL SERVICE

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON POST OFFICE AND CIVIL SERVICE,
*Washington, D. C., March 29, 1948.*

The committee met at 10 a. m., in the Pillement Suite, Waldorf-Astoria Hotel, New York City, Senator WILLIAM LANGER presiding.

Present: Senator LANGER (chairman) and Senator Ecton.

Also present: Mr. George D. Riley, staff director, Post Office and Civil Service Committee; Mr. Constantine D. Chrissos, secretary, Post Office and Civil Service Committee; Mr. John H. Sheehan, general superintendent of mails, New York Post Office; Mr. Charles H. Carle, assistant superintendent, post office quarters; Mr. Carl F. Dietz, president, New York Mail and Newspaper Transportation Co.; Mr. Francis D. Weeks, vice president and treasurer, New York Mail and Newspaper Transportation Co.; Mr. Joseph F. Devaney, superintendent, New York Mail and Newspaper Transportation Co.; Mr. J. Arlington Smith, assistant treasurer, New York Mail and Newspaper Transportation Co.

The CHAIRMAN. Let the record show that Senator O'Conor telephoned and said that he could not be here today but would be able to be here later in the week. Senator JOHNSTON was called to South Carolina and couldn't possibly be here. Senator THYE told me it wouldn't be possible for him to make it either. He told me that on Friday.

Mr. Riley, just what is the subject we are considering here today?

Mr. RILEY. The purpose of this meeting, Mr. Chairman, is to consider the extension of the present provisions, in new or old form, relating to the twenty-and-some-odd miles of pneumatic-tube service used by the Post Office Department and operated by Mr. Dietz and his associates. As you recall, there was legislation that went through last year which called for an extension of the present rates through the present fiscal year, at which time any new changes would become effective—so that there is a fairly comfortable amount of time here within which to make bids—I understand it takes perhaps 4 weeks or so to advertise for bids.

Mr. DIETZ. Six weeks.

The CHAIRMAN. May I see the advertisement?

Mr. DIETZ. Yes, sir [handing same to chairman].

Mr. RILEY. At some convenient point, Mr. Chairman, I would like to have this history [indicating] of the pneumatic tube operations, and the New York system in particular, inserted in the record.

The CHAIRMAN. Let's have the advertisement and the history of the pneumatic tube service inserted in the record at this point and mark them "Exhibits 1 and 2," respectively.

Mr. RILEY. Yes, sir.

(The following statement entitled "Development of Postal Pneumatic Tube Service" was inserted into the record and marked "Exhibit 1" pursuant to the chairman's instructions:)

"DEVELOPMENT OF POSTAL PNEUMATIC TUBE SERVICE

"Following is a résumé of the development of pneumatic tube and automobile mail service 1899–1916, as set forth in Senate committee print 65th Congress, 1st session dated 1917:

" 'Pursuant to authority contained in the act making appropriations for the service of the Post Office Department approved July 13, 1892 (* * * to examine into the subject of a more rapid dispatch of mail matter between large cities and post-office stations and transportation terminals located in large cities by means of pneumatic tubes or other systems), with a view to ascertaining the cost and advantages of such a system, and advertisement was issued dated July 26, 1892.

" 'Eight proposals were received and a committee appointed by the Postmaster General recommended acceptance of the offer made by the Pneumatic Transit Co. of New Jersey to construct a tube line in Philadelphia between the main post office and the sub-post-office on Chestnut Street below Fourth Street, for test purposes for a period of 1 year without cost or obligation to the United States. This offer was accepted. For a period of about 1 year prior to March 1, 1894, that service was on an experimental basis without cost to the United States. Subsequent to that date, up to July 1, 1896, the service was paid for out of the appropriation for mail messenger service at the rate of $3,450 per annum. The length of the line was .055 of a mile. The appropriation bill for the Post Office Department for the fiscal year 1897 was the first to make specific mention of the pneumatic tubes. In connection with the allowance for mail-messenger service, it provided that a sum not exceeding $35,000 of that amount could be used for the transportation of mail by pneumatic tubes or other similar device.

" 'The appropriation bill for the fiscal year 1898 authorized the expenditure out of the mail-messenger service a sum not to exceed $150,000 for the transportation of mail by pneumatic tubes. Accordingly, four contracts were let in addition to the tube service then in operation at Philadelphia for service in Boston, New York, between Brooklyn and New York and additional service in Philadelphia. The contracts were let as follows:

" 'November 27, 1896, with the Pneumatic Transit Co. for combined pneumatic tube and wagon service in Philadelphia for a term of 4 years from July 1, 1897, at $23,366 per annum, of which amount $16,966 was apportioned to the tube service.

" 'November 27, 1896, with the United States Mail, Package & General Pneumatic Delivery Co. between the general post office, Brooklyn, and general post office, New York, N. Y., for a term of 4 years from August 27, 1897, at $14,000 per annum.

" 'March 27, 1897, with the Tubular Dispatch Co. between the main post office, New York, N. Y., and Station P, also between the main office and Station H, via Station D, Madison Square and F from October 1, 1897, to June 30, 1901, at the rate of $148,500 per annum.

" 'July 1, 1897, with the Boston Pneumatic Transit Co. for combined pneumatic tube and wagon service in Boston, between the main office and the North Union Railroad Station from October 1, 1897, to June 30,

1901, at $18,000 per annum, of which amount $9,000 was apportioned to the tube service.

" 'These contracts stipulated double lines of tubes, each way, in order to permit transmittal of carriers in both directions, all contracts to expire June 30, 1901. On that date all service via pneumatic tubes was discontinued because the Congress failed to make further appropriations.

" 'Pursuant to authority contained in the Appropriation Act approved April 1, 1902 (32 Stat. 114), an advertisement dated June 1, 1902, was issued by the Postmaster General, inviting proposals for carrying the mails by pneumatic tubes or other similar devices at Boston, Brooklyn, New York, Philadelphia, Washington, Chicago, and St. Louis.

" 'The contract at Boston contemplated 8.89 miles of double line 8-inch and 10-inch tubes, at an annual rate of $79,852.67; at New York, 24.653 miles at $16,799 per mile, a total of $414,145.74; at Philadelphia 7.642 miles at $17,000 per mile, a total of $129,914; at Chicago, Ill., 8.70 miles at $13,750 per mile, a total of $119,625 and at St. Louis, Mo., 3.16 miles at $15,274.37 per mile, a total of $48,267. The Boston, Mass., New York, N. Y., and Philadelphia, Pa., contracts terminated on June 30, 1906, and the Chicago, Ill., on September 30, 1907, and the St. Louis, Mo., on June 30, 1907.

" 'The annual report of the Postmaster General for the year 1905 shows full service in operation via pneumatic tubes in Boston, Brooklyn, and Chicago.

" 'An advertisement was issued on June 29, 1906, pursuant to law for service by pneumatic tubes in the cities of Boston, Brooklyn, New York, Philadelphia, Pittsburgh, Baltimore, Cincinnati, Kansas City, San Francisco, Chicago, and St. Louis. The term for Chicago and St. Louis was to run from July 1, 1907, to June 30, 1916, and in the other cites from October 1, 1906, to June 30, 1916.

" 'Contracts were awarded at Boston, Brooklyn, New York, Philadelphia, Chicago, and St. Louis, for an aggregate of 63.275 miles of double-line tubes at $16,869 per mile per annum, a total annual rate of $1,067,411.09. No proposals were received for service via pneumatic tubes from Pittsburgh, Baltimore, Cincinnati, Kansas City, and San Francisco.

" 'These contracts were extended for a period of 6 months by the Postmaster General, in accordance with law and later extended by the Congress to June 30, 1918, in accordance with the act of March 4, 1917. All service via pneumatic tubes was discontinued on June 30, 1918, due to the fact that the Congress failed to appropriate moneys for its further operation.

" 'In accordance with authority contained in the act of June 19, 1922, according to 42 Stat. 61, service was resumed at New York, N. Y., effective October 2, 1922, to June 30, 1932, at an annual rate per mile of double line at $17,000. In accordance with the authority contained in the act referred to, the Interstate Commerce Commission increased the rate to $19,500 per mile, per annum, to become effective July 1, 1923, which is the present rate paid at New York, N. Y.

" 'Another contract was entered into at New York, N. Y., effective July 1, 1932, for a term of 2 years at the same rate per mile. The contract contained a provision permitting the Postmaster General to make three 1-year extensions, all of which have been made, the last extension terminating on June 30, 1936.

" 'Under date of April 5, 1937, the route was again advertised, with a view to reletting the contract for a period of 10 years from July 1, 1937, to June 30, 1947. However, as no proposal for service was received under the advertisement, and in order to maintain service subsequent to June 30, 1937, the Department exercised the right contained in the contract to extend the service for a period of 6 months, which will terminate on December 31, 1937. The second advertisement was issued on September 23, 1937, requesting proposals for service on said route for a period of 6 months ending June 30, 1939. Only one proposal was received, which was rejected by the Postmaster General because the proposal was not responsive to the advertisement, nor in accordance with the existing statutes relating to service via pneumatic tubes. The third advertisement, which is now pending and returnable on December 24, 1937, is for the same period—January 1, to June 30, 1938.

" 'After the termination of all contracts on June 30, 1918, the service at Boston, Mass., was not reinstated until August 1, 1926, for a 10-year period ending July 31, 1936. This contract is different from the one in effect at New York, N. Y. It is on a rental basis at the rate of $24,000 per annum, the contractor only being required to furnish the tube system and to maintain it in operating condition during the period of the contract. The United States furnishes all labor and power in connection therewith. Authority for entering into a contract on that basis is contained in the appropriation act for pneumatic-tube service for the fiscal year 1927.

" 'A new contract was consummated at Boston for a new term and under the same provisions as the former contract to run from February 1, 1937, to January 31, 1947. Under date of February 28, 1935, the postmaster at Boston advised that the annual cost of pneumatic-tube service amounted to $52,815, of which amount $24,000 is paid for the rental of the system, and the remainder for labor hire, power costs, etc.'

"The foregoing résumé takes the Boston, Mass., tube up to January 31, 1947. The contract was then extended to June 30, 1947, and again extended to July 31, 1947. An advertisement for a further term of service on this route was issued in April of 1947, but no proposals were received. A temporary contract was, therefore, made for a term of 11 months beginning August 1, 1947, and ending June 30, 1948, under authority granted in (39 U. S. C. 434) at a rate of $24,000 annually. An advertisement is now pending soliciting proposals on a contract rental basis for pneumatic tube service in Boston for a term of 1, 5, or 10 years to begin on July 1, 1948.

"It will be noted that the résumé shows the history of pneumatic tube service at New York and Brooklyn up to December 31, 1937. Thereafter, a temporary contract was made for the period January 1, 1938, to February 28, 1938, and a second temporary contract was made for the period March 2, 1938, to June 30, 1938. The next contract was for the period of July 1, 1938, to June 30, 1940, followed by one for the period July 1, 1940, to June 30, 1941, and subsequently extended to June 30, 1942. The next contract period covered July 1, 1942, to June 30, 1947, and the terms of this contract were extended to December 31, 1947, and further extended by mutual agreement to June 30, 1948, at the rate of $9,382 per mile per annum. Advertisement for a term of 1, 5, or 10 years is now pending.

"The following statutes are applicable: Act of April 21, 1902 (32 Stat. 114), act of March 2, 1907 (34 Stat. 1211), act of May 27, 1908 (35 Stat. 412), act of June 19, 1922 (42 Stat. 661, 39 U. S. C. 423).

"MARCH 26, 1948."

(The following statement entitled "Proposals for Pneumatic Tube Mail Service" was inserted into the record and marked "Exhibit 2" pursuant to the chairman's instructions:)

"PROPOSALS FOR PNEUMATIC TUBE MAIL SERVICE

"POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT,
"OFFICE OF THE POSTMASTER GENERAL,
*"Washington, D. C., March 25, 1948.*

"Proposals will be received at the office of the Fourth Assistant Postmaster General, Post Office Department, Washington, D. C., until 10 a. m., May 6, 1948, for furnishing a pneumatic tube system on route 507011–A, on a lease or rental basis, for use in the transmission of the mails in the Borough of Manhattan and between the New York and Brooklyn post offices, both in the city of New York, N. Y., for a period of 1 year, 5 years, or 10 years, beginning July 1, 1948, in accordance with the conditions specified in the instructions to bidders. Prospective bidders may obtain a copy of the advertisement by making application to the Fourth Assistant Postmaster General, Post Office Department, Washington 25, D. C.

"JESSE M. DONALDSON,
*"Postmaster General."*

The CHAIRMAN. Nobody else can bid on this but these people here, isn't that right?

Mr. RILEY. I understand that they have the only system of tubes operating——

The CHAIRMAN. Well, then, there isn't any use advertising it.

Mr. RILEY. No; there isn't much use in advertising it.

Mr. CARLE. No; except that the law requires——

The CHAIRMAN. But as a practical matter, you don't anticipate getting more than but one bid.

Mr. CARLE. Yes, sir; that is correct.

The CHAIRMAN. I would like to have this inserted in the record [indicating] and marked "Exhibit 3."

(The following statement entitled "Advertisement Inviting Proposals for Furnishing a Tube System on a Lease or Rental Basis for Use in the Transmission of Mails by Pneumatic Tubes or Other Similar Devices at New York, N. Y., and Between the General Post Office at New York and the General Post Office at Brooklyn, N. Y." was inserted in the record and marked "Exhibit 3" pursuant to the chairman's instructions:)

"ADVERTISEMENT INVITING PROPOSALS FOR FURNISHING A TUBE SYSTEM ON A LEASE OR RENTAL BASIS FOR USE IN THE TRANSMISSION OF MAILS BY PNEUMATIC TUBES OR OTHER SIMILAR DEVICES, AT NEW YORK, N. Y., AND BETWEEN THE GENERAL POST OFFICE AT NEW YORK AND THE GENERAL POST OFFICE AT BROOKLYN, N. Y.

"POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT,
*"Washington, D. C., March 25, 1948.*

"Proposals will be received until 10 a. m., May 6, 1948.

"JESSE M. DONALDSON,
*"Postmaster General."*

"INSTRUCTIONS TO BIDDERS FOR FURNISHING A PNEUMATIC TUBE SYSTEM ON ROUTE 507011–A AT NEW YORK, N. Y., INCLUDING THE GENERAL POST OFFICE AT BROOKLYN, N. Y.

"1. The pneumatic tube system contemplated by these instructions to bidders will be known as route No. 507011–A.

"2. The designation 'tube system,' as used in these instructions, contemplates the tube lines, power plants, receiving and dispatching apparatus, carriers (mail containers), and any machinery, equipment, or device necessary to the efficient use of pneumatic tubes as a facility for the transmission of mail in the cities of New York and Brooklyn, N. Y.

"3. Any contract entered into under this advertisement shall be for a term of 1 year, 5 years, or 10 years from July 1, 1948, unless sooner annulled, or terminated, as provided for elsewhere in these instructions.

"4. The mail-handling points to be embraced on the tube system are as follows: Church Street Annex to Canal Street Station; Canal Street Station to Prince Station (Station A); Prince Station (Station A) to Old Chelsea Station (Station O); Old Chelsea Station (Station O) to General Post Office; General Post Office to Times Square Station; General Post Office to Grand Central Annex; Times Square Station to Radio City Station (Station G); Radio City Station (Station G) to Ansonia Station (Station N); Ansonia Station (Station N) to Planetarium

Station (Station W); Plantetarium Station (Station W) to Cathedral Station (Station H); Cathedral Station (Station H) to Morningside Station (Station I); Morningside Station (Station I) to Manhattanville Station (Station J); Manhattanville Station (Station J) to Triborough Station (Station L); Grand Central Annex to Lenox Hill Station (Station Y); Lenox Hill Station (Station Y) to Gracie Station (Station K); Gracie Station (Station K) to Hell Gate Station (Station U); Hell Gate Station (Station U) to Triborough Station (Station L); Church Street Annex to Cooper Station (Station D); Cooper Station (Station D) to Madison Square Station; Madison Square Station to Murray Hill Station (Station F) to Grand Central Annex; Church Street Annex to Bowling Green Station (Station P) via Wall Street Station; Church Street Annex to General Post Office, Brooklyn, N. Y.

"NOTE.—Points in parentheses are old stations that have been renamed and are now or will be in effect July 1, 1948.

"The points named above shall be connected by the shortest practicable route with double lines of pneumatic tubes not less than 8 inches in diameter, inside measurement, at the expense of the contractor, notwithstanding the designation and/or location of the said stations and annexes may be changed during the contract term; and the carriers (mail containers) shall be of uniform construction and size not less than 6⅞ inches in diameter and 21 inches in length, inside measurement.

"5. The Post Office Department will—

"(a) Allot in the premises under its control, space for the tubes, powerplants, receiving and dispatching apparatus, and other appliances to be installed in the points on the tube system.

"(b) Provide the operators necessary to operate the tube system.

"(c) Furnish electric power necessary in connection wtih the operation of the tube system.

"6. The contractor will—

"(a) Furnish and maintain the tube system and powerplants in a satisfactory operating condition, including the personnel required therefor.

"(b) Provide the necessary powerplants of a type that can be operated by electricity, and capable of transmitting the carriers at an average speed of 30 miles per hour between points.

"(c) Make the tube system available for the transmission of mail 18 consecutive hours daily, Monday to Friday, inclusive, 6 consecutive hours on each Saturday and not exceeding a total of 36 additional hours during each month of December occurring in the contract period or any extension thereof, on a schedule to be prescribed by the Postmaster General.

"(d) Make repairs to the premises connected with the tube system resulting from damage occasioned by the installation of the tubes, powerplants, receiving and dispatching apparatus, machinery, equipment, and devices.

"(e) Remove the tubes, powerplants, receiving and dispatching apparatus, machinery, equipment, and devices, from the points connected on the tube system at their own expense at the expiration of the term, or the termination of the contract, if requested to do so by the Postmaster General.

"(f) Upon the discontinuance of tube service at any point connected with the system, the contractor will restore the premises upon which alterations have been made to permit of the installation of the tubes, powerplants, receiving and dispatching apparatus, to the condition in which they were received, ordinary wear and tear expected, if requested to do so by the Postmaster General.

"7. Proposals shall be accompanied by—

"(a) A map showing the location, and as far as practicable, the streets and ways to be followed in the connection of the points to be embraced on the system, together with the distances from point to point.

"(b) A general description of the powerplants to be installed for the operation of tubes.

"(c) Plans, both profile and flat, showing the tubes, powerplants, and receiving and dispatching apparatus, and the proposed location thereof; and the manner of entering the buildings.

"(d) A statement of the distances between the several mail-handling points connected with the tube system, duly verified by a competent engineer. The distance between any two points must be by the shortest practicable route and if a detour is made, the reason therefor must be given.

*"Cancellation provisions*

"8. The Postmaster General may annul, cancel, terminate, and end any contract that may be entered into under this advertisement—

"(a) For repeated failure of the tube system to operate due to matters within the control of the contractor.

"(b) For repeated failure on the part of the contractor to make necessary repairs to the tube system promptly.

"(c) For failure to have the tube system in a condition for efficient operation on July 1, 1948.

"(d) For violation of the postal laws.

"(e) For refusal to discharge any persons connected with the maintenance and repair of the tube system when requested to do so by the Postmaster General.

"(f) For failure of contractor to change the location of the tube lines and receiving and dispatching apparatus made necessary by reason of the remodeling or rebuilding of the quarters in which the tube terminals are located; or by reason of the failure of the contractor to have all points embraced on the route as outlined in paragraph 4 of this advertisement, connected with the tube system, as more specifically provided for in said paragraph 4.

"(g) For failure of the Congress to appropriate funds for the operation of the system.

"(h) Whenever the contractor shall become a Member of Congress.

"(i) Whenever, in the discretion of the Postmaster General, the public interest may require.

"The contract shall be canceled, without additional compensation to the contractor, in the event of the purchase of the pneumatic tube system by the United States.

"Annulment, cancellation, termination, or ending for any of the causes recited above shall not impair the right of the Postmaster General to claim damages from the contractor or his surety, and such damages may, for the purpose of setoff or counterclaim in the settlement of any claim of said contractor or its surety against the United States, whether arising under this contract or otherwise, be assessed and liquidated by the General Accounting Office of the United States.

*"Fines and deductions*

"9. The Postmaster General reserves the right to deduct from the pay of the contractor, such sums as he may deem proper as a penalty for the delay, damage, or loss of mail in transit, failure to maintain the tube system in a satisfactory state of repair, or for any other cause within the control of the contractor that may impair the efficiency of the tube system.

"10. Employees of the contractor shall not handle the mails.

"11. Bidders and their sureties shall familiarize themselves with the conditions contained in these instructions before signing proposals and assuming liability thereunder as bidders and sureties.

"12. Two or more individuals or a surety company will be accepted as surety on the bond of a bidder or contractor under this advertisement.

"13. Individual sureties must make oath that they are owners of real estate worth in the aggregate, a sum totaling the amount of the bond, free and above all debts due and owing by them, and all judgments, mortgages, and executions against them, after allowing all exemptions of every character whatsoever. A married woman will not be accepted as a surety either on a bond of a bidder or on the contract.

"14. A surety company, which has complied with the provisions of the acts of August 13, 1894, and March 23, 1910, will be accepted as sole surety on the bond of a bidder or contractor under this advertisement, but the Postmaster General reserves the right to reject any surety company which, as surety on a contract, has previously refused or failed to provide service or furnish equipment as contemplated by the contract.

"15. Proposals will not be considered which are without the bond, oath, or certificate required by the acts of June 23, 1874, and August 11, 1876.

"16. Notice of the withdrawal of a proposal will not be considered unless filed in the office of the Fourth Assistant Postmaster General at least 24 hours prior to the expiration of the advertisement.

"17. The Postmaster General reserves the right to disregard the proposals of failing contractors and bidders and also to disregard proposals accompanied by bonds on which there appears as surety the name of a person who has been declared a failing contractor or bidder or barred from bidding for any reason whatever.

"18. The accepted bidder under this advertisement will be required to execute a contract prescribed by the Postmaster General within 30 days from the date the award is made, which shall include a stipulation that it is made subject to the Postal Laws and Regulations, Edition of 1940, insofar as they may be applicable thereto, with special reference to section 64, otherwise the bidder will be considered to have failed, and the Postmaster General may proceed to contract for the service with other parties according to law.

"19. The Postmaster General may, in his discretion, continue in force any contract entered into as a result of this advertisement beyond its express terms for a period not to exceed 6 months.

"20. Proposals submitted under this advertisement, as well as any contract entered into thereunder, shall specify the rate per annum for the rental of the entire tube system and shall be accompanied by a bond in double the amount of the annual rental stated in the bid.

"21. Payment for service on the route will commence when the entire tube system shall have been completed and accepted by the Postmaster General, and service performed according to contract.

"22. Proposals shall be enclosed in sealed envelopes addressed 'Fourth Assistant Postmaster General, Post Office Department, Washington 25, D. C.' and endorsed 'Proposals for the Rental of Pneumatic Tubes, New York, N. Y.'

"23. The Postmaster General reserves the right to reject any or all bids received under this advertisement.

"JESSE M. DONALDSON,
*"Postmaster General."*

The CHAIRMAN. Is there anything further from the Post Office Department before we hear from Mr. Dietz?

Mr. CARLE. Not unless you care to ask me any questions. I have a little statement that I have prepared that sort of highlights the thing from an operating standpoint and goes back into the history of it. I will be glad to read it or have it inserted in the RECORD, if you like, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. How long is it?

Mr. CARLE. It is only 3 or 4 pages long.

The CHAIRMAN. Go ahead and read it into the RECORD.

Mr. CARLE. Yes, sir.

(Mr. Carle then read the following statement into the records:)

"Mr. Chairman, the pneumatic-tube service, so far as the city of New York is concerned, had its inception in the fiscal year 1898, or 50 years ago. For the fiscal year ended June 30, 1898, the records show 5.85 miles of tubes in New York City, operated at an annual cost of $168,655 or $28,829 per mile.

"Since then the number of miles of tubes operated has been generally upward, and the operating cost per mile downward.

"The Post Office Department now operates two systems of pneumatic tubes in the United States, 1 in Boston, Mass., where we operate about 1.6 miles of double lines of tubes, and at New York, N. Y., where the system consists of 26.969 miles of double lines of tubes connecting the general post office, 21 large postal stations, and the post office at Brooklyn, N. Y.

"Here in New York the service operates 17 hours a day on weekdays, except Saturdays, and 5 hours on Saturdays. There is no service scheduled on Sundays, and the holiday service is limited.

"The New York City system is rented from the New York Mail & Newspaper Transportation Co., a corporation, having executive offices in this city. The company furnishes the complete tube system and keeps it in operating condition. All labor and power necessary for the operation of the tubes and the handling of the mails thereby is provided by the Post Office Department at its expense. The current contract with the owning corporation is at the rate of $9,382 per mile of double line of 8-inch tubes, and expires on June 30, 1948.

"Currently an advertisement is pending, bids being due on May 6, 1948, for furnishing a pneumatic-tube system in the city of New York for a term of 1 year, 5 years, or 10 years, beginning July 1, 1948. Of course, no bids have as yet been received and we do not know definitely what the rate will be subsequent to June 30, 1948, or what other contract conditions may be involved.

"For budgetary purposes the operating expenses at New York, N. Y., and Boston, Mass., are included in one item of appropriation, which for the fiscal year 1948 is $700,000. The 1948 cost breakdown is as follows:

| | |
|---|---|
| Personnel services, all of which is for the service here in New York | $377,477 |
| Tube system rent, of which $24,000 is for Boston, Mass | 277,023 |
| Intercommunicating telephone system, which is for the New York service exclusively | 4,500 |
| Electric power, which is also for the New York service exclusively | 41,000 |
| Total | 700,000 |

"The estimate of cost for the fiscal year 1949 is $744,700, which includes an estimated increase in personnel cost at New York, and a small increase to $11,000 a mile for tube rental at New York, a slight increase in the cost of power at New York.

"The tube service at New York performs a very important mail-handling function, connecting as it does the main post office with 21 of the larger and more important mail-handling units, and also the main post office at Brooklyn, which has no direct mail connections except with the Long Island Railroad at the Flatbush Avenue Station. Other and very important mail connections must be made at the New York, N. Y., railroad depots; and of course, the city of Brooklyn, with a population of over 3 million and postal receipts for the 1946 calendar year of $15,304,814, is dependent for its incoming mail supply on the New York post office and railroad terminals.

"The pneumatic tubes are used for the transportation of ordinary letter mail, special-delivery matter, airmail, registered mail, daily papers in limited quantities, and miscellaneous letter-sized pieces of other mail when included with the letter mails.

"The New York post office had receipts of $131,369,047 for the calendar year 1947, an increase of $1,436,497 over the previous calendar years, which will give some idea of the magnitude of the business handled.

"In connection with an investigation of the pneumatic-tube service at New York, a mail count was kept on Thursday, March 27, 1947, an average business day. The count was carefully made under the direct supervision of competent servicemen. On that day 5,871,546 pieces of mail were handled through the pneumatic tubes.

"During the period of pneumatic-tube operation 50.71 percent of the ordinary letter mail requiring transportation was transmitted by way of the tubes, and, considering the 24-hour period as a whole, 31.18 percent of the ordinary letter mail requiring transportation was transmitted through the tubes.

"Fifty-one and sixty-one one-hundredths percent, or 2,126,970 pieces of first-class mail for city delivery received from other post offices were transmitted through the tubes.

"Twenty-eight and thirty-eight one-hundredths percent, or 265,410 pieces of ordinary transit first-class mail from other post offices requiring transportation were transmitted through the tubes.

"The tubes are important to the service at New York because of traffic density, because they afford a means of obtaining a steady flow of mail to mail-handling employees at the point where they work it, thereby making the entire operation more flexible, and because they have proven to be dependable and speedy as compared with any method of surface transport.

"The Post Office Department welcomes the survey being undertaken by your committee and will endeavor, with the help of the postmaster at New York, Mr. Goldman, and his staff of supervisory employees, to furnish you with all the detailed information you may desire."

The CHAIRMAN. When did you take over this operation for the first time?

Mr. CARLE. We took over the operation for the first time in March of 1938—March 2, 1938, was when we took over the company employees on a temporary basis, and that became a regular basis on July 1, 1938.

The CHAIRMAN. What does that cost the Government?

Mr. CARLE. The personnel cost is something over $300,000 a year. Mr. Sheehan has the exact figures on that.

Mr. SHEEHAN. The salaries at New York total $320,700. The salaries at Brooklyn, $8,403.09; electric current——

The CHAIRMAN. What other costs have you?

Mr .CARLE. The costs are split into four general headings. In addition to the personnel, of course, we have the tube-system rent, which is at the rate of $9,382 a mile. Then we have to pay for the intercommunicating telephone system, which costs in the neighborhood of $4,500 a year; and the electric power, which costs in the neighborhood of $41,000 a year.

The CHAIRMAN. Prior to 1938 did the company pay all these costs?

Mr. CARLE. Before 1938 the company paid all the expenses.

The CHAIRMAN. What was the rent per mile, say, in 1937?

Mr. CARLE. The figure for 1937 was—it is worked out on a fiscal-year basis—$19,488 a mile. There possibly were some deductions for fines and penalties. The financial records of the Department show that in 1937 it was operating 26.5732 miles of tubes at a cost of $517,861.93, which, on a mileage-basis rate per mile, figures out to be $19,488.

The CHAIRMAN. Now you pay $9,382 a mile?

Mr. CARLE. Yes, sir.

Senator ECTON. What was the reason that you took over the personnel and the operation of the whole system at that time?

Mr. CARLE. The operating company, as I understand it, was having—more or less—trouble with labor and didn't want any longer to be responsible for the actual operation of the tubes. It then became necessary for the Post Office Department—assuming that the Post Office Department wanted to continue the tube operations—to take over and operate it itself.

Senator ECTON. In other words, it got to the point that if the tube system was to be continued in operation, then the postal department almost had to take it over to continue it in operation.

Mr. CARLE. That's correct, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. What is the number of personnel you have now?

Mr. CARLE. Approximately 144.

The CHAIRMAN. What is your average pay?

Mr. CARLE. The rates vary from $2,900 to $2,500 a year.

The CHAIRMAN. Of course, you don't expect anybody to be able to live on those salaries, do you?

Mr. CARLE. They don't seem to be very high.

The CHAIRMAN. Those are starvation wages. What is the highest salary you pay?

Mr. CARLE. $2,500 a year.

The CHAIRMAN. And your lowest is $2,000?

Mr. CARLE. Yes, sir.

I do have here somewhere a breakdown on personnel expense. [Indicating.] This breakdown I have includes some supervisory employees; and for the fiscal year 1948 the estimate shows 1 at $3,600; 3 at $3,100, 118 at $2,500, 17 at $2,200, and 4 at $2,100.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you know anything about this personnel. Are they married people—full time?

Mr. CARLE. It is a full-time operation for them.

The CHAIRMAN. Married folks?

Mr. CARLE. I guess most of them are.

Mr. SHEEHAN. Yes; most of them are married.

The CHAIRMAN. How long have they worked for the Government?

Mr. CARLE. Since 1938.

The CHAIRMAN. What is your turnover?

Mr. CARLE. From the record, Senator, it isn't apparently too large.

Mr. SHEEHAN. It is very small.

Mr. CARLE. We are carrying one vacancy at the present time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Bureau of Labor Statistics found out that it cost $3,347 to live in New York for a man, wife, and two children. If that is the case how can people live on $2,000 or $2,500 a year?

Mr. CARLE. It doesn't seem to be a very high salary.

Senator ECTON. How soon do you think that this tube system will have to be replaced entirely?

Mr. CARLE. Senator, I wouldn't know. We know that parts of the system have been underground for somewhere in the neighborhood of 50 years. This morning over at Grand Central Station we looked at a piece of pipe that had come out of the ground. The gentlemen who are familiar with the system thought the piece of pipe was around 40 years old and there was no noticeable wear. The pipes seem to be very economical to operate. At the beginning of the day there is put through a carrier containing a special lubricant, and it seems that when those carriers go through there isn't a great deal of wear on the pipes.

Senator ECTON. So the system has been definitely proved to be satisfactory?

Mr. CARLE. I don't believe that there can be any doubt of that. We have had very few failures in the system. It certainly saves a lot of time in transit between points as compared with motor vehicles or any other surface means.

Senator ECTON. It not only saves time but isn't it also true that it saves a lot of transportation expense?

Mr. CARLE. I believe that is true; yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. What was your total cost last year?

Mr. CARLE. The total cost of the tube service was $653,758. That included the tube rental, the salaries, the power, and the telephone service.

The CHAIRMAN. Will you just tell us why this figure should be raised, Mr. Dietz?

Mr. DIETZ. May I go into a little historical sketch of this, Mr. Chairman?

The CHAIRMAN. Go right ahead, Mr. Dietz, and you can take all the time you want.

Mr. DIETZ. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Just about 10 years ago when the tube system was faced with a CIO union development, among the claims the CIO wanted and made were substantial increases in pay, for which we had no money. We took it up with the Government and the Post Office Department stated that there was no appropriation beyond what we were already being given, and there seemed to be no way in which any larger appropriation could be accomplished in order to make the higher rates of pay available to the men that they demanded.

Originally, the rates of pay per mile rental were based on a 60-hour week. Then the Post Office Department, as generally was the case in all industries everywhere—the 60-hour week became shortened gradually until finally a 40-hour week became, more or less, the established working period, and the boys, of course, wanted a correction in their pay to conform with the 40-hour-week schedule for which we were not being compensated at all. That was batted around for numbers of weeks and we had a trial period in order to try to work out a transfer from a tube operation by our company to a lease operation in order to take care of the question of unionization of the men, with an increase of roughly 30 to operate the tube system on the shortened workweek. So, we had the two things—the higher rates of pay and a substantially larger number of men in order to operate the system. Besides, there was precedent for the Government operating on a lessee basis because of Boston having already been placed on an operating-lease basis several years before then.

We were, secondarily, confronted with the expiration of a 30-year power contract with the New York Edison Co. and we were told that after April 1, 1938—I think it was—our power rates would be increased about two-thirds. Obviously, we couldn't absorb that so it just meant that we would be operating the tube system just for the pleasure of doing so and possibly going into very, very deep red and there was just no reason for our trying to continue on that basis, all of which was recognized by the then Fourth Assistant Postmaster General, Mr. Purdum.

So we worked out this lease arrangement whereby the Government furnished the power and, as I understand it, the power required by the tube service was wrapped up in a general Treasury Department contract with the New York Edison Co. The details of that contract I am not familiar with.

Under those conditions we arranged an entirely new schedule of lease payments. The new rate contemplated a return to the company of $144,000 a year, which was the average for a 9- or 10-year period immediately preceding these negotiations, exclusive of depreciation and interest charges, because this company standing on its own feet was regularly in the red. When we applied depreciation and interest charges to the amount of free-money flow we had from the operations we were in the red, and it was only because the company was owned by a stronger parent that it was possible for us to get along at all. We couldn't borrow. We had no basis upon which to borrow. We loaned the company the necessary funds. So it was thought that if we had the average over a period, without being saddled with any extraneous expenditures, $144,000 a year to us—before depreciation and interest—was a basis upon which we could negotiate and agree.

That was done—and for the first few years we came around that figure—$140,000, $143,000—somewhere around that figure. However, during the last few years, due to the very sharp rise in costs we are nowhere near the $144,000-a-year figure. I think last year it was $104,000. The year before that it was lower, so that over the period of the last 5 years, actually multiplying $144,000 by 5 for that 5-year period, we have a substantial deficit in relationship to what was expected, and that was one of the reasons why the figure we first put in about 5 or 6 months ago—merely as an expression of opinion of what we should have—was as high as it was because we added into our operating expense—in recalculating the expense—the deficiency which we felt we were entitled to, although there was no contractual obligation on the part of the Government to make that guaranty. However, we felt that we were giving the Post Office Department a very much heavier service than before because the mail tonnage, as you know, did increase hugely during the war. Obviously, the wear and tear was greater and we felt that a reimbursement was not an unfair thing for the Government to consider. However, I think probably Mr. Myers is quite right when he makes the statement that there was no provision in the contract—no obligation—and it probably would be pretty difficult to establish the adjustment on that basis, although I would like to have that considered and I think it is fair.

These systems have been operated with a great measure of efficiency and I don't think we have paid a fine in the past 5 years, although if the system fails and the work stops we are fined on the basis of 30 minutes or over. I think we can well contend that the system has been a pretty good service system.

We are today at the point where we feel that any new price should be reflected at a rate of $144,000 to us per year. In launching into the matter of economics I figure that on a basis of a 60-cent dollar it should be a lot more than that because as we all know the value of the dollar has fallen considerably while our replacement charges are, of course, tremendously higher than they ever were before. Our tube failures fortunately were very little but the costs of replacement are manyfold what the costs were even in the middle thirties on those items. Our carrier costs today are up at least 60 percent over the carrier costs in the late thirties and early forties. Those rings I showed you, Mr. Chairman, are now quoted at double what we paid for them in the last few years. This necessarily means that our operating costs—because of economic conditions—are substantially higher and will be higher than they ever have been before and we feel that that request for proper consideration of those elements is a pretty reasonable one.

Now, on top of that we have this very unfortunate situation of Consolidated Edison having advised the Treasury Department, with whom the contract for power runs, that at the end of daylight saving in 1948 they will no longer be able to furnish us direct current for our 11 powerplants. That, of course, could be disastrous and it is almost unthinkable that that period should arrive.

The contract calls for the Government furnishing power to the station equipment as presently exists and which is a direct-current requirement. Alternating current, in itself, is not desirable. We do have it in Boston but it is not a flexible means of operating that equipment. Direct current is flexible. We can operate up to 20, 24, 26 pounds at will in case any obstruction does occur. We consulted the two major power companies as to what method is the best for doing the job. It is agreed that an attempt to put alternating current motors on our compressors is a terrifically major job because there is nothing standard that will fit into those particular structures. The only practical way is to provide motor generator sets—a motor generator set consisting of a motor receiving alternating current and then converting the alternating current through a generator—on the same shaft with the direct current and hooking right straight into the panel boards presently existing.

Senator ECTON. Could you manage this conversion for all 11 stations by 1 central plant, Mr. Dietz?

Mr. DIETZ. It could be done, sir, but it would require a tremendous amount of special wiring to be run under the streets. In New York you are not permitted to run wires above the surface—and we would have to get franchises and it would be a terrific job. We would have to tear up the streets.

Senator ECTON. The only practical way is to have a unit right at each station?

Mr. DIETZ. Yes, sir.

Senator ECTON. That would be 11 altogether?

Mr. DIETZ. Yes, sir.

(Off-the-record conversation.)

Mr. DIETZ. On top of that the Edison Co. has advised the Treasury Department that before the end of the daylight saving period in 1948 they want to make these changes at the general post office at Vesey Street and also at one of the intermediate stations right up here on the East Side—station K—on 87th Street. It ties up the whole system, crosstown and up the East Side.

They have not made a very detailed study as to price costs but they have thrown out some figures and the cost of that changeover seems to run somewhere in the neighborhood of $200,000 to $275,000.

Senator ECTON. This is a change from d. c. to a. c.?

Mr. DIETZ. Yes, sir; and they give us a delivery time of a year. Now, whether that still prevails I am not too sure, because we haven't discussed this matter with them for at least 3 or 4 months but there may be a little easing off on the time period. Oh, yes, another point was that station changes, of course, would again be at Government expense as it now is provided for in our contract.

Another point that we never have been happy with under the operating contracts was that while we were tied into the service for X years—whatever the contract would call for—it was always provided that at the Government's discretion service could be stopped momentarily and that did happen to us in 1918, and we were down for 4 solid years. We have felt that a contract of that sort should be bilateral and not unilateral.

The CHAIRMAN. Why did you have to stop?

Mr. DIETZ. By direction of Mr. Burleson, and for what reason, I don't know. Then the systems in New York and Boston were reinstated in 1922. Philadelphia, St. Louis, and Chicago never were reinstated.

The CHAIRMAN. You must know why Mr. Burleson had the system stopped.

Mr. DIETZ. No, I do not know.

The CHAIRMAN. You mean to tell this committee that an order just stopping this system was issued.

Mr. DIETZ. That has been my understanding.

Mr. WEEKS. I think the contract was running out. My recollection is that the contract was running out sometime in 1917 and under that contract it had the usual 6 months and 6 months possible for the Post Office Department to continue operations but then there were some hearings that took place at that time comparing this service with truck service and then we got the word that at the conclusion of the extended period there would be no renewal.

The CHAIRMAN. Could you tell us about that, Mr. Carle?

Mr. CARLE. I am not, as I said, connected with that division and I don't know that back history, but I would be glad to furnish it to the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. We would like to have that for the record.

Mr. CARLE. We will supply that for you, Mr. Chairman.

(Off-the-record conversation.)

The CHAIRMAN. Have you a chart there showing the cost each year?

Mr. CARLE. Yes, sir [handing same to chairman].

The CHAIRMAN. You haven't got it for 1941, 1942——

Mr. CARLE. That chart carries us up until sometime in 1937.

The CHAIRMAN. Have you the cost for 1939, 1940, 1941, and so on?

Mr. CARLE. There was a contract from January 1, 1938, until February 28, 1938, at $19,000 a mile for 27 miles of tubes at that time. Beginning March 2, 1938, a contract was made running until June 30, 1938, at $8,800 a mile—27 miles of tubes. Then between July 1, 1938, and June 30, 1940, the contract was at the rate of $9,649 a mile, which included $267 a mile for a change in one of the stations. Then from July 1, 1940, until June 30, 1941, then extended to June 30, 1942, the contract rate was the same as at present, $9,382 a mile.

I will get an up-to-date chart for you, Mr. Chairman, and submit it for the record.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you, Mr. Carle, we would really like to have that.

Mr. Dietz, have you a chart showing the amount of money you made or lost each year up to the present time?

Mr. DIETZ. Oh, yes, Mr. Weeks can give us that information.

Mr. WEEKS. During the period from 1938 until 1940—the contract period—our expenses, actual expenses, excluding interest and depreciation charges were approximately $111,300. The contract rate of $9,382 a mile would give us a rental of $253,000, which meant a net return of $141,729.94.

The CHAIRMAN. How big an investment was this?

Mr. DIETZ. The original cost of the system in New York was about $4 million—just under $4 million.

Mr. WEEKS. In the year 1940—that is, before depreciation—in the calendar year 1940 our actual costs were $117,191.26.

The CHAIRMAN. Are you taking care of depreciation each year?

Mr. DIETZ. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. How much depreciation would it amount to?

Mr. WEEKS. We are permitted to depreciate—under agreement with the Board of Tax Appeals—the tube lines were permitted a rate of 2 percent per annum.

The CHAIRMAN. What did they allow depreciation on?

Mr. WEEKS. Underground street construction 2 percent.

Of the original cost in New York, $1,191,806.74 is nondepreciable cost upon which they have never permitted any depreciation.

Senator ECTON. That was left out in this chart that shows your annual cost and your rate per mile up to 1938. That isn't included in these figures, is it? [Indicating.]

Mr. WEEKS. No; these figures are excluding all depreciation charges.

Senator ECTON. Then I wondered if you had the annual cost, the rates per mile since 1938 up to 1948.

Mr. WEEKS. I have those figures here.

Senator ECTON (indicating). This chart shows the annual cost average around 516 or 517 thousand dollars annually, and your rate per mile something over $19,000. Well, the postal system, as I understand it, took over the personnel in 1938. Therefore the last 10 years your operating cost would necessarily be considerably less than the previous years.

Mr. WEEKS. That's correct.

Senator ECTON. And your rate per mile would be less, and I wondered if you had a chart that would show the difference during the last 10 years over the previous years?

Mr. DIETZ. If we haven't those charts, we will prepare them and get them to you.

Senator ECTON. Mr. Chairman, I think we should have them.

The CHAIRMAN. Will you get what Senator Ecton has asked for, Mr. Dietz?

Mr. DIETZ. Yes, we will.

Senator ECTON. I think we should have the tabulation for the record.

Mr. DIETZ. We will get it for you, Senator ECTON.

The CHAIRMAN. Who really owns this thing?

Mr. DIETZ. The parent company is the Lamson Corp. of Delaware, which owns the New York Mail & Newspaper Transportation Co.——

The CHAIRMAN. Who are the stockholders in the Lamson Corp.?

Mr. DIETZ. There are 2,400 of them, no one holding more than 10 percent except one holder. The next larger interest is somewhere between 7 and 8 percent and all the rest is scattered all over the Eastern States.

The CHAIRMAN. Is that stock on the curb?

Mr. DIETZ. Yes, sir; and on the Boston Exchange.

The CHAIRMAN. What are the quotations on the——

Mr. DIETZ. On the common around $8 and on the preferred around 41 or 42—that is a $50 stock.

The CHAIRMAN. And now you are in arrears in payment of interest?

Mr. DIETZ. No, sir; we have no loans—no arrearages on the preferred.

The CHAIRMAN. I would like to see your last 3 or 4 reports.

Mr. DIETZ. I would be very happy to furnish them.

The CHAIRMAN. I suppose the reports are audited by auditors each year.

Mr. DIETZ. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. What dividends have you paid on the common?

Mr. DIETZ. The common earned $2.06 and we paid a $1 dividend.

The CHAIRMAN. What surplus have you?

Mr. DIETZ. About one million, seven or eight——

The CHAIRMAN. Have you been paying $1 right along each year?

Mr. DIETZ. No, sir; 75 cents the year before, but that did not come out of the tube-system service. That came out of the Lamson operations which run about seven and a half million.

The CHAIRMAN. I am talking about the tube system.

Mr. DIETZ. I would say that the tube system as a service is a losing proposition.

The CHAIRMAN. It is?

Mr. DIETZ. Yes, sir. It is not an attractive part of our business.

The CHAIRMAN. How many States does the Lamson Co. operate in?

Mr. DIETZ. All of them.

(Off-the-record conversation.)

The CHAIRMAN. Do I understand you to say that this company has lost money right along?

Mr. DIETZ. When all the charges are against us there is no doubt about it.

The CHAIRMAN. Then why do you keep on doing business?

Mr. DIETZ. I have often wondered about that myself.

Mr. WEEKS. Here are the figures for 1932 to 1936 [indicating].

The CHAIRMAN. Does it give you the losses?

Mr. WEEKS. Yes; after interest and depreciation costs.

The CHAIRMAN. Even though the Government took over the personnel and paid the labor you haven't made any money?

Mr. WEEKS. No, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. You certainly made interest on your money; didn't you?

Mr. WEEKS. Not a proper amount; not a proper rate of interest.

The CHAIRMAN. But you certainly made some money.

Mr. WEEKS. There has been a cash benefit.

Mr. DIETZ. The operations of this company entirely by itself and free from Lamson, with its interest charges on borrowed money, notes and unpaid bonds would always show red.

The CHAIRMAN. If you had no borrowed money—if you actually had it paid off in 1938—you must have made money.

Mr. DIETZ. But it wasn't all paid off.

(Off the record conversation.)

The CHAIRMAN. Assuming you were clear of debt, how much have you made, would you say?

Mr. WEEKS. After interest and depreciation charges there was a net loss of $6,569.23—that is, yielding 3-percent interest on the indebtedness, so that you might say that if the interest rate was slightly under 3 it would be an even break—so we are getting less than 3 percent.

Senator ECTON. That is on the indebtedness and not the investment.

Mr. WEEKS. The indebtedness; yes.

The CHAIRMAN. Could you state how much you would have to get from the Government in order to get 6 percent——

Senator ECTON. I wouldn't say that the entire committee would want to guarantee that. They wouldn't think 6 percent is excessive but this is a business deal and I think the committee would realize that these gentlemen have a system to operate here and that if a new contract is entered into it might be worked out to the benefit of both sides, without unnecessary and undue expenses. I don't want to be bound——

The CHAIRMAN. We are not bound by it.

Senator ECTON. I don't want to be on the record as saying that I think 6-percent interest on this investment is excessive because it certainly is not.

Mr. WEEKS. Postmaster Farley, back in 1935, made a recommendation—and I think there was a bill introduced in Congress at that time, the McCormick bill—that was to consider the purchase of the tube lines at that time.

The CHAIRMAN. Consider the purchase——

Mr. WEEKS. Yes; and the company at that time was proposing to the Government that they buy it if they wanted it. We have always considered right from the start that that was the logical thing. I think it was originally put in with the thought of Government purchase. We never contemplated originally operating these tubes. It was an experimental development back in 1900 and the original thought was, and it was the recommendation at that time, that if it proved successful that the Government would purchase them.

The CHAIRMAN. How does the cost of pneumatic-tube service compare to delivery with trucks?

Mr. CARLE. The cost at the present rate of rental, according to the latest figures we have, is $57,000 a year less than comparable truck service would cost.

The CHAIRMAN. Pneumatic-tube service is $57,000 a year less?

Mr. CARLE. At the present rate of rental; yes, sir.

Senator ECTON. Let me ask you this, Mr. Dietz: In explaining the motor down there to me this morning you indicated that it was almost—I don't know if you said it was absolutely impossible—to change the motor in there to use a. c. current instead of d. c. current.

Mr. DIETZ. In the same relative position that the motor is in today.

Senator ECTON. Yes; I got it from you that it was impractical and almost an impossibility.

Mr. DIETZ. That's correct, and we limit the flexibility by so doing. D. c. current has a double range of speeds. A. c. current does

not. If a. c. current went in we would have to have special relays that would control the relative speed from point to point. We wouldn't have the flexibility that we have today. [To Mr. Devaney:] How many of those relays have we in Boston?

Mr. DEVANEY. I think it is three.

Mr. DIETZ. It is not a practical thing.

Mr. DEVANEY. No; it isn't.

Senator ECTON. How would the cost of the two systems compare if it were practical? Do you have an idea?

Mr. DIETZ. I should think it would be more expensive——

Senator ECTON. To change from a. c. than it would be to put in a motor-generator set and transfer the a. c. from the d. c. current and use your present equipment.

Mr. DIETZ. That's right.

The CHAIRMAN. Senator Ecton, you and I pretty much agree that they should have fair compensation for the work that they are performing.

Senator ECTON. Senator, I think that you and I and the rest of the members of the committee want to at least try to do what is fair and reasonable.

Mr. DIETZ. We appreciate that sentiment very much, indeed.

Of course, you understand that it is our responsibility to provide a high standard of maintenance and operation, with ample inspections, and to be ready at a moment's notice for any emergency and operate at any time according to the requirements of the Post Office Department.

We do throw in at the end of each year, by arrangement with the Post Office Department, an additional service to take care of Christmas mail, for which we get no compensation.

Mr. DEVANEY. That's right; the 2 Saturdays preceding Christmas we operate 12 hours additional and 12 hours the Sunday preceding Christmas—36 hours' extra time each year.

Mr. SHEEHAN. That's correct. That has been the standard practice under these contracts.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you get paid from the New York Mail & Newspaper Transportation Co.?

Mr. DIETZ. My salary comes right from Lamson.

Mr. WEEKS. We make a service charge against that corporation because we run all their books.

The CHAIRMAN. What is the total of that amount?

Mr. WEEKS. $5,900 a year.

The CHAIRMAN. You mean to say that the total amount is $5,900 that this New York Mail & Transportation Co. pays to the Lamson Co.?

Mr. DIETZ. Yes; just $5,900 for the officers. They have some employees of their own. I believe they have 18 employees.

Lamson charges the New York Mail Co. for the responsibility that I have toward New York Mail as president of both companies and it gets its compensation for that service of $5,900 for whatever Mr. Smith, Mr. Weeks, and I do for New York Mail.

Mr. WEEKS. And that includes all the audits, accounting services, payment of all bills and so on. The operating end of the business Mr. Devaney and all the servicemen and maintenance crew are——

The CHAIRMAN. How much does that amount to?

Mr. WEEKS. We have it broken down by operating expenses.

Mr. SMITH. We don't have the salaries listed.

The CHAIRMAN. Could you get us those figures?

Mr. WEEKS. Yes, sir.

Mr. DIETZ. And the charge that we make for the services that we render?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes.

Mr. DIETZ. We will furnish those figures to you.

The CHAIRMAN. Did I understand you to say, Mr. Carle, that the highest-priced man in the Postal Department in connection with this matter is getting $3,600 a year?

Mr. CARLE. One foreman at $3,600; yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. That is out of a total of 144 men?

Mr. SHEEHAN. That's right.

The CHAIRMAN. How can you get any first-class help for $300 a month, I would like to know.

Mr. CARLE. I don't know, sir. I believe those are statutory rates, are they not, Mr. Sheehan?

Mr. SHEEHAN. That's right, Public Laws 134 and 386.

The CHAIRMAN. How can you get men to work that cheap?

Mr. SHEEHAN. They are servicemen. Of course, they can go elsewhere but they feel that they have certain privileges like vacations, sick leave, security retirement——

Mr. CARLE. The real truth of it is that most of us can't do very much else.

Senator ECTON. It is definite employment and definite pay and you consider that that has a value.

Mr. CARLE. Yes.

Senator ECTON. And pensions and vacation benefits, sick-leave benefits, and all that sort of thing.

Mr. CARLE. That's right.

The CHAIRMAN. When the President in 1932 put in his Economy Act they did decrease them; did they not?

Mr. SHEEHAN. Yes; we were furloughed for a long time until the present administration came in, when Mr. Farley became Postmaster General.

The CHAIRMAN. Of course, times were better than when he came in.

Mr. SHEEHAN. That's right.

Mr. CARLE. After a person has been in the service 30–35 years—I have something around 31 years—I feel that the retirement privilege is worth the little difference I might be able to get if I should go out and work commercially. That's the way I feel about it personally.

Mr. SHEEHAN. I am in 43 years.

The CHAIRMAN. With this high cost of living, you can hardly break even.

Mr. CARLE. It makes it tough scratching sometimes, Senator.

Mr. WEEKS. Mr. Chairman, we would be glad to have any investigators come in and examine thoroughly all of our figures, costs, and everything else, but we think that as far as original costs—investment in the business and in the tube lines and so forth are concerned—it is all a part of Government records. You've got the Bankhead reports where there is a complete survey of all the original costs, not only by the Post Office Department but by the ICC and the Treasury Department and the figures have been gone over.

The CHAIRMAN. Have you submitted an estimate or a bid, Mr. Dietz?

Mr. DIETZ. We have had some very informal discussions with Mr. Myers and we have reduced some of it to writing. We have three alternates in the absence of any advertisement by the Government so there was nothing official by this. Mr. Myers said he can't even consider it because there isn't any appropriation, and all he has today is the same rate that we have had for the last 5 years, and with all these other provisions that have always been irksome to us, that is all the authority he has at the present time, and he said that in his opinion—and I think we agree—it is going to require legislation unless the Post Office Department can reshuffle its own expenditures so that a large portion of the overall appropriation may flow to this service. If that is not possible, then legislation may possibly be required. The last figure we made was close to $11,000 per year per mile—that is an increase from our present $9,382. I am not so sure that since September—when this letter was written—that it isn't going to be necessary to revise these figures somewhat because we have suffered some increases in cost since September.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to read part of this contract, if I may——

The CHAIRMAN. Go right ahead, Mr. Dietz.

Mr. DIETZ. Thank you, sir. [Reading:]

"It is mutually understood and agreed that the Postmaster General will—

"First. Allot, in the premises under the control of the Department, space for the installation of the tubes, power plants, receiving and dispatching apparatus and other appliances necessary in connection with the use of the tube system.

"Second. Provide the man power (operators) necessary to operate the tube system, together with the necessary telephone switchboard and the supervisors.

"Third. Furnish electric power necessary for the operation of the tube system.

"Fourth. Accord access to the post offices for the employees of the contractor for the purpose of maintenance, repair, and inspection of the tube system and equipment."

Then:

"It is further stipulated and agreed that the Postmaster General may annul, cancel, and terminate this contract for—

"(a) Repeated failure of the tube system to operate due to conditions within the control of the contractor.

"(b) Repeated failure on the part of the contractor to make necessary repairs to the tube system promptly.

"(c) For failure to have the tube system in a condition for efficient operation on July 1, 1942, or within a reasonable time thereafter, the contractor having failed to exercise due diligence in constructing the system.

"(d) Violation of the postal laws and the several acts of Congress relating to post offices and post roads and such regulations as are incorporated in the postal laws and regulations, edition of 1940.

"(e) Refusal of contractor to discharge any person employed by the contractor in connection with the maintenance and repair of the tube system, when requested to do so by the Postmaster General.

"(f) For failure of the Congress to appropriate funds for the operation of the system.

"(g) Whenever the contractor shall become a Member of or Delegate to Congress.

"(h) Whenever, in the opinion of the Postmaster General, the public interest requires it."

The CHAIRMAN. What does that last paragraph mean?

Mr. DIETZ. I don't know what it means.

We don't like to enter into a long-term contract with that sort of thing hanging over our heads. Furthermore, the contract provides 5 years—but if at any time Congress fails to appropriate the money the contract is null and void. All the Postmaster General needs to do under the provisions of this contract is to fail to ask for the appropriation and at the end of the fiscal year we are through—our whole organization is thrown right out in the street. So, I see no reason why there shouldn't be a biparty contract entered into which would be agreeable to both parties. I think this whole thing requires a reshuffling to be consummate with the times.

Senator ECTON. Has that general provision always been in there?

Mr. DIETZ. Yes, sir.

Senator ECTON. I wondered whether or not it was in all Government contracts.

Mr. DIETZ. I don't know.

Mr. CARLE. I haven't had a chance to find out whether there is any basic law that requires that provision in the contract and I am unable to say at the present time. That would be a question for legislation if it is a law.

Mr. WEEKS. There is another provision in the contract which we are not in favor of and that is that in the event service ceases at the termination of the contract if the Post Office Department asks us to do so, we will have to tear out all terminal equipment out of the post offices and restore the post offices to the condition they were in prior to the installation of the equipment at our expense.

When the service went out in 1918 all of this terminal equipment machinery, terminals, receiving and dispatching apparatus, everything was, I believe, torn out of the post offices and when it went back in 1922 or 1923 all of that had to be put back in again.

Senator ECTON. You mean to say that you tore all that out and reinstalled it?

Mr. WEEKS. That's right. There was no provision in the contract to reimburse us for that and my recollection is that it cost the company around $350,000 to do that work. Neither Mr. Dietz nor I were with the company then.

We don't say that that isn't a proper provision in the contract, but we feel that if that provision is in there then the rental that is now paid should contemplate paying us something to build up some means of doing it. If we were faced with that situation tomorrow I wouldn't say that it would break this company but the company is insolvent now and it has been for several years. The only way we can get a bond now on our present contract is for the parent company to guarantee the performance——

The CHAIRMAN. Did you ever pay in all this money, this $4 million, was that ever paid in or was it financed from the very beginning?

Mr. WEEKS. I can say this, Senator: There was quite an expansion of the mileage here in New York in 1912 and also some extensions in Boston and other cities and the mail tube companies at that time were unable to finance that. They couldn't borrow any money. They had defaulted. The bonds hadn't paid any interest. The only way that they could get the money to do that was for the money to come out of the parent company, Lamson, so that at that time Lamson, or the parent company, which was then American Pneumatic Service Co., sold one and a half million first preferred stock and the whole purpose of that financing at that time was to raise the funds to put in the extension of lines so that the present preferred stock that the parent company now pays dividends on is really money which they raised at that time to expand the lines and then they loaned it to the operating company on notes. The parent company has a 6-percent cumulative stock and it pays its stockholders 6 percent for that money but on the intercompany notes they collect 3 percent on those notes.

On all of these items we would welcome any Government group of any kind to investigate this tube history and all our books and accounts. All we ask is what is considered to be a fair return, but we feel that there are some inequities in the present contract.

(Off-the-record conversation.)

The CHAIRMAN. Senator Ecton, do you have any questions?

Senator ECTON. No, Mr. Chairman; I don't believe I do.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Riley, do you have any questions you would like to ask?

Mr. RILEY. I have 1 or 2, Mr. Chairman. [To Mr. Dietz.] You do a job for the railroads, I believe, where the tube is somewhat smaller than this, isn't that right, Mr. Dietz?

Mr. DIETZ. Yes; 5½ inches.

Mr. RILEY. What kind of rate do you have on that job?

Mr. DIETZ. It is an outright sale.

Mr. RILEY. On these capital changes, including a changeover to converters or transformers—or even new motors—is that in your bid anywhere?

Mr. DIETZ. I haven't read the specifications. I don't believe it is in the advertisement. It doesn't make any reference to it there.

Mr. RILEY. That would seem to call for a separate appropriation then.

Mr. DIETZ. Undoubtedly.

Mr. RILEY. Do you have a cost figure in mind?

Mr. DIETZ. I think it would run somewhere from two hundred to two hundred and twenty-five thousand dollars.

Mr. RILEY. In other words, you are right up against this changeover and even if you didn't get relief here, somebody would have to still pay for the conversion, isn't that right, Mr. Dietz?

Mr. DIETZ. That's right.

Mr. RILEY. So that that would be a companion piece in the legislation no matter what is done in this case?

Mr. DIETZ. That's right.

Mr. RILEY. What is, in your opinion, a fair return on your layout here?

Mr. DIETZ. Eleven thousand dollars per year per mile, and I told Mr. Myers a while ago that some items of increase have come in since September which might require an adjustment of perhaps a few hundred dollars.

(Off-the-record conversation.)

Mr. RILEY. I wonder how the gentlemen would feel about the cost-plus plan?

Mr. DIETZ. I think we would be——

Mr. WEEKS. The only way to approach this would be for the Government and the company to sit down and figure out what is a proper return and from that point the annual rental should be adjusted accordingly. That, I think, would be the proper way to approach this problem.

Mr. RILEY. Where do you get your standby crews to clear up your obstructions in the lines?

Mr. DIETZ. I think Mr. Devaney can answer that question, Mr. Riley.

Mr. DEVANEY. We don't have any standby crews. Repairs are made by our maintenance crew. If we should have repairs in the street of any considerable size, it becomes necessary to hire extra men in order to augment our maintenance force.

Mr. DIETZ. Mr. Chairman, may I ask you for your guidance on this thing? The Post Office Department has put out a bid on which returns must be made before May 6. If we fail to have them, the Post Office Department, under statutes, must again advertise for a period of 6 weeks. If we fail to come to some preliminary understanding, it would be completely devastating in view of this ending of the contract, beyond which the Post Office Department has no money to pay for the tube service. Secondly, we have this terrifically difficult question of power. Now, perhaps, the Treasury Department——

The CHAIRMAN. I think those matters should be taken up with the Post Office Department——

Mr. CARLE. Those matters are certainly ones that I personally would want to talk to Mr. Myers and Mr. Buckley about.

Mr. DIETZ. Well, then, Mr. Chairman, as you suggested, all of these points that we have discussed today will be matters for us to adjust with the Post Office Department, I take it?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes, indeed; and then the Post Office Department can come before our committee for any remedial legislation.

Mr. DIETZ. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you, Mr. Dietz.

---

APPENDIX

OFFICE OF THE POSTMASTER,
*New York, N. Y.*

NEW YORK, N. Y., UNDERGROUND POST OFFICE

For almost 50 years the New York Post Office has operated an underground service to speed the delivery of 5 million pieces of mail daily. This pneumatic tube service is the only one of its kind in the United States. Boston has a very short pneumatic tube system between the North and South stations, and there was formerly a short tube in Chicago. However, they do not compare with the New York pneumatic tube system.

The tubes are mammoth replicas of those in department stores and form a network that links virtually all of Manhattan's post office stations. They tunnel 4 to 6 feet below the street surface, going above ground to cross the Brooklyn Bridge.

There are approximately 27 miles of double-track tube lines. Mail is placed in huge projectile-like carriers—steel cylinders whose outside dimensions are 24 inches long and 8 inches in diameter. Inside they measure about 22 inches long and 7 inches in diameter. Weighing approximately 21 pounds, each cylinder has a capacity of 9 pounds and holds some 400 to 500 letters. It is possible to dispatch them at 12-second intervals. These carriers are slightly smaller than the tubes so that they may be shot forward by compressed air from colossal pumps.

The nerve center of the system is at the general post office in Manhattan. Approximately 27 miles of double-track tubes criss-cross Manhattan and link 22 substations together, and with the general post office at Brooklyn, N. Y., there are 23 points connected with the tube service.

From the Battery they shoot over to the main post office in Brooklyn and in Manhattan some of the lines are on the subway roof, others are below it. They go down 12 feet under the Chrysler Building, and about 18 feet under Grand Central. The average speed of the tubes is about 30 miles an hour.

The system is a private invention and is not owned by the Government, but is leased annually. The company keeps it in working order, but the post office supplies the manpower to operate it. The tubes operate from 5 a. m. to 10 p. m. every day, except Saturday, when they close down at 10 a. m. They are not in operation on Sundays or legal holidays. On a full day the pneumatic-tube lines carry approximately 95,000 tube carriers. An outside label shows the destination of each carrier and it is not opened until it reaches the proper destination.

A number of test carriers are sent through the tube lines before regular operation starts. Pressure in the lines is from 3 to 8 pounds per inch.

Today when mail matter must move quickly to meet all kinds of timetable deadlines—plane, railroad, and steamer—to ensure its early delivery, the underground pneumatic-tube system is invaluable. Without it the post office would have to operate a larger fleet of trucks to transport the mail.

Pneumatic-tube service is used for the transportation of ordinary letter mail, air mail, special-delivery mail, registered mail, daily newspapers in limited quantities, and miscellaneous letter-size pieces.

Pneumatic-tube service is dependable inasmuch as it is not affected generally by street surface traffic or by weather conditions.

The present pneumatic-tube system has a distinct value as a medium of transportation for first-class mail because of the effectiveness of the system, connecting as it does 23 points including the general post office in Brooklyn, thus establishing a circular system converging at Church Street Station, provision being made for a crosstown service between east and west side lines, from the general post office to Grand Central Station, and from Manhattanville to Triborough Stations.

---

SEPTEMBER 5, 1947.

Re route No. 507011–A, New York City.

FOURTH ASSISTANT POSTMASTER GENERAL,
*United States Post Office,*
*Washington, D. C.*

DEAR SIR: In accordance with your verbal request for proposals covering pneumatic-mail-tube service over route No. 507011–A

at New York, N. Y., and between the general post office at New York and the general post office at Brooklyn, N. Y., subsequent to December 31, 1947, we desire to submit herewith the following:

PROPOSAL I

For the 6 months' period January 1 to June 30, 1948, inclusive, we suggest that the service be continued under the mutual-agreement provision at the end of paragraph 9, page 6, contained in the existing contract dated June 16, 1942, and hereby notify you of our consent to such extension.

PROPOSAL II

For service subsequent to June 30, 1948, we propose any 1 of the following 3 alternates:

*Alternate A*

The undersigned will lease to the Post Office Department its system of pneumatic tubes consisting of 26.969 miles of double 8-inch tubes, together with powerplants, receiving and dispatching apparatus, carriers (mail containers) and machinery and equipment necessary for the operation thereof for the transmission of the mails to provide the same service as is now provided under the existing contract, for a period of one (1) year beginning July 1, 1948, at a monthly rental equivalent to an annual rate of $11,000 per year per mile of double tube. The general terms and conditions of the contract to be generally the same as those in the present contract dated June 16, 1942, except more specifically—

(a) There is to be no option to extend the period of the contract beyond June 30, 1949, and

(b) If the service is discontinued by the Post Office Department at the expiration of the contract there shall be no obligation upon the lessor to remove its equipment from the post offices where now located and restore the premises to their former condition, unless it is provided that the lessor shall be fully reimbursed by the Government for the cost of such removal and restoration.

In the event of any interruption in service either during conversion of the equipment from direct to alternating current or due to failure on the part of the Government to provide direct or alternating current, the lessor is to suffer no loss in rental as a result of such interruption in service.

(c) The lessor is to be either completely relieved of or fully reimbursed by the Government for the cost of any changes in the location of tube lines or station equipment which may be required to be made during the life of the contract.

*Alternate B*

Same as Alternate A except that the term of the contract is to be for a period of ten (10) years, equally binding upon the Government as on the lessor, beginning July 1, 1948, and the annual rental rates to be as follows:

(a) For the first year a monthly rental equivalent to an annual rate of $11,000 per year per mile of double tube.

NOTE.—This rate is based upon estimated operating and maintenance costs aggregating $152,659, plus $144,000 to cover depreciation, interest, and return on investment. While this $144,000 figure was not considered adequate it was, however, a figure agreed upon by the Post Office Department and this corporation in 1938 when the lease contract of June 29, 1938, was negotiated.

(b) For the second and each succeeding year of the contract the rental shall be paid monthly but the total annual rate will be adjusted upward or downward as the total actual operating and maintenance costs of an immediately preceding year vary from $152,659.

*Alternate C*

If an inspection of the property, a study of the service, and an analysis of possible savings by Government officials indicate that it would be in the best interests of the Government to acquire title to the pneumatic-tube system as at July 1, 1948, or at any time thereafter, New York Mail & Newspaper Transportation Co. will be prepared to enter into negotiations toward that end.

The foregoing is submitted in the expectation that it will meet your present requirements which we understand are largely for budgetary purposes. We have not attempted to outline in full all the details which we expect would have to become part of any formal contract, all of which we believe could be negotiated without difficulty through further discussions with your office.

Very truly yours,

NEW YORK MAIL & NEWSPAPER TRANSPORTATION CO.,
CARL F. DIETZ, *President.*

---

APRIL 16, 1947.

Hon. E. B. JACKSON,
*Chief Clerk and Director of Personnel, Washington, D. C.*

MY DEAR SIR: As directed by you at the meeting held at this office of the committee appointed for the purpose of making an investigation as to the need for the continuation of the pneumatic-tube service for a term of years beginning July 1, 1947, under a new contract, a report is submitted herewith together with the data accumulated and compiled for use in connection with the study being made.

The present contract for pneumatic-tube service on route 57011–A at New York, N. Y., expires June 30, 1947. The contractor is the New York Mail & Newspaper Transportation Co. of 101 Park Avenue, New York 17, N. Y. At the present time the cost of the mileage is $9,382 per mile of double 6-inch tubes per annum, on a total mileage of 26.9690 miles. The total cost under the present contract is $253,023.158 per annum.

The service is performed on week days, Monday to Friday, inclusive, from 5 a. m. to 10 p. m. (17 hours), and on Saturdays from 5 a. m. to 10 a. m. (5 hours). No service is performed on legal holidays; January 1 (New Year's Day), February 22 (Washington's Birthday), May 30 (Memorial Day), July 4 (Independence Day), first Monday in September (Labor Day), November 11 (Armistice Day), Thanksgiving Day in the latter part of November, and December 25 (Christmas Day). During the present contract the actual operation of the pneumatic-tube service has been performed by post office employees, the operation of the pneumatic tubes having been taken over by the Post Office Department under date of July 1, 1938.

Conforming with the carrier delivery service performed on local legal holidays, namely, February 12 (Lincoln's Birthday), October 12 (Columbus Day), and the Tuesday following the first Monday in November (election day), the pneumatic tubes are operated part of the day, from 5 a. m. to 10 a. m. (5 hours).

The points connected with pneumatic-tube service include the general post office and 21 stations located in the Borough of Manhattan, and the general post office at Brooklyn, N. Y. These 23 points together with the distance between them are as follows:

| *Lines* | *Length (miles)* |
|---|---|
| Church Street Station to Canal Street Station | 0.7465 |
| Canal Street Station to Station A | .4908 |
| Station A to Station O | 1.6002 |
| Station O to General Post Office | 1.3196 |
| General Post Office to Times Square Station | .8774 |
| General Post Office to Grand Central Station | 1.5545 |
| Times Square Station to Radio City Station | 1.1794 |
| Radio City Station to Ansonia Station | 1.3974 |
| Ansonia Station to Planetarium Station | .8950 |
| Planetarium Station to Station H | 1.2570 |
| Station H to Morningside Station | 1.1238 |
| Morningside Station to Station J | .7143 |
| Station J to Station L | 1.1793 |
| Grand Central Station to Lenox Hill Station | 1.5031 |
| Lenox Hill Station to Gracie Station | 1.0105 |
| Gracie Station to Hell Gate Station | 1.1048 |
| Hell Gate Station to Station L | 1.2435 |
| Church Street Station to Cooper Station | 2.1714 |
| Cooper Station to Madison Square Station | .8450 |
| Madison Square Station to Murray Hill Station to Grand Central Station | 1.6448 |
| Church Street Station to Wall Street Station to Bowling Green Station | 1.1500 |
| Church Street Station to General Post Office, Brooklyn, N. Y. | 1.9607 |
| Total | 26.9690 |

All of the points connected are served with double tube lines except stations enumerated hereunder, which are supplied by single lines. The length of the single lines is divided by two to determine the basis for payment of double lines.

| *Lines (single)* | *Length (miles)* |
|---|---|
| Madison Square Station to Grand Central Station | 1.3037 |
| Grand Central Station to Murray Hill Station | 1.0531 |
| Murray Hill Station to Madison Square Station | .9328 |
| Church Street Station to Wall Street Station | .7173 |
| Wall Street Station to Bowling Green Station | .5103 |
| Bowling Green Station to Church Street Station | 1.0724 |

The chart showing the points connected and the length of lines between each point is submitted as exhibit I.

The points previously named are directly connected with the tube service. All other postal units are indirectly connected through the utilization of certain stations as transfer points for the exchange of mail between points connected with the tube service and stations served by motor vehicle service only. These points are listed below:

| *Exchange point* | *To and from—* |
|---|---|
| Church Street Station. | Knickerbocker Station. |
| Cooper Station | Tompkins Square Station. |
| Station J | College Station, Hamilton Grange Station, Audubon Station, Washington Bridge Station, Inwood Station, Kingsbridge Station, High Bridge Station, Morris Heights Station, Tremont Station, Fordham Station, Williamsbridge Station, City Island Station, and Pelham Station. |
| Station L | Station X, Hub Station, Morrisania Station, Boulevard Station, Bronx Central Station, West Farm Station, Parkchester Station, Westchester Station, and Wakefield Station. |
| Station O | Village Station. |

The pneumatic-tube service is operated by air pressure developed and maintained through 11 power stations which are located at the general post office, New York, N. Y., and the general post office at Brooklyn, N. Y.; also Church Street Station, Cooper Station, Grand Central Station, Gracie Station, Station L, Station J, Planetarium Station, Times Square Station, and Station O. A uniform speed of 30 miles per hour between the postal points connected is required under the terms of the contract.

The carriers used in the pneumatic-tube service for the transportation of mail are steel cylinder containers, 8 inches in diameter and 24 inches long, outside measurements, and 6⅞ inches in diameter and 22 inches long, inside measurements, and weigh approximately 21 pounds each. Each carrier has an ordinary capacity of about 9 pounds, or 400 letters, and carriers may be dispatched at 12-second intervals. The pneumatic-tube service is used for the transportation of ordinary letter mail, special-delivery matter, air mail, registered mail, daily papers in limited quantities, and miscellaneous letter sized pieces of other mail when included with the letter mails. The mail transported is for outbound destinations, in-bound from other post offices, interchanged between the postal units of the New York, N. Y., post office, and between the Brooklyn, N. Y., post office, and the New York, N. Y., post office.

The space occupied by the pneumatic-tube machinery at each of the points included is shown hereunder:

| Station | Space occupied by pneumatic tubes and containers (square feet) | | | Storage space for containers (square feet) | Operating machinery (square feet) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | First floor | Second floor | Third floor | Pipe gallery floor | Basement |
| Brooklyn general post office [1] | 234 | | | | 554 |
| New York general post office [1] | 582 | | | | 1,100 |
| Station A | 485 | | | | |
| Station H H | Room | 450 | | | |
| Station J | 462 | | | | 2,232 |
| Station L | 405 | | | | 1,218 |
| Station O [1] | | 481 | | | 1,881 |
| Ansonia Station | 510 | | | | |
| Bowling Green Station [1] | 216 | | | | |
| Canal Street Station [1] | Room | 549 | | | |
| Church Street Station [1] | | | 1,496 | | (sub) 6,118 |
| Cooper Station [1] | | 357 | | | 1,468 |
| Gracie Station | 336 | | | | 1,320 |
| Grand Central Station [1] | | 768 | | [2] 1,040 | |
| Hell Gate Station | 390 | | | | |
| Lenox Hill Station [1] | Room | 468 | | | |
| Madison Square Station [1] | | 893 | | | |
| Morningside Station | 360 | | | | |
| Murray Hill Station | 288 | | | | |
| Planetarium Station [1] | Room | 425 | | | 2,345 |
| Radio City Station | 510 | | | | |
| Times Square Station | 570 | | | | 1,816 |
| Wall Street Station | 236 | | | | |

[1] Government-owned buildings.
[2] First.

There is shown hereunder the locations of the Brooklyn, N. Y., post office and the New York, N. Y., post office and stations connected with the pneumatic-tube service. The date of expiration of the lease for rented buildings is also shown.

| Station | Location | Date lease expires |
|---|---|---|
| Brooklyn general post office | Washington and Johnson Sts. | Government-owned. |
| New York general post office. | 8th Ave. and 33d St | Do. |
| Station A | 103–105 Prince St | July 15, 1956. |
| Station H | 215–221 West 104th St | Government-owned. |
| Station J | 309–311 West 125th St | Nov. 30, 1951. |
| Station L | Lexington Ave. and 126th St. | Dec. 31, 1954. |
| Station O | 217–229 West 18th St | Government-owned. |
| Ansonia Station | 203–209 West 69th St | Sept. 30, 1954. |
| Bowling Green Station | Custom House | Government-owned. |
| Canal Street Station | 350 Canal St | Do. |
| Church Street Station | 90 Church St | Do. |
| Cooper Station | 93–99 4th Ave | Government-owned. |
| Gracie Station | 211–215 East 87th St | July 24, 1956. |
| Grand Central Station | 450 Lexington Ave | Government-owned. |
| Hell Gate Station | 226–230 East 106th St | Oct. 14, 1954. |
| Lenox Hill Station | 217–223 East 70th St | Government-owned. |
| Madison Square Station | 149–153 East 23d St | Do. |
| Morningside Station | 232–234 West 116th St | Mar. 31, 1947. |
| Murray Hill Station | 221–229 East 34th St | Nov. 2, 1947. |
| Planetarium Station | 127–135 West 83d St | Government-owned. |
| Radio City Station | 322–332 West 52d St | Dec. 11, 1956. |
| Times Square Station | 221–241 West 38th St | Sept. 30, 1955. |
| Wall Street Station | 165 Pearl St | May 19, 1955. |

The present pneumatic tube system has a distinct value as a medium of transportation for first-class mail because of the effectiveness of the system, connecting as it does 23 points, including the General Post Office at Brooklyn, N. Y., thus establishing a circular system converging at Church Street Station, provision being made for cross-town service between the east and west side lines from the General Post Office, New York, N. Y., to Grand Central Station, and from Station J to Station L.

Experience had with the pneumatic tubes as a medium for the transportation of mail at New York, N. Y., since their establishment, has proven their value as an essential auxiliary to the motor vehicle service. They have been operated efficiently, thereby affording a reliable and dependable means for a more expeditious dispatch of mails for train connection and interchange of mail for delivery by carrier than could be obtained by the exclusive use of motor vehicle service. Because of advantages in the time of transit, the fact that they can be used at any time during the period of operation, and the large volume of mail being transported through the pneumatic tube system, it is advisable in the interest of good service in New York, N. Y., and Brooklyn, N. Y., that this service be continued.

*Redesignation of lettered stations*

| Old name | New name | Address | Postal zone | Date of change |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Station A | Prince | 103 Prince St | 12 | June 1, 1947 |
| Station B | Knickerbocker | 128 East Broadway | 2 | Oct. 1, 1946 |
| Station C | Village | 641 Washington St | 14 | Feb. 1, 1947 |
| Station D | Cooper | 93 4th Ave | 3 | Apr. 1, 1947 |
| Station F | Murray Hill | 221 East 34th St | 16 | Do. |
| Station G | Radio City | 322 West 52d St | 19 | Do. |
| Station H | Cathedral | 215 West 104th St | 25 | June 1, 1947 |
| Station I | Morningside | 232 West 116th St | 26 | Oct. 1, 1946 |
| Station J | Manhattanville | 309 West 125th St | 27 | June 1, 1947 |
| Station K | Gracie | 211 East 87th St | 28 | Oct. 1, 1946 |
| Station L | Triborough | 2089 Lexington Ave | 35 | June 1, 1947 |
| Station M | Audubon | 511 West 165th St | 32 | Apr. 1, 1947 |
| Station N | Ansonia | 203 West 69th St | 23 | Oct. 1, 1946 |
| Station O | Old Chelsea | 217 West 18th St | 11 | June 1, 1947 |
| Station P | Bowling Green | Customhouse | 4 | Feb. 1, 1947 |
| Station R | Hub | 438 Westchester Ave | 55 | Do. |
| Station S | Howard | Howard and Lafayette Sts. | 13 | Do. |
| Station T | Morrisania | 442 East 167th St | 56 | Apr. 1, 1947 |
| Station U | Hell Gate | 226 East 106th St | 29 | Do. |
| Station W | Planetarium | 127 West 83d St | 24 | Oct. 1, 1946 |
| Station X | Mott Haven | 517 East 139th St | 54 | June 1, 1947 |
| Station Y | Lenox Hill | 217 East 70th St | 21 | Feb. 1, 1947 |
| West 43d St | Bryant | 23 West 43d St | 18 | Do. |

The magnitude of the business transacted by the New York, N. Y., post office is indicated by its postal receipts. For the fiscal year ended June 30, 1946, the postal receipts totaled $123,078,829.34, of which $81,571,270.84 represents the postal receipts of the general post office and the 21 stations connected with the transportation facilities for the interchange of mails through the medium of the pneumatic-tube service.

The personnel assigned to the general post office and these postal units includes 7,834 regular clerks, 2,631 regular carriers, 802 regular mail handlers, 82 regular cleaners, a force of 1,490 substitute clerks, 4,865 temporary substitute clerks, 449 substitute carriers, 20 temporary substitute carriers, 169 substitute mail handlers, 494 temporary substitute mail handlers, 2 telephone operators, 132 regular pneumatic-tube operators, and 1,381 custodial employees.

The following table sets forth in detail the postal receipts for the fiscal year 1946 and the employees at present assigned to the various carrier delivery stations connected by the pneumatic-tube service.

| Stations | Receipts | Clerks | | | Carriers | | | Mail handlers | | | Cleaners | Telephone operators | Pneumatic tube operators, regular | Custodial |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Regular | Substitute | Temporary substitute | Regular | Substitute | Temporary substitute | Regular | Substitute | Temporary substitute | | | | |
| General Post Office, incoming, outgoing, and transportation departments | $9,782,962.39 | 2,325 | 417 | 1,576 | 252 | 41 | 3 | 390 | 89 | 363 | | | 33 | 567 |
| Station A | 1,095,382.48 | 74 | 1 | 13 | 43 | 14 | | 7 | | | 7 | | 4 | |
| Station H | 718,167.33 | 78 | 11 | 47 | 87 | 21 | 1 | 4 | | | | | 3 | 11 |
| Station J | 568,118.72 | 107 | 17 | 32 | 76 | 18 | 3 | 11 | | | 5 | | 5 | |
| Station L | 449,976.31 | 52 | | 10 | 39 | 7 | | 4 | | | 3 | | 3 | |
| Station O | 2,627,174.66 | 149 | 11 | 34 | 104 | 19 | | 22 | | | | | 4 | 15 |
| Ansonia Station | 817,959.35 | 88 | 10 | 26 | 70 | 13 | 1 | 4 | | | 5 | | 3 | |
| Bowling Green Station | 3,273,081.25 | 102 | 17 | 31 | 60 | 12 | 2 | 3 | | | 2 | | 2 | |
| Canal Street Station | 3,856,193.58 | 194 | 48 | 38 | 104 | 12 | 1 | 20 | | | | 1 | 4 | 36 |
| Church Street Station | 15,598,224.19 | 1,570 | 267 | 887 | 247 | 36 | | 126 | 30 | 49 | | | 19 | 464 |
| Cooper Station | 2,961,800.08 | 166 | 36 | 45 | 133 | 23 | 3 | 10 | | | | | 4 | 15 |
| Gracie Station | 842,511.69 | 89 | 7 | 32 | 83 | 18 | | 3 | | | 6 | | 2 | |
| Grand Central Station | 13,727,081.34 | 1,385 | 243 | 1,534 | 317 | 36 | 1 | 90 | 50 | 82 | | | 19 | 195 |
| Hell Gate Station | 419,453.82 | 45 | 4 | 18 | 59 | 16 | 2 | 2 | | | 2 | | 2 | |
| Lenox Hill Station | 886,060.25 | 110 | 36 | 19 | 112 | 11 | 1 | 7 | | | | | 2 | 12 |
| Madison Square Station | 7,425,945.72 | 357 | 144 | 116 | 99 | 14 | 1 | 33 | | | | 1 | 5 | 54 |
| Morningside Station | 208,260.39 | 47 | 1 | 7 | 29 | 14 | | 2 | | | 2 | | 2 | |
| Murray Hill Station | 1,940,747.32 | 170 | 39 | 92 | 153 | 22 | | 16 | | | 10 | | 3 | |
| Planetarium Station | 595,590.82 | 68 | 9 | 23 | 66 | 12 | | 3 | | | | | 3 | 12 |
| Radio City Station | 2,249,737.52 | 261 | 76 | 153 | 220 | 34 | 1 | 16 | | | 14 | | 4 | |
| Times Square Station | 4,366,290.14 | 247 | 55 | 105 | 197 | 45 | | 24 | | | 20 | | 4 | |
| Wall Street Station | 7,160,551.49 | 150 | 41 | 27 | 81 | 11 | | 5 | | | 6 | | 2 | |
| Total | 81,571,270.84 | 7,834 | 1,490 | 4,865 | 2,631 | 449 | 20 | 802 | 169 | 494 | 82 | 2 | 132 | 1,381 |

*Finance stations not connected by pneumatic tubes, but which are located within territory served by carrier stations that are connected by pneumatic tube service*

| Stations | Receipts | Clerks | | | Mail handlers | | | Cleaners | Stations | Receipts | Clerks | | | Mail handlers | | | Cleaners |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Regular | Substitute | Temporary substitute | Regular | Substitute | Temporary substitute | | | | Regular | Substitute | Temporary substitute | Regular | Substitute | Temporary substitute | |
| Clinton | $267,810.11 | 8 | | | | | | 1 | Station No. 5 | $286,399.77 | 6 | | | | | | |
| Columbia University | 374,278.81 | 10 | | | 1 | | | 1 | Station No. 18 | 98,137.32 | 4 | | | | | | |
| Columbus Circle | 1,277,192.67 | 16 | | | 1 | | | 1 | Station No. 40 | 172,376.32 | 4 | | | | | | |
| Ellis Island | 7,800.68 | 1 | | | | | | | Station No. 82 | 587,410.14 | 12 | | | 1 | | | |
| Empire State | 1,614,833.79 | 12 | | | 1 | | | | Station No. 102 | 109,639.88 | 4 | | | | | | |
| Gansevoort | 581,042.86 | 13 | | | 1 | | | 1 | Station No. 138 | 384,377.35 | 10 | | | | | | |
| Governors Island | 15,321.42 | 1 | | | | | | | Sutton Station | 955,856.70 | 19 | | | 2 | | | |
| Greeley Square | 2,561,533.97 | 39 | | | 5 | | 4 | 3 | Tudor Station | 45,027.75 | 2 | | | | | | |
| London Terrace | 424,925.75 | 6 | | | 1 | | | | Welfare Island Station | 5,434.40 | 1 | | | | | | |
| Rockefeller Center | 4,038,497.29 | 42 | | 8 | 2 | | | 1 | Bryant Station | 3,341,091.12 | 28 | | | 1 | | | 2 |
| Howard | 1,009,939.64 | 23 | | 5 | 2 | | | 2 | Total | 18,188,826.60 | 270 | | 13 | 18 | | 4 | 12 |
| Seamen's Church | 29,898.86 | 9 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

*Postal receipts for fiscal year 1946 and personnel at present assigned to nontube carrier delivery stations*

| Stations | Receipts | Clerks | | | Carriers | | | Mail handlers | | Telephone operator | Cleaners | Custodial |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Regular | Substitute | Temporary substitute | Regular | Substitute | Temporary substitute | Regular | Substitute | | | |
| "X" | $367,633.71 | 41 | 1 | 3 | 32 | 8 | | 1 | | | | 4 |
| Audubon | 305,259.71 | 41 | 2 | 15 | 40 | 11 | | 1 | | | | 4 |
| Boulevard | 435,608.91 | 47 | 2 | 23 | 71 | 17 | | 2 | | | | 4 |
| Bronx Central | 796,372.24 | 158 | 140 | 90 | 76 | 20 | 2 | 13 | 1 | 1 | | 75 |
| City Island | 22,389.02 | 7 | | | 4 | 1 | | | | | 1 | |
| College | 180,635.12 | 56 | 2 | 15 | 43 | 21 | | 1 | | | | 5 |
| Fordham | 439,844.45 | 44 | 3 | 8 | 47 | 13 | | 1 | | | 3 | |
| Hamilton Grange | 300,413.94 | 44 | 2 | 10 | 44 | 19 | | 2 | | | 3 | |
| High Bridge | 385,787.17 | 40 | 3 | 10 | 45 | 16 | 1 | 2 | | | 2 | |
| Hub | 471,902.85 | 48 | | 9 | 36 | 8 | 1 | | | | 3 | |
| Inwood | 254,477.88 | 33 | | 9 | 34 | 7 | | 2 | | | | 4 |
| Kings Bridge | 189,969.83 | 39 | 2 | 13 | 58 | 13 | 2 | 2 | | | 1 | |
| Morrisania | 237,820.96 | 47 | 3 | 8 | 67 | 19 | 1 | 1 | | | | 3 |
| Morris Heights | 323,800.25 | 46 | 2 | 11 | 58 | 17 | 1 | 1 | | | | 4 |
| Parkchester | 218,504.09 | 24 | | 2 | 20 | 4 | | 2 | | | | |
| Pelham | 103,878.58 | 15 | 1 | | 21 | 2 | | | | | 2 | |
| Tremont | 285,926.78 | 47 | 2 | 17 | 72 | 14 | 1 | 3 | | | 1 | |
| Wakefield | 181,783.34 | 42 | 1 | 10 | 45 | 9 | | 2 | | | | 6 |

*Postal receipts for fiscal year 1946 and personnel at present assigned to nontube carrier delivery stations*—Continued

| Stations | Receipts | Clerks | | | Carriers | | | Mail handlers | | Telephone operator | Cleaners | Custodial |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Regular | Substitute | Temporary substitute | Regular | Substitute | Temporary substitute | Regular | Substitute | | | |
| Washington Bridge | $507,600.33 | 52 | 1 | 25 | 58 | 9 | | 3 | | | | 3 |
| Westchester | 161,741.27 | 47 | | 16 | 77 | 17 | 1 | 2 | | | 3 | |
| West Farms | 185,607.18 | 45 | 4 | 15 | 75 | 18 | | 2 | | | | 4 |
| Williams Bridge | 147,752.46 | 41 | 1 | 20 | 66 | 15 | | 1 | | | 3 | |
| Total | 6,504,710.07 | 1,004 | 172 | 329 | 1,089 | 278 | 10 | 44 | 1 | 1 | 22 | 116 |

The first group of stations listed are located in the Borough of Manhattan, south of 127th Street, embracing a financial and business section that requires the best postal facilities obtainable. Aside from the general post office, Grand Central Station, and Church Street Station, the points named are located at varying distances from the railroad depots, thus requiring facilities for receipt, dispatch, and interchange of mails, and from the standpoint of good postal service it is essential that the best facilities obtainable for the transportation of mail be provided. The second group of stations referred to above are also located in the same area, but are not operated as carrier stations or mail-handling units, but serve the financial needs of their respective localities and develop mail matter which is handled at other units.

*Finance stations located within territory served by carrier delivery stations not connected by pneumatic-tube service*

| Stations | Receipts | Regular clerks | Mail handlers | Cleaners |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Allerton | $69,349.11 | 2 | | 1 |
| Fieldston | 20,510.89 | 1 | | 1 |
| Hillside | 29,534.61 | 2 | | |
| Jerome Avenue | 224,095.64 | 9 | 1 | |
| Mosholu | 74,374.78 | 2 | | 1 |
| Ogden | 60,830.85 | 3 | | |
| Parkway | 54,626.85 | 2 | | |
| Perry Avenue | 76,764.67 | 3 | | 1 |
| Pilgrim | 63,180.09 | 2 | | |
| Riverdale | 19,077.85 | 1 | | |
| Soundview | 90,594.97 | 3 | | 1 |
| Throggs Neck | 20,704.66 | 2 | | |
| Van Nest | 57,917.13 | 2 | | |
| Woodlawn | 42,474.28 | 2 | | |

*Finance stations, etc.*—Continued

| Stations | Receipts | Regular clerks | Mail handlers | Cleaners |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Fort Schuyler [1] | $2,793.55 | | | |
| Naval Training [2] | 8,369.00 | | | |
| Total | 915,198.93 | 36 | 1 | 5 |

[1] Discontinued Aug. 1, 1945.
[2] Discontinued Dec. 15, 1945.

The two groups named above are located in the Borough of Manhattan, north of 127th Street, and in the Borough of the Bronx. Pelham Station is located in Westchester County, outside of the city limits. Mail for these points originating at points connected with pneumatic-tube service is transmitted via tube to either station L or station J where connection is made with motor vehicle service.

*Carrier delivery stations in Manhattan served by motor vehicle service only*

| Station | Receipts | Clerks | | | Mail handlers | | | Carriers | | | Cleaners | Custodial |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Regular | Substitute | Temporary substitute | Regular | Substitute | Temporary substitute | Regular | Substitute | Temporary substitute | | |
| Knickerbocker | $745,911.55 | 64 | 6 | 18 | 2 | | | 76 | 14 | | | 10 |
| Morgan | 1,520,803.97 | 801 | 181 | 1,101 | 240 | 109 | 310 | | | | | 413 |
| Thompkins Square | 237,532.97 | 34 | | 1 | | | | 22 | 3 | | 2 | |
| Village | 744,585.92 | 53 | 4 | 21 | 2 | | | 41 | 14 | 1 | | 141 |
| Total | 3,248,834.41 | 952 | 191 | 1,141 | 244 | 109 | 310 | 139 | 31 | 1 | 2 | 564 |

To determine the volume of first-class matter handled at New York, N. Y., and Brooklyn, N. Y., and to develop the value of the pneumatic-tube system as a medium for the transportation of mails, certain statistical data was assembled from a computation of mails handled on Thursday, March 27, 1947. Specimens of the forms used for this purpose, and the instructions issued in connection therewith, are submitted as exhibit A. These forms were used in the assembling and compilation of certain statistical data pertaining to mail matter at New York, N. Y., and Brooklyn, N. Y., and they include the following:

No. 1. Record of daily cancellations, weights of originating first-class mails classified as for local delivery, and for other post offices shown in half-hour periods and disposition thereof by one of four methods, namely, dispatch via pneumatic tubes, dispatch via motor-vehicle service, delivery through station, or dispatched directly to trains.

No. 2. Weight of ordinary first-class mails received for delivery in pouches made up by RPO's, or other post offices.

No. 3. Weight of ordinary transit first-class matter for dispatch to other post offices received from RPO's, post offices, or steamships.

No. 4. Number of originating first-class special-delivery letters and packages. Also the number of special-delivery first-class articles received from other post offices.

No. 5. Number of pieces originating airmail, also number of pieces of outgoing airmail received from other post offices and RPO's.

No. 6. Number of pieces of incoming airmail for delivery by New York post office, also for other post offices.

No. 7. Number of pieces of second-class matter (daily newspapers) dispatched via pneumatic tubes.

No. 8. Number of special-delivery and special-handling parcels (other than first-class matter) dispatched via pneumatic tubes.

No. 9. Number of ordinary second-class (other than daily newspapers), 3d- and 4th-class matter (not including special-delivery or special-handling parcels) dispatched via pneumatic tubes.

No. 10. Number of registered articles, all classes, including registered special delivery and registered airmail, dispatched or delivered.

No. 11. Number of pneumatic-tube carriers originating at stations delivered to the tube operators for transmission.

No. 12. Additional supervisors were assigned to each point connected with pneumatic-tube service, who devoted their entire attention to the supervision of the gathering of the data, and the compilation of the data was conducted under the direction of a competent supervisor who had special training and experience in this class of work.

Based upon statistical data, it has been determined that the pneumatic-tube service transported matter of various classes and subclasses in quantities as shown by the following table:

| | Total mail | Via tube |
|---|---|---|
| Ordinary first-class matter originating New York post office | 9,186,600 | |
| Originating matter rehandled | 2,133,578 | |
| Originating matter including rehandled | 11,320,178 | 2,637,360 |
| Incoming from other post offices for city delivery | 6,012,765 | 2,126,970 |
| Transit for other post offices | 1,744,965 | 265,410 |
| Total first-class matter | 19,077,908 | 5,029,740 |
| Incoming airmail for city delivery | | 324,556 |
| Incoming airmail for other post offices (not requiring further transportation by plane) | | 6,578 |
| Total incoming airmail | | 331,134 |
| Outbound airmail originating in New York post office | | 124,909 |
| Outbound airmail from other post offices for dispatch from New York post office | | 248 |
| Total | | 125,157 |

| | Total mail | Via tube |
|---|---|---|
| Special-delivery letters for city delivery and other post offices mailed at New York Post Office | 40,654 | 18,261 |
| Special-delivery letters for city delivery and other post offices received from other postoffices | 48,805 | 19,796 |
| Total special-delivery letters originating and incoming | 89,456 | 38,057 |
| Special delivery and special handling, city delivery | | 817 |
| Parcels (other than first-class, outgoing) | | 808 |
| Total special delivery and special handling parcels | | 1,625 |
| Originating and incoming registered articles | 137,756 | 6,095 |
| Daily newspapers for city delivery | | 7,989 |
| Daily newspapers for other post offices | | 18 |
| Total daily newspapers via tubes | | 8,007 |
| Second-class other than dailies | | 889 |
| Third-class other than special delivery and special handling | | 262,111 |
| Fourth-class other than special delivery and special handling | | 255 |
| | | 263,255 |
| Transmitted through tubes from Brooklyn, N. Y., post office | | 68,476 |
| Total number of pieces transmitted via tube | | 5,871,546 |

Based on the weight of ordinary first-class matter requiring transportation at the New York post office daily, it has been developed that there is handled between the hours of 5 a. m. and 10 p. m., when the pneumatic tubes are in operation, 58.30 percent of the originating mail, 68.32 percent of the incoming mail for city delivery, and 72.82 percent of the transit mail for other post offices. Combining originating mail, incoming mail for city delivery, and transit mail for other post offices, 61.49 percent is handled during the same period.

The following table sets forth in detail the weight of first-class mail requiring transportation, showing weight and percentage transmitted through pneumatic tubes and that transported by motor-vehicle service.

| | Transmitted through pneumatic tubes | | | Transported by motor vehicle service | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Weight of mails | Weight of mails ½ hourly | Percentage | Weight of mails | Weight of mails ½ hourly | Percentage |
| Originating first class: | | | | | | |
| During period 5 a. m. to 10 p. m. when tubes are in operation | *Pounds* 65,934 | *Pounds* 1,939 | 41.95 | *Pounds* 91,220 | *Pounds* 2,683 | 58.05 |
| During period 10 p. m. to 5 a. m. when tubes are not in operation | None | None | ---- | 112,402 | 8,023 | 100.00 |
| Total | 65,934 | ---- | ---- | 203,622 | ---- | ---- |
| Incoming for city delivery: | | | | | | |
| During period 5 a. m. to 10 p. m. when tubes are in operation | 47,266 | 1,390 | 75.54 | 15,308 | 450 | 24.46 |
| During period 10 p. m. to 5 a. m. when tubes are not in operation | None | None | ---- | 29,012 | 2,072 | 100.00 |
| Total | 47,266 | ---- | ---- | 44,320 | ---- | ---- |
| Transit for other post offices: | | | | | | |
| During period 5 a. m. to 10 p. m. when tubes are in operation | 5,898 | 173 | 38.97 | 9,236 | 272 | 61.03 |
| During period 10 p. m. to 5 a. m. when tubes are not in operation | None | None | ---- | 5,649 | 404 | 100.00 |
| Total | 5,898 | ---- | ---- | 14,885 | ---- | ---- |
| All ordinary first-class matter: | | | | | | |
| During period 5 a. m. to 10 p. m. when tubes are in operation | 119,098 | 3,503 | 50.71 | 115,764 | 3,405 | 49.29 |
| During period 10 p. m. to 5 a. m. when tubes are not in operation | None | None | ---- | 147,063 | 10,505 | 100.00 |
| Total | 119,098 | ---- | ---- | 262,827 | ---- | ---- |

*Percentage of ordinary 1st-class matter handled during period when tubes are in operation compared to percentage handled when tube service is not available*

| | Originating mails | Incoming city delivery | Transit for other post offices | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| From 5 a. m. to 10 p. m. | 58.30 | 68.32 | 72.82 | 61.49 |
| From 10 p. m. to 5 a. m. | 41.70 | 31.68 | 27.18 | 38.51 |

The volume of ordinary first-class matter originating at the New York post office was 9,186,600 pieces, of which 91.46 percent, or 8,402,123 pieces were mailed at the general post office and stations connected by pneumatic-tube service, and 784,477 pieces, or 8.54 percent originating at stations having no pneumatic tube connections. The detailed compilation of form 1, showing the volume of pieces of ordinary first-class mail originating in the New York post office is submitted as exhibit B.

In developing the data necessary to determine the volume of originating and other first-class mails transported by the pneumatic-tube service, a weight basis was used, the mails being weighed after preparation for final dispatch, and prior to being placed into containers, either in carriers or pouches.

The final distribution of out-bound and New York City mails is made at the general post office, Grand Central Station, and Church Street Station. Partial final distribution of out-bound and full distribution of New York City mails is made at Madison Square Station. Primary distribution of out-bound mails and full city distribution is made at all other points, excepting stations which do not make distribution of mail received in drops or from collections between 2:30 p. m. and midnight.

Under this system it develops that a certain portion of the mail is transported by pneumatic tubes or motor-vehicle service more than once, and during the process of distribution and preparation for final dispatch, rehandling is necessary. Therefore, the volume of mail handled, expressed by weight or by pieces will be in excess of the cancellations, and credit must be given accordingly for the quantity of mail handled and rehandled.

It has been ascertained that out of a total of 8,976,300 pieces of originating first-class mail, including that which is handled and rehandled, that require transportation, 29.38 percent, or 2,637,360 pieces were transmitted through the tubes.

That ordinary first-class matter for city delivery received from other post offices totaled 4,121,370 pieces, and that 51.61 percent representing 2,126,970 pieces were transmitted through pneumatic tubes.

That ordinary transit first-class mail from other post offices requiring transportation through the New York post office totaled 935,235 pieces, and that 28.38 percent, or 265,410 pieces were transmitted by pneumatic tube.

This data from which these results were developed, including forms 1, 2, and 3, and summaries thereof, are submitted as exhibit C.

The special-delivery articles of the first class handled totaled 89,456, of which 14,886 were delivered direct to trains from the terminals, and 10,237 were delivered to addresses from the station of origin or point of original receipt. Of the remainder of 64,333, 38,057, or 59.16 percent, were transmitted through the pneumatic tubes, and 26,276 or 40.84 percent, were transmitted by motor-vehicle service. This latter included mail received from trains during nontube hours.

In addition to the special-delivery first-class articles transmitted by the pneumatic tubes, 1,625 pieces of special-delivery articles other than first class and special handling parcels were transported via tube. The data from which this statement was developed, forms 4 and 8, are submitted as exhibit E.

Outbound airmail requiring transportation at the New York post office totaled 743,519 pieces, of which 16.83 percent, or 125,157 articles, were transmitted by pneumatic-tube service, and 331,134 pieces of incoming airmail, including that for New York City or for dispatch to other post offices, were transmitted via pneumatic tubes. The data from which this statement was developed, forms 5 and 6, are submitted as exhibit F.

Daily newspapers amounting to 8,007 for local delivery and for dispatch to other post offices, were transported by pneumatic tubes. Two hundred sixty-three thousand two hundred and fifty-five pieces of mail matter of all classes not heretofore recorded were transmitted via pneumatic tubes. The data from which this statement was developed, forms 7 and 9, are submitted as exhibit G.

Registered articles requiring transportation totaled 95,080 pieces, of which 6.41 percent, or 6,059 articles, were transported via pneumatic tubes. The data from which this statement was developed, form 10, is submitted as exhibit H.

Submitted herewith is exhibit R showing the number of pneumatic tube carriers dispatched during the statistical period.

To illustrate as clearly as possible the volume of important letter mails transported by the different mediums of transportation used, namely, the pneumatic-tube system and the motor-vehicle service, two graphic charts have been prepared and are presented herewith. One block graph chart shows the volume of letter mails transported, expressed by weight, and the proportion to the whole that is transported by pneumatic-tube service compared with the proportion transported by the motor-vehicle service. The other block graph shows the volume of special-delivery mail expressed in pieces, and the proportions transported by each of the two mediums utilized to transport the matter.

The foregoing statement relating to the volume of mail transmitted by pneumatic tube and supporting data included in exhibits C, E, F, G, and H relate to the New York post office and do not include Brooklyn, N. Y.

The data relating to the Brooklyn, N. Y., post office is presented separately. The postal receipts of the Brooklyn, N. Y., post office for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, amounted to $14,423,143.02. The Brooklyn, N. Y., general post office receipts were $4,076,772.39 or 28.26 percent of the total receipts of the office. The postal area of Brooklyn, N. Y., includes, in addition to a very large residential population of 2,928,757, because of the fact that it is the most populous borough in the Greater City of New York, important business sections which are located therein, and those interests demand good postal service. In the interest of the general post office at Brooklyn, N. Y., the general post office building being connected with the pneumatic-tube system, are included the borough and county governments, State and Federal courts, office buildings many floors in height, and an important retail shopping district. The Brooklyn post office also serves a portion of Queens Borough, in which section there is located a population of 261,034. (The total population served by the Brooklyn, N. Y., post office is 3,189,791.)

The cancellation and permit mail of the first class handled at the Brooklyn, N. Y., post office totaled 1,296,627 pieces; 35.95 percent of the originating letter mails handled at Brooklyn, N. Y., is for local delivery within the area served by that office. Of the number of pieces of originating incoming letter mails requiring transportation from or to Brooklyn, N. Y., via New York, N. Y., 35.45 percent was transmitted through the pneumatic tubes. The data relating to the mails of the Brooklyn, N. Y., post office are submitted as exhibit D.

The Brooklyn, N. Y., post office having no direct mail connections except with the Long Island Railroad at the Flatbush Avenue station, necessarily must make connection for outbound mails through the New York, N. Y., railroad depots and is dependent for its supply of inbound mails through the New York, N. Y., post office and railroad terminals.

Ninety-seven and ninteen-hundredths percent of all the outbound and 69.06 percent of all the inbound mails for Brooklyn, N. Y., passes through the New York, N. Y., post office and therefore it is extremely important that the most direct and expeditious medium of transportation be established and maintained between the Brooklyn, N. Y., post office and the New York, N. Y., post office.

While the pneumatic service is in operation mail is handled as follows:

*Brooklyn, N. Y.*

| | Percent |
|---|---|
| Outgoing: | |
| Via tube | 27.68 |
| Via motor-vehicle service | 72.32 |
| However, for New York, N. Y., delivery 46.41 percent is transmitted by tube and 53.59 percent is transported by motor-vehicle service. | |
| Incoming: | |
| Via tube | 38.71 |
| Via motor-vehicle service | 61.29 |
| Combined: | |
| Via tube | 35.45 |
| Via motor-vehicle service | 64.55 |
| Special delivery, air mail, and registered mail handled as follows: | |
| Outgoing: | |
| Special delivery via tube | 52.59 |
| Air mail via tube | 4.19 |
| Registered mail via tube | 48.56 |
| Incoming: | |
| Special delivery via tube | 58.78 |
| Air mail via tube | 63.73 |
| Registered mail via tube | 13.44 |

*Brooklyn, N. Y.*—Continued

| | Percent |
|---|---|
| Combined: | |
| Special delivery via tube | 56.90 |
| Air mail via tube | 40.07 |
| Registered mail via tube | 32.11 |

Approximately 92 percent of the average daily mailing of first-class matter originates within the territory served by the general post office, New York, N. Y., and points connected with the pneumatic-tube service, and the greater portion of the postal activities are conducted at the general post office and stations within the area served by the pneumatic tubes. The postal receipts for this area were 93.3 percent of the total station receipts of the office for the fiscal year 1946. This great volume of business is transacted within the most congested section of the city.

From the foregoing presentation, in addition to the exhibits, it has been reliably established that at New York, N. Y., and the Brooklyn, N. Y., general post office, there is transmitted via pneumatic-tube service a daily average of 5,871,546 pieces of important mail requiring expeditious transmission, warranting the utilization of every available medum of transportation to accelerate its movement through the congested sections to the points of final distribution for delivery within the city, and for dispatch via the several rail terminals to all points throughout the United States and for foreign destination.

Closely correlated to the subject of pneumatic tube transportation in New York City is the question of motor-vehicle transportation. The New York post office employs, under normal conditions, approximately 584 motor vehicles to transport mail in the city of New York, in its interstation service, in its service to rail terminals and depots, and for local delivery service. The experience acquired in this manner concerning traffic congestion is based upon the actual experience of the motor-vehicle service in connection with traffic congestion. Such congestion is enountered in varying degrees in every section of the city, and is by no means confined to any particular period of the day or year, but is due entirely to the fact that the portion of the city of New York which is served by the New York post office is built upon a long, narrow island, and that the main traffic routes are necessarily north and south, with distances varying from 200 feet between such north and south traffic avenues in some cases to almost 900 feet between avenues in other sections.

This, together with the fact that practically the entire portion of the island of Manhattan lying south of 59th Street has become to a great extent a business district, with enormous hotel and amusement areas set in the middle of the business sections, results in a constant traffic congestion in this portion of the Borough of Manhattan.

The greatest congestion, of course, and that presenting the most serious problem, is found in the midtown and downtown sections of Manhattan and along the streets leading to the exits from New York to the main highways in New Jersey, Brooklyn, Queens, and the Bronx. The records of the Motor Vehicle Department of the State of New York for the calendar year 1946 show that there are 785,007 licenses issued in this city, and the number of cars in use has shown a steady increase for many years.

Further complicating this situation has been the replacement of streetcar traffic, in almost every section of the city, by motorbuses. The introduction of the interstate bus for transportation to other points is another factor that has added to the congestion, inasmuch as the bus terminals are without exception located in the midtown section of New York City.

All of these factors add to the situation which has been recognized as presenting a problem of great magnitude, which can only be met by stringent police regulations. Constant study is made by police officials for the purpose of restricting traffic in the various portions of the city affected, and for this reason the pneumatic tubes have been proven to be a valued auxiliary in the handling of the mails.

The route over which the pneumatic tube service is located, with mileage between the points connected (showing the route of the tube system) is transmitted as exhibit I.

The motor vehicle service is efficiently organized and operated and as previously stated, the operation of the pneumatic tube service is efficient. For the purpose of illustrating the advantages of the pneumatic tube service in speed and transportation of the mails, as compared with the transportation of mail by motor vehicle service, there is presented herewith a comparative table built up from current schedules and based on theoretical dispatch from the general post office at New York, N. Y., to each one of the other points connected with the pneumatic tube service.

*Comparative time and mileage between tube and motor-vehicle service from the general post office*

| Station | Via tubes | | Via motor vehicle service | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Mileage | Time | Mileage | Time |
| | | Minutes | | Minutes |
| A | 2.9198 | 8 | 2.7 | 28 |
| H | 5.6062 | 15 | 4.8 | 53 |
| J | 7.4443 | 20 | 5.1 | 30 |
| L | 6.4164 | 19 | 6.1 | 85 |
| O | 1.3196 | 5 | 1.0 | 11 |
| Ansonia | 3.4542 | 11 | 2.2 | 26 |
| Bowling Green | 5.3847 | 17 | 4.9 | 60 |
| Canal St | 3.4106 | 10 | 2.6 | 42 |
| Church St | 4.1571 | 13 | 3.1 | 25 |
| Cooper | 4.3854 | 12 | 2.3 | 31 |
| Gracie | 4.0681 | 12 | 4.5 | 60 |
| Grand Central | 1.5545 | 4 | 1.8 | 25 |
| Hell Gate | 5.1729 | 16 | 5.6 | 72 |
| Lenox Hill | 3.0576 | 9 | 3.7 | 48 |
| Madison Square | 3.5404 | 10 | 1.6 | 15 |
| Morningside | 6.7300 | 18 | 6.0 | 68 |
| Murray Hill | 2.6076 | 7 | 1.2 | 40 |
| Planetarium | 4.3492 | 13 | 3.7 | 40 |
| Radio City | 2.0568 | 8 | 1.1 | 11 |
| Times Sq | .8774 | 3 | .5 | 7 |
| Wall St | 4.8744 | 16 | 4.3 | 47 |
| Brooklyn general post office | 6.1178 | 17 | 4.7 | 35 |

A detailed description of the route of travel of vehicles over motor vehicle circuits or routes in New York, N. Y., and between the Brooklyn, N. Y., general post office, and the general post office, New York, N. Y., and stations, is shown in exhibit L.

There is also submitted a complete set of the present motor vehicle schedules, including pneumatic tube service, showing approximate transit time between stations. This is submitted as exhibit M.

Illustration of the advantage in speed of transmission by pneumatic tube over motor vehicle service is presented in the comparative table, exhibit N, which indicates the time of transit via pneumatic tube service, compared with the time of transit via motor vehicle service, based on the present schedules of the motor vehicle service on an hourly basis; also the time of transit if motor vehicle service were operated on a half-hourly basis.

The advantage of the pneumatic tube service for the expeditious dispatch and handling of mail has been heretofore shown. The advantage of this service over motor vehicle service, other than the speed of transmission, is the fact that it may be used at any time, whereas the motor vehicle service necessarily is scheduled at regular intervals for trips; in other words, mail destined for transportation

by motor vehicle service must be held from one trip to the next, whereas the use of the tubes is available at any time during the hours of service.

Its advantage in reducing to a minimum the possibility of missing train connections or a delivery of mail is apparent. The tubes also afford a means for feeding mail to a distribution unit in a continuous stream, rather than forwarding the mass by motor vehicle service. By using the tubes, special delivery matter and other matter of this type may be forwarded to the point of distribution for delivery each few minutes. If this service were not available the mail could not be forwarded until the dispatch of the next regularly scheduled motor vehicle trip, and in consequence there is the possibility that mail which now connects with outgoing airplane or train connection and delivery trip might fail to connect if dispatched by motor vehicle service.

The principal railroad terminals for the receipt and dispatch of mails are connected with Grand Central Station for New York Central and New York, New Haven & Hartford Lines, and connected with the general post office for Pennsylvania Railroad Lines, Long Island Rail Road, Lehigh Valley Railroad, and New York, New Haven & Hartford Railroad. Connections with trains scheduled to enter and leave the Pennsylvania terminal are also made through Church Street station by using the Hudson & Manhattan Railroad, connecting at Newark, N. J. The terminals for the Baltimore & Ohio Railroad, the Central Railroad of New Jersey, Erie Railroad, Delaware, Lackawanna & Western Railroad, and the West Shore Railroad are located on the New Jersey shore of the Hudson River.

The three principal distribution units of the New York post office are located at the general post office, the Grand Central Station, and the Church Street Station, all of these being located contiguous to the principal railroad terminals. In view of the close contact of the above-mentioned units to the principal railroad depots, it is possible to dispatch 16.38 percent of first-class mails direct to trains after the distribution is completed. There are a total of 227 trains scheduled to carry out-bound mails and 223 trains scheduled to carry in-bound mails on the railroads leaving and entering New York City. Schedules chonologically arranged showing this service are submitted as exhibit J.

Based upon these schedules and the schedules of the pneumatic-tube service and motor-vehicle service, comparative tables have been prepared and are submitted as exhibit O for out-bound mails and exhibit P for in-bound mails. These tables represent mails dispatched from and received at New York City via certain representative trains. The comparison represented in the tables shows the advantage expressed in time that the pneumatic-tube transportation has over the motor-vehicle service. Eight out-bound and 14 in-bound trains were selected as being representative of the advantages secured in the expeditious movement of the mails, out-bound and in-bound, via pneumatic-tube service.

There is submitted as exhibit Q a list of the scheduled trains for outbound mail, chronologically arranged, which depart during the period of the day the tubes are in operation. They illustrate clearly the advantages gained in time by use of the tubes, which permit of later closing time than would be possible if motor-vehicle service were used exclusively, and the additional advantages of supplementary close-by use of the tube system after final dispatch has been made by motor vehicles. It is shown in the table referred to that the closing time of mails to connect over 45 outbound trains departing from the several depots of the railroads leaving New York between the hours of 5 a. m. and 5:30 p. m. would have to be advanced 1 hour if pneumatic-tube service were not available and in use. It is also shown that mail is distributed after the regular closing time and may be forwarded for supplementary dispatch via tubes for periods varying from 5 to 60 minutes after the regular tie-out and dispatch. The variation in the time depends upon the distance between the points of dispatch and the points at which train connections are made. The supplementary dispatch feature has a particular advantage during the peak mail handling hours, since its use insures dispatch of the greatest number of letters via the earliest trains.

Pneumatic-tube service is dependable in that it is not affected generally by street surface traffic or weather conditions, and this may be best illustrated by the following comparative statistical statement showing irregularities, including interruptions, delays, and failures of service in the pneumatic-tube and motor-vehicle services from January 1 to December 31, 1946, divided into quarterly periods. The data presented in the statement are taken from the official records of the motor-vehicle service and reports to the Department covering irregularities in tube service.

Comparative table showing service irregularities in the motor-vehicle service and pneumatic-tube service, in quarterly periods from January 1 to December 31, 1946.

Motor-vehicle irregularities include delays and failures. Pneumatic-tube irregularities include all interruptions of the service.

| Year and quarter | Motor vehicle | Tube |
|---|---|---|
| 1946: | | |
| March | 1,886 | 8 |
| June | 1,833 | 7 |
| September | [1] 2,507 | 13 |
| December | [1] 10,734 | 7 |
| Total | 16,960 | 35 |

[1] Abnormal irregularities due to trucking strike, Christmas period, shortage, and the condition of trucks.

The pneumatic-tube service is in operation daily from 5 a. m. to 10 p. m., covering a range of 17 hours. The contract specifies service for a period not to exceed 18 consecutive hours daily, Monday to Friday, inclusive, and 6 consecutive hours on Saturday, provided, however, the Postmaster General may extend the hours of operation for a total of not exceeding 36 additional hours during each and every month of December occurring during the contract period or any extension thereof.

During the period of operation, from 5 a. m. to 10 p. m. daily, approximately 61.49 percent of all first-class matter is handled on an average day. The following table showing the quantity by weight, each hourly period, showing disposition under appropriate classification, and also indicating the percentage transmitted by pneumatic-tube service, is submitted for the purpose of illustrating that the present range of pneumatic-tube service is desirable.

| | Incoming, originating and transit letter mails transmitted through pneumatic tube | Incoming, originating and transit letter mails transported by motor vehicle service | Incoming and originating letter mails delivered at station of origin or at point of original receipt | Originating and transit letter mails sent direct to trains (tube or motor vehicle not required) | Total incoming originating and transit letter mails | Percentage transmitted through pneumatic tubes |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | *Pounds* | *Pounds* | *Pounds* | *Pounds* | *Pounds* | |
| 12:01 to 1 a. m. | | 26,087 | 1,879 | 5,599 | 33,565 | |
| 1 to 2 a. m. | | 26,602 | 2,316 | 4,986 | 33,904 | |
| 2 to 3 a. m. | | 21,574 | 1,905 | 5,459 | 28,938 | |
| 3 to 4 a. m. | | 12,358 | 2,670 | 2,660 | 17,688 | |
| 4 to 5 a. m. | | 2,794 | 3,818 | 2,301 | 8,913 | |
| 5 to 6 a. m. | 4,983 | 2,613 | 2,743 | 1,661 | 12,000 | 41.53 |
| 6 to 7 a. m. | 6,159 | 3,730 | 2,653 | 4,191 | 16,733 | 36.81 |
| 7 to 8 a. m. | 5,386 | 6,757 | 3,765 | 2,983 | 18,891 | 28.51 |
| 8 to 9 a. m. | 6,138 | 2,481 | 5,522 | 2,427 | 16,568 | 37.05 |
| 9 to 10 a. m. | 5,507 | 5,273 | 3,267 | 542 | 14,589 | 37.75 |
| 10 to 11 a. m. | 8,557 | 2,402 | 3,707 | 649 | 15,315 | 55.87 |
| 11 to 12 a. m. | 7,100 | 2,688 | 3,177 | 1,414 | 14,379 | 49.38 |
| 12:01 to 1 p. m. | 8,309 | 3,922 | 1,617 | 1,350 | 15,198 | 54.67 |
| 1 to 2 p. m. | 6,166 | 3,721 | 807 | 955 | 11,649 | 52.93 |
| 2 to 3 p. m. | 5,122 | 4,359 | 807 | 2,035 | 12,323 | 41.56 |
| 3 to 4 p. m. | 5,721 | 5,271 | 550 | 1,447 | 12,989 | 44.04 |
| 4 to 5 p. m. | 5,158 | 6,067 | 885 | 2,716 | 14,826 | 34.79 |
| 5 to 6 p. m. | 5,559 | 6,060 | 659 | 2,641 | 14,919 | 37.26 |
| 6 to 7 p. m. | 6,554 | 12,024 | 612 | 4,236 | 23,426 | 27.98 |
| 7 to 8 p. m. | 8,864 | 17,781 | 1,042 | 5,909 | 33,596 | 26.38 |
| 8 to 9 p. m. | 12,050 | 13,523 | 870 | 4,287 | 30,730 | 39.21 |
| 9 to 10 p. m. | 11,765 | 17,091 | 1,847 | 7,548 | 38,251 | 30.76 |
| 10 to 11 p. m. | | 25,324 | 1,735 | 8,747 | 35,806 | |
| 11 to 12 p. m. | | 32,325 | 1,674 | 8,007 | 42,006 | |
| Total | 119,098 | 262,827 | 50,527 | 84,750 | 517,202 | |
| Percentage of mail | 23.03 | 50.82 | 9.77 | 16.38 | 100.00 | |

The following table, showing the number of trucks assigned to interstation and depot service, and capacity of same as of March 31, 1947:

| Make | Capacity (tons) | Depot | Interstation | Prepaid and collection | Active reserve | Reserve for Mondays and emergencies | Service | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| International | 1 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 6 | | 2 | 13 |
| International D15 | 1 | | | 36 | | | | 36 |
| Chevrolet | 1 | | | 10 | | | | 10 |
| Ford | 1 | | | 199 | 11 | | 1 | 211 |
| White | 2 | 37 | 4 | 4 | 5 | | | 61 |
| International | 2 | 3 | 37 | 5 | 8 | | | 53 |
| White | 3 | 64 | 16 | | 17 | | | 97 |
| White Super | 3 | 19 | 1 | | 4 | | | 24 |
| Auto Car | 3 | 3 | 15 | | | | | 18 |
| Mack | 5½ | | | | 12 | | 1 | 13 |
| Ford cargo body | 1½ | | | 5 | 35 | | | 40 |
| Chevrolet cargo body | 1½ | | | | 8 | | | 8 |
| Total | | 111 | 103 | 260 | 106 | | 4 | 584 |

The present motor vehicle service between stations connected by pneumatic tubes is generally operated on an hourly frequency and is used principally for the transportation of bulk mail. During the period July 1, 1917, to October 22, 1922, the pneumatic-tube service was not in operation, and the interstation motor vehicle service was operated on a half-hourly frequency to those points formerly connected by pneumatic tubes. In addition there was an express motor vehicle service for the transportation of special delivery and pouch mails, operating on a half-hourly frequency between the hours of 4 a. m. and 11 p. m., during which hours the tubes were previously in operation; said express service being provided between City Hall Station (Church Street Station) via Grand Central Station to Station L, on the east side and between City Hall Station (Church Street Station) via General Post Office to Station J on the west side.

If the pneumatic tube service were not in operation, additional motor vehicle service, similar to that which was operated in the former instance, would necessarily have to be provided as a substitute service for the transportation of those mails now transmitted through pneumatic tubes. The following estimate of the cost thereof is submitted, with such additional items of cost as would necessarily be involved in this proposition. The substitute motor vehicle service on which the estimate is based includes the following items:

| | |
|---|---|
| Additional interstation service: | |
| Daily: 312 hours of truck service performed daily by 39 drivers over 39 8-hour runs operating 2-ton White trucks for 253 days or 78,936 hours at $2.16 per hour | $170,501.76 |
| Saturdays: 18⅓ hours of truck service for 52 Saturdays performed on 2-ton White trucks, or 954 hours, at $2.16 per hour | 2,060.64 |
| Total | 172,562.40 |
| Daily: 224 hours of truck service performed daily by 28 drivers on 28 8-hour runs operating 3-ton White trucks for 253 days or 56,672 hours at $2.19 per hour | 124,111.68 |
| Additional interstation service—Continued | |
| Saturdays: 13 hours of truck service for 52 Saturdays performed on 3-ton White trucks or 676 hours at $2.19 per hour | $1,480.44 |
| Total | 125,592.12 |
| Daily: 192 hours of truck service performed daily by 24 drivers on 24 8-hour runs operating 2-ton White trucks for 253 days or 48,576 hours at $2.16 per hour | 104,924.16 |
| Saturdays: 11 hours of truck service for 52 Saturdays performed on 2-ton White trucks or 572 hours at $2.16 per hour | 1,235.52 |
| Total | 106,159.68 |
| Additional service between Brooklyn and New York, N. Y.: | |
| Daily: 46 hours of truck service performed daily by 6 drivers on six 8-hour runs operating 1-ton Ford trucks for 253 days or 11,638 hours at $1.65 per hour | 19,202.70 |
| Saturdays: 5 hours of truck service performed each Saturday for 52 Saturdays or 260 hours at $1.65 per hour | 429.00 |
| Total | 19,631.70 |
| Total cost, additional motor-vehicle service | 423,945.90 |

The present motor-vehicle service generally operates on an hourly frequency between the general post office and the 21 points of the New York, N. Y., post office now connected by pneumatic tubes, and would be supplemented by the establishment of a half-hourly motor-vehicle service between the hours of 5 a. m. and 10 p. m. An express route would be established to operate on a half-hourly frequency between 5 a. m. and 10 p. m. from Church Street Station via Grand Central Station to Station L, to Station J, and return over the same route.

Motor-vehicle service, now operating from Morgan Station to Stations J and L and the stations north of these points, would be routed out of the general post office in addition to the present trips now scheduled from the general post office to Stations J and L and stations north of these points, which would establish a 20-minute frequency motor-vehicle service on trips between the general post office and Station J.

There would also be established two express routes, operating from 5 a. m. to 10 p. m., to transport pouch mails from Church Street Station for train connections at the general post office and Grand Central Station, and interstation connections at those points.

The motor-vehicle service between the Brooklyn, N. Y., post office and points in the New York, N. Y., post office would necessarily have to be increased to provide for adequate transportation service in lieu of the tube service now performed.

In addition to the estimate of the cost of motor-vehicle service that would be required, consideration has been given to the effect that would be had upon the personnel engaged at present in the handling of mails, performing operations connected with the pouching, tubing, receiving, and dispatching operations inside the stations and on the mailing platforms.

It should be understood that mails dispatched and received via the pneumatic-tube service are usually handled within the workroom area adjacent to the apparatus used, and the tube operators are required to open and empty the inbound tube carriers and to close the outbound tube carriers and dispatch them. The mail forwarded via motor-vehicle service must be enclosed in pouches and moved from the pouch racks to the tailboard of the truck and must be checked into the vehicle; and, in reverse order, mail received must be checked and removed from the tailboard of the truck and delivered to points in the workroom area where the mails are opened.

Taking the factors relating to the subject under consideration and based upon the quantity and character of this work as performed under the present arrangement it is estimated that 90 additional employees would be required to replace the services and personnel now provided for the pneumatic-tube service.

There is transmitted with this report a number of photographs of the pneumatic-tube equipment at the general post office and the various stations, which photographs have been marked "Exhibit K."

The following tabulation is presented to show the work performed and the number of post-office employees required at present; the number of pouches that would have to be made up and handled if the tube service were not available, and the number of post-office employees that would be required to perform the work incident thereto:

| | Number of pouches now originating on an average day at tube stations or transferred at these points | Number of pouches that are handled in dispatching-receiving sections and mailing platform at tube stations | Number of employees handling pouches in dispatching-receiving sections and mailing platform at tube stations | Number of tube carriers containing mail dispatched | Number of employees engaged in handling mails in tube section (tube operators) | Estimated number of additional pouches that would have to be established if tube service were not available | Estimated number of pouches that would be handled in dispatching and receiving section if tube service were not available | Estimated number of employees required to handle pouches if tube service were not available |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| General post office | [1] 9,147 | 18,202 | 93 | 5,562 | 33 | 2,098 | 23,864 | 148 |
| Grand Central | [1] 5,942 | 10,429 | 31 | 6,170 | 19 | 6,750 | 22,000 | 94 |
| Church Street | [1] 3,175 | 3,599 | 25 | 2,617 | 19 | 4,290 | 10,000 | 71 |
| A | 44 | 122 | 2 | 206 | 4 | 418 | 795 | 4 |
| Cooper | 95 | 255 | 2 | 612 | 4 | 210 | 657 | 5 |
| Murray Hill | 39 | 233 | 2 | 479 | 3 | 189 | 577 | 4 |
| Radio City | 51 | 358 | 2 | 793 | 4 | 231 | 847 | 6 |
| H | [1] 32 | 92 | 1 | 402 | 3 | 418 | 897 | 3 |
| J | [1] 717 | 1,365 | 9 | 1,408 | 5 | 532 | 3,931 | 10 |
| L | [1] 271 | 504 | 6 | 864 | 3 | 532 | 3,071 | 9 |
| O | 51 | 179 | 2 | 460 | 4 | 231 | 624 | 7 |
| Hell Gate | 14 | 58 | 1 | 128 | 2 | 342 | 695 | 3 |
| Ansonia | 40 | 115 | 1 | 261 | 3 | 418 | 922 | 4 |
| Bowling Green | 41 | 240 | 2 | 912 | 2 | 210 | 639 | 4 |
| Canal Street | 88 | 285 | 3 | 399 | 4 | 231 | 2,339 | 10 |
| Gracie | 17 | 90 | 1 | 301 | 2 | 342 | 725 | 4 |
| Lenox Hill | 14 | 88 | 1 | 292 | 2 | 342 | 716 | 4 |
| Madson Square | 449 | 713 | 5 | 1,305 | 5 | 750 | 1,601 | 11 |
| Morningside | 13 | 42 | 1 | 120 | 2 | 210 | 425 | 3 |
| Planetarium | 29 | 107 | 1 | 278 | 3 | 418 | 885 | 3 |
| Times Square | 48 | 312 | 2 | 632 | 4 | 210 | 602 | 6 |
| Wall Street | 67 | 319 | 1 | 394 | 2 | 210 | 609 | 5 |
| Total | 20,384 | 37,707 | 194 | 24,595 | 132 | 19,582 | 77,421 | 416 |

[1] Transfer of pouches in transit included.

Total personnel required under existing methods of transportation, pneumatic-tube service and motor-vehicle service combined (194 plus 132) ..... 326
Total personnel required if motor-vehicle service were used exclusively ..... 416
Total additional employees that would be required ..... 90

The above tabulation, based on careful estimates, shows that 20,384 pouches made up under existing methods require 37,707 handlings in course of transit between points of origin and destination; and that without the use of the pneumatic tubes, which transmitted 24,595 originating carriers containing mail between the points connected by tubes on an average day, 19,582 additional pouches would have to be made up, making a total of 39,966 pouches, for transportation via motor-vehicle service, which would require 77,421 handlings between the points of origin and destination, representing an increase of approximately 105 percent over that required with the combined use of the present motor-vehicle service and pneumatic-tube service.

It is estimated that the additional work involved in a substitution of motor-vehicle service to replace the service now performed by the pneumatic-tube system would require the utilization of the services of 90 additional employees, and that this additional personnel would include 60 clerks and 30 mail handlers. Based on the average rate of pay at the New York post office as of July 1, 1946, the cost is estimated as follows:

| | |
|---|---|
| 60 clerks, at $3,000 per annum | $180,000 |
| 30 mail handlers, at $2,500 per annum | 75,000 |
| Total cost (90 employees) | 255,000 |

The summary of the items and the estimated annual cost referred to in the foregoing is submitted:

| | |
|---|---|
| Additional motor-vehicle service | $423,945.90 |
| Additional personnel | 255,000.00 |
| Total estimated cost | 678,945.90 |

There would be additional items of cost not included in the above, such as the original investment for 6 1-ton trucks for the Brooklyn, N. Y., post office, and 46 2-ton trucks for the New York, N. Y., post office, at an approximate cost of $1,250 for the 1-ton trucks and $2,300 each for the 2-ton trucks, making a total of $113,300. The existing garage facilities at New York, N. Y., are inadequate to accommodate the 46 2-ton trucks; therefore additional garage facilities would be required.

It has been estimated that 19,582 additional pouches that would be made up daily would have a bearing upon the cost of the substitute for the pneumatic-tube service, since such a large increase in the use of mail equipment to replace the equipment now furnished by the contractor would be an element of considerable expense.

Taking into consideration the principal items, motor-vehicle service and personnel, which would be required, it is estimated that such service would cost $678,945.90 compared with the cost of the pneumatic-tube service of $253,023.15 for the rent of the tube system, plus $320,700 at New York, N. Y., and $8,403.09 at Brooklyn, N. Y., for the salaries of the tube operators now on the Post Office Department's payroll; plus $37,433.19 at New York, N. Y., and $1,639.33 at Brooklyn, N. Y., for electric current used in connection with pneumatic-tube service for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1946, making a total of $621,198.76 for tube operation. These figures indicate that a substitute motor-vehicle service, replacing the pneumatic-tube service would cost $57,747.14 more than the cost of the existing pneumatic service without considering any of the other elements of expense mentioned.

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Rental of tube system | | $253,023.15 |
| Salaries of tube operators at New York, N. Y. | 320,700.00 | |
| Salaries of tube operators at Brooklyn, N. Y. | 8,403.09 | |
| Total salaries of tube operators | | 329,103.09 |
| Electric current at New York, N. Y. | $37,433.19 | |
| Electric current at Brooklyn, N. Y. | 1,639.33 | |
| Total electric current | | 39,072.52 |
| Total for tube operations | | 621,198.76 |

| | |
|---|---|
| Estimated motor-vehicle and personnel cost | 678,945.90 |
| Cost of pneumatic-tube service | 621,198.76 |
| Total more than present cost of pneumatic-tube service | 57,747.14 |

As a result of a thorough study and careful consideration of the foregoing presentation of the factors related to the question of the transportation of the mails at New York, N. Y., and between Brooklyn, N. Y., and New York, N. Y., the following summary of conclusions and recommendations is submitted.

CONCLUSIONS

The volume of postal business transacted and the vast quantity of first-class mails, outbound and inbound, handled daily by the New York post office justifies the use of the best transportation facilities obtainable for the movement of the mails interchanged between the general post office, New York, N. Y., and the stations, and the general post office, Brooklyn, N. Y., in order to insure the most expeditious dispatch and delivery of the mails.

The principal railroad terminals being located in different sections of the city, and some across the Hudson River in New Jersey, it is necessary that contact between the depots and the general post office and stations be maintained by the use of transportation mediums as will permit the exchange of mails, particularly first-class mails, in the shortest period of time.

Since 93.3 percent of the total postal receipts of the New York post office originate in the territory south of and including stations J and L, logically that is the area wherein the most important first-class mails are handled.

Excepting the general post office, the Grand Central Station, and the Church Street Station, the other 19 stations connected with pneumatic tubes included in the area south of 127th Street are located at various distances from the two principal railway terminals, namely, Grand Central Terminal and Pennsylvania Terminal; and because of their importance to the localities they serve, rapid transportation facilities are required to maintain adequate and satisfactory postal service.

The pneumatic-tube service now in operation is a valuable auxiliary transportation medium supplementing the motor-vehicle service, by which 5,871,546 pieces of mail of all classes are transmitted on an average day between the general post office and the 22 other postal units of the New York post office and the Brooklyn, N. Y., general post office, and the New York, N. Y., general post office.

During the period of pneumatic-tube operation, 50.71 percent of the ordinary letter mail requiring transportation is transmitted via pneumatic tubes, and considering the 24-hour period as a whole, 31.18 percent of the ordinary letter mail requiring transportation is transmitted via the same method.

Of the total mailing of first-class matter, 91.46 percent, or 8,402,123 pieces are mailed at the general post office and stations connected by pneumatic-tube service; 51.61 percent or 2,126,970 pieces of first-class mail for city delivery, received from other post offices, are transmitted through the tubes; 28.38 percent, or 265,410 pieces of ordinary transit first-class mail from other post offices requiring transportation are transmitted through the tubes.

The surface transportation in the city of New York is seriously interfered with and subject to interruptions and delay because of the acute congestion caused by the vast number of vehicles operating over the city streets, and by the density of population; and the pneumatic-tube system provides a subsurface medium for the prompt exchange of outbound and inbound first-class mails

between the general post office and carrier stations and the distribution centers for dispatch to trains or transmission to stations of delivery, free from street congestion or delay caused by traffic or inclement weather.

The transportation via pneumatic tubes permits of later closings and the use of supplementary dispatches after the final closing time for out-bound mails and the rapid transmission of in-bound and local mails for delivery.

The availability of the pneumatic tube service, when used for the transmission of mails at any time during the hours of operation, has a decided service advantage over the motor vehicle, since mail must necessarily accumulate between the schedule time of departure of a motor vehicle trip and the departure of the subsequent motor vehicle trip.

To provide the same motor vehicle service which was in operation when the tube service was discontinued, it would be necessary to schedule motor vehicles on a half-hourly frequency between the points connected by the pneumatic tubes. Additional employees would be required at all these points to perform the duties incident to the handling of pouches and the loading and unloading of vehicles.

The estimated annual cost for additional motor vehicles and the additional personnel that would be required as a substitute for pneumatic tube service would be $678,945.90, which would be $57,747.14 more than the present cost of the pneumatic tube service, which is $621,198.76.

Superior service is provided through the medium of the pneumatic tube service as compared with the motor vehicle service, on a basis of availability, speed of transmission, and dependability, considering the obstacles prevailing against a more rapid surface transportation, and the freedom of movement of the subsurface medium of transportation.

No definite statement can be made as to what quantity of the mail transported via pneumatic tube is expedited, on a basis of comparison between that medium and the motor vehicle service; but it is clearly demonstrated and recognized that the pneumatic tube system transports the mail between the 23 points connected with greater celerity than it is possible with motor vehicle service under the congested traffic conditions existing in the city of New York and as an auxiliary medium of transportation supplementing the motor vehicle service, it has a distinct value that constitutes a necessity for the maintenance of adequate and reasonable postal service at New York, N. Y., and between New York, N. Y., and Brooklyn, N. Y.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The following summary of the recommendations referred to heretofore is submitted:

That the present pneumatic tube service, for which the existing contract expires on June 30, 1947, be continued, and that similar service be contracted for, consisting of single and double tube lines connecting the points specified in the following table, with a mileage of 26.9690; all points indicated to be connected with double tube lines except Murray Hill Station, Bowling Green Station, and Wall Street Station, where single lines are provided.

| Lines: | *Length (miles)* |
|---|---|
| Church Street Station to Canal Street Station | 0.7465 |
| Canal Street Station to Station A | .4908 |
| Station A to Station O | 1.6002 |
| Station O to General Post Office | 1.3196 |
| General Post Office to Times Square Station | $.8774 |
| General Post Office to Grand Central Station | 1.5545 |
| Times Square Station to Radio City Station | 1.1794 |
| Radio City Station to Ansonia Station | 1.3974 |
| Ansonia Station to Planetarium Station | .8950 |
| Planetarium Station to Station H | 1.2570 |
| Station H to Morningside Station | 1.1238 |
| Morningside Station to Station J | .7143 |
| Station J to Station L | 1.1793 |
| Grand Central Station to Lenox Hill Station | 1.5031 |
| Lenox Hill Station to Gracie Station | 1.0105 |
| Gracie Station to Hell Gate Station | 1.1048 |
| Hell Gate Station to Station L | 1.2435 |
| Church Street Station to Cooper Station | 2.1714 |
| Cooper Station to Madison Square Station | .8450 |
| Madison Square Station to Murray Hill Station to Grand Central Station | 1.6448 |
| Church Street Station to Wall Street Station to Bowling Green Station | 1.1500 |
| Church Street Station to General Post Office, Brooklyn, N. Y | 1.9607 |
| Total | 26.9690 |

A total of five copies of this report is being submitted in order that each member of the committee studying the matter may be provided with a copy.

Respectfully submitted.

———— ————, *Postmaster.*

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT,
OFFICE OF THE FOURTH
ASSISTANT POSTMASTER GENERAL,
*Washington, D. C., March 31, 1948.*

Mr. GEORGE D. RILEY,
*Senate Commitee on Post Office and Civil Service,*
*Washington, D. C.*

MY DEAR MR. RILEY: Reference is made to the hearings in New York City on March 29, 1948, concerning the general subject of the pneumatic-tube service at New York City.

In accordance with the request of the committee chairman at the hearing, there is transmitted a tabulation showing the tube mileage, the amounts paid to the contractor, the New York Mail & Newspaper Transportation Co., and the rates per mile from 1898 to 1948, inclusive. The amount shown for the fiscal year 1948 is for the entire year, upon the expiration of which the contract now in force terminates.

Concerning the chairman's request for advice as to why the tube service was discontinued effective July 1, 1918, I wish to refer you to the printed report of the hearing before the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads, United States Senate, 64th Congress, 1st session, on H. R. 10484, an act making appropriations for the service of the Post Office Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1917, and for other purposes and with reference to the pneumatic-tube service. The document is dated March 29, 1916.

Reference is also made to reports of the Postmaster General for the fiscal years 1916, 1917, and 1918. I quote as follows from the report of the Postmaster General for the fiscal year 1918:

"The advisability of the discontinuance of the pneumatic-tube service in the cities where it was in operation—New York-Brooklyn, Chicago, Boston, Philadelphia, and St. Louis—was pointed out by the Postmaster General in his annual reports for the past 2 years. As no provision was made for the continuance of this service in the bill making appropriations for the service of the Post Office Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1919, and for other purposes, it was discontinued at the close of the fiscal year ending June 30, 1918.

"Experience has demonstrated that the contentions of the Department with respect to this tube service were well founded and that equally efficient service can be rendered at much less cost by other means."

In accordance with your telephone request yesterday there is attached a photostatic copy of the existing pneumatic-tube contract between the Government and the New York Mail & Newspaper Transportation Co. and also 5 copies of the advertisement inviting proposals for furnishing a tube system on a lease or rental basis for use in the transmission of mails by pneumatic tubes or other similar devices at New York, N. Y., and between the general post office at New York and the general post office at Brooklyn, N. Y.

Trusting that this will furnish you with the information desired, I am,

Sincerely yours,

WALTER MYERS,
*Fourth Assistant Postmaster General.*

*Pneumatic-tube service, New York, N. Y., 1898–1948*

| | Miles | Annual cost | Rate per mile |
|---|---|---|---|
| Fiscal year ending June 30— | | | |
| 1898 | 5.85 | $168,655.00 | $28,829 |
| 1899 | 5.85 | 161,520.50 | 27,610 |
| 1900 | 5.85 | 161,520.50 | 27,610 |
| 1901 | 5.85 | 161,520.50 | 27,610 |
| 1902 | (1) | (2) | (1) |
| 1903 | 6.853 | 110,292.65 | 16,094 |
| 1904 | 6.853 | 98,986.73 | 14,444 |
| 1905 | 6.853 | 105,300.05 | 15,365 |
| 1906 | 6.853 | 106,332.21 | 15,516 |
| 1907 | 7 | 119,000.00 | 17,000 |
| 1908 | 9.3998 | 159,801.00 | 17,000 |
| 1909 | 20.3987 | 346,777.90 | 17,000 |
| 1910 | 21.2763 | 361,697.10 | 17,000 |
| 1911 | 25.173 | 427,941.00 | 17,000 |
| 1912 | 25.173 | 427,941.00 | 17,000 |
| 1913 | 25.781 | 436,276.80 | 17,000 |
| 1914 | 26.699 | 453,883.00 | 17,000 |
| 1915 | 26.421 | 449,157.00 | 17,000 |
| 1916 | 26.429 | 449,293.00 | 17,000 |
| 1917 | 26.429 | 449,293.00 | 17,000 |
| 1918 | 26.429 | 449,293.00 | 17,000 |
| 1919 | (1) | (1) | |
| 1923 | 26.8173 | 496,120.05 | 18,500 |
| 1924 | 26.4588 | 515,946.60 | 19,500 |
| 1925 | 26.4588 | 515,946.60 | 19,500 |
| 1926 | 26.4588 | 515,946.60 | 19,500 |
| 1927 | 26.4588 | 515,946.60 | 19,500 |
| 1928 | 26.4588 | 515,946.60 | 19,500 |
| 1929 | 26.4588 | 515,946.60 | 19,500 |
| 1930 | 26.4588 | 515,946.60 | 19,500 |
| 1931 | 26.4588 | 515,946.60 | 19,500 |
| 1932 | 26.4588 | 515,946.60 | 19,500 |
| 1933 | 26.4588 | 515,946.60 | 19,500 |
| 1934 | 26.4588 | 515,946.60 | 19,500 |
| 1935 | 26.4588 | 515,946.60 | 19,500 |
| 1936 | 26.5047 | 516,296.39 | 19,479 |
| 1937 | 26.5732 | 517,861.93 | 19,488 |
| 1938 [3] | 26.5732 | 259,058.70 | 19,500 |
| 1938 [4] | 27 | 85,500.00 | 19,000 |
| 1938 [5] | 27.1858 | 79,745.00 | [6] 8,800 |
| 1939 | 27.1858 | 262,315.78 | [7] 9,649 |
| 1940 | 26.969 | 253,023.16 | 9,382 |
| 1941 | 26.969 | 253,023.16 | 9,382 |
| 1942 | 26.969 | 253,023.16 | 9,382 |
| 1943 | 26.969 | 253,023.16 | 9,382 |
| 1944 | 26.969 | 253,023.16 | 9,382 |
| 1945 | 26.969 | 253,023.16 | 9,382 |
| 1946 | 26.969 | 253,023.16 | 9,382 |
| 1947 | 26.969 | 253,023.16 | 9,382 |
| 1948 | 26.969 | 253,023.16 | 9,382 |

[1] All services discontinued beginning July 1, 1918. Resumed at New York City, Oct. 2, 1922, for 10-year period.
[2] No appropriation; all service discontinued.
[3] To Dec. 31, 1937 (6 months).
[4] From Jan. 1, to Feb. 28, 1938 (2 months).
[5] From Mar. 2, to June 30, 1938 (4 months).
[6] Effective Mar. 2, 1938, the Post Office Department began paying for power, telephone service, and salaries of substitute tube operators; the contractor furnishing only tubes, power plants, receiving and dispatching apparatus, lubricants, waste and other supplies required in their operation. Contractor furnished personnel and all services prior to Mar. 2, 1938.
[7] Effective July 1, 1938, Department employed regular and substitute personnel at its expense; contractor continued furnishing same item as in footnote 6.

CONTRACT FOR THE RENTAL OF PNEUMATIC TUBES ON ROUTE 507011–A AT NEW YORK, INCLUDING THE GENERAL POST OFFICE AT BROOKLYN, N. Y.

This article of contract, made this 16th day of June 1942, between the United States of America (acting in this behalf by the Postmaster General) and the New York Mail & Newspaper Transportation Co., a corporation organized under the laws of the State of New York and having executive offices at New York, N. Y., by Carl F. Dietz, president, and the Lamson Corp. of Delaware, a corporation organized under the laws of the State of Delaware and having executive offices at Wilmington, Del., and the Lamson Corp., a corporation organized under the laws of the State of New York, and having executive offices at Syracuse, N. Y., as its sureties:

Whereas, after proper advertisement dated April 2, 1942, inviting proposals for the transmission of mails by pneumatic tubes upon a lease or rental basis (route 507011–A), the New York Mail & Newspaper Transportation Co. submitted a proposal dated May 26, 1942, which was duly accepted by the Postmaster General by order No. 17831 of June 16, 1942, contemplating the furnishing of a pneumatic-tube system on a lease or rental basis and,

Whereas, pursuant to the foregoing, the New York Mail & Newspaper Transportation Co. has been accepted as contractor for furnishing a pneumatic-tube system on route 507011–A, which proposal and acceptance are hereby referred to and constitute the basis of this contract, at the rate of $9,382 per mile per annum, of double lines of 8-inch tubes actually operated, which at the inception of this contract period are 26.9690 miles;

Now, therefore, the said contractor and its sureties do jointly and severally undertake, covenant and agree with the United States of America, and do firmly bind themselves to provide and maintain a pneumatic-tube system connecting the following postal points in the city of Greater New York:

Church Street Annex to Canal Station.
Canal Station to Station A.
Station A to Station O.
Station O to the General Post Office.
General Post Office to Times Square Station.
General Post Office to Grand Central Annex.
Times Square Station to Station G.
Station G to Station N.
Station N to Station W.
Station W to Station H.
Station H to Station I.
Station I to Station J.
Station J to Station L.
Grand Central Annex to Station Y.
Station Y to Station K.
Station K to Station U.
Station U to Station L.
Church Street Annex to Station D.
Station D to Madison Square Station.
Madison Square Station to Station F to Grand Central Annex.
Church Street Annex to Station P via Wall Street Station.
Church Street Annex to General Post Office, Brooklyn.

It is further stipulated and agreed:

That the contractor will place its pneumatic-tube system connecting the points above named at the disposal of the Post Office Department for operation by it, under the following terms and conditions:

1. The contractor will lease to the Post Office Department for a term beginning 12:01 a. m., July 1, 1942, and expiring midnight June 30, 1947, unless sooner annulled or terminated as hereinafter provided, its system of pneumatic tubes and machinery owned by it appurtenant thereto and necessary for the operation thereof as the same shall exist at the commencement of said term.

2. At the expiration of said term, or the prior termination of the contract, the Post Office Department shall vacate, relinquish, and return to the contractor the leased property in the same condition in which it shall be at the commencement of the term, except as changes therein agreed to by the contractor shall have been made during the term and except for ordinary wear and tear and for damages or depreciation not attributable to the negligence or willful or malicious acts of employees of the Post Office Department. At the expiration of the term the contractor will, if requested so to do by the Post Office Department, remove the tubes, powerplants, receiving and dispatching apparatus, machinery, equipment and devices located in post offices or on premises of the Post Office Department, from such post offices and premises, except as hereinafter provided.

3. The Post Office Department shall pay to the contractor as rental for the leased property, rental payable monthly, computed at an annual rate of $9,382 per mile, of double 8-inch tubes.

4. The contractor undertakes that, at the commencement of the term the tubes, equipment and machinery appurtenant thereto shall be in good workable condition, satisfactory for the efficient handling of the mails and capable of transmitting the mails in containers through the tubes at an average speed of 30 miles per hour.

5. The contractor will, at its expense, furnish all lubricants, waste, and other supplies required in the operation of the pneumatic tubes and will maintain the pneumatic tubes and equipment and machinery appurtenant thereto, including the powerplants, in a satisfactory working condition during the period of the term, promptly making all necessary repairs therein, except that repairs made necessary by the negligence or willful or malicious acts of employees of the Post Office Department will be made by the contractor, but shall be paid for by the Post Office Department.

6. Except as hereinafter expressly provided, all labor and power necessary for the operation of the tubes and the handling of the mails thereby shall be furnished by the Post Office Department at its expense.

7. During the term of this lease or any extension thereof the contractor shall be under no obligation to change the location, arrangement, or character of any of its tubes, machinery, or equipment as the same may exist at the commencement of the term of this lease, except as hereinafter provided.

8. In the event of interruption of service due to the failure of the contractor to perform its obligations, as herein set forth, or due to any other cause within the control of the contractor, the Postmaster General may withhold from the payments otherwise due the contractor hereunder as a deduction of rental or as a penalty, such amount as he may deem proper with due regard for the extent of such impairment of service as to time and portion of the tube system so affected.

9. It is further stipulated and agreed:

First. That the pneumatic-tube system furnished under this contract is to be operated for not more than 18 consecutive hours daily, Mondays to Fridays, inclusive, and 6 consecutive hours on Saturdays, during the term of the lease, on a schedule to be prescribed by the Postmaster General: *Provided, however,* That the right is reserved by the Postmaster General to extend the hours of operation for a total of not exceeding 36 additional hours during each and every month of December occurring during the contract period or any extension thereof.

Second. That the contractor will furnish powerplants to be operated by electric power and capable of transmitting the carriers at average speed of 30 miles per hour between points connected by tubes, receiving and dispatching apparatus, carriers (mail containers) not less than 6⅞ inches in diameter and 21 inches in length, inside measurement, of uniform construction interchangeable between the several lines, and any other machinery, equipment, or device necessary for the efficient operation of the pneumatic tubes.

Third. That the contractor will repair in an expeditious manner, the tube lines, power plants, receiving and dispatching apparatus, carriers, machinery, equipment and devices, constituting the tube system contemplated by this contract.

Fourth. That the contractor will make repairs to the premises connected with the tube system, resulting from damage occasioned by the installation of the tubes, power plants, receiving and dispatching apparatus, machinery, equipment, and devices.

Fifth. That the contractor will restore the premises upon which alterations have been made to permit of the installation of the tubes, power plants, receiving and dispatching apparatus, upon discontinuance of tube service at any point connected with the system, to the condition in which they were received, ordinary wear and tear excepted, if requested to do so by the Postmaster General; except as hereinafter provided.

Sixth. That the contractor will discharge any person employed by it in connection with the maintenance and repair of the tube system when requested to do so by the Postmaster General.

Seventh. That the contractor will account for and pay over to the Postmaster General any money belonging to the United States which may come into the possession of the contractor, its sureties or employees.

Eighth. The contractor will make repairs to the premises connected with the tube system resulting from damage occasioned by the installation of the tubes, power plants, receiving and dispatching apparatus, machinery, equipment, and devices.

Ninth. The contractor will remove the tubes, power plants, receiving and dispatching apparatus, equipment and devices at its expense at the expiration of the term or, except as hereinafter provided, at the termination of the contract or lease if requested to do so by the Postmaster General.

Tenth. The contractor will further, at its expense, upon the discontinuance of the tube service at any point connected with the system, except as hereinafter provided, restore the premises upon which alterations have been made to permit of the installation of the tubes, power plants, receiving and dispatching apparatus to the condition in which they were received, ordinary wear and tear excepted, if requested to do so by the Postmaster General.

For which service, when properly performed and the evidence thereof shall have been filed in the Office of the Fourth Assistant Postmaster General, the said New York Mail & Newspaper Transportation Co., contractor, is to be paid by the United States at the contract rate hereinbefore named; payments to be made monthly and as soon after the close of each month as accounts can be adjusted and settled; said pay to be subject, however, to be reduced or discontinued by the Postmaster General as hereinafter stipulated.

It is mutually understood and agreed that the Postmaster General will—

First. Allot in the premises under the control of the Department space for the installation of the tubes, power plants, receiving and dispatching apparatus, and other appliances necessary in connection with the use of the tube system.

Second. Provide the manpower (operators) necessary to operate the tube system, together with the necessary telephone switchboard and the supervisors.

Third. Furnish electric power necessary for the operation of the tube system.

Fourth. Accord access to the post offices for the employees of the contractor for the purpose of maintenance, repair, and inspection of the tube system and equipment.

It is further stipulated and agreed that the Postmaster General may annul, cancel, and terminate this contract for—

(a) Repeated failure of the tube system to operate due to conditions within the control of the contractor.

(b) Repeated failure on the part of the contractor to make necessary repairs to the tube system promptly.

(c) For failure to have the tube system in a condition for efficient operation on July 1, 1942, or within a reasonable time thereafter—the contractor having failed to exercise due diligence in constructing the system.

(d) Violation of the postal laws and the several acts of Congress relating to post offices and post roads and such regulations as are incorporated in the Postal Laws and Regulations, Edition of 1940.

(e) Refusal of contractor to discharge any person employed by the contractor in connection with the maintenance and repair of the tube system, when requested to do so by the Postmaster General.

(f) For failure of the Congress to appropriate funds for the operation of the system.

(g) Whenever the contractor shall become a Member of or Delegate to Congress.

(h) Whenever, in the opinion of the Postmaster General, the public interest requires it.

It is further stipulated and agreed that—

First. In the event of the purchase of the pneumatic-tube system by the United States within the term of this contract, this contract shall be cancelled, without additional compensation to the contractor.

Second. Annulment, cancellation, or termination for any of the causes recited above in this contract shall not impair the right of the Postmaster General to claim damages from the contractor or its sureties and such damages may, for the purpose of setoff or counterclaim in the settlement of any claim of said contractor or its sureties against the United States, whether arising under this contract or otherwise, be assessed and liquidated by the General Accounting Office of the United States.

Third. The Postmaster General reserves the right to withhold from the pay of the contractor such sums as he may deem proper to impose as fines or deductions for failure to furnish and maintain the tube system in a satisfactory state of repair, or for any other cause within the control of the contractor that impairs the efficiency of the tube system.

Fourth. Employees of the contractor engaged in the maintenance and repair of the tube system shall not handle mail.

Fifth. No Member of or Delegate to Congress shall be admitted to any share in or part of this contract or any benefit to arise therefrom.

Sixth. It is further stipulated that the contractor warrants that he has not employed any person to solicit or secure this contract upon any agreement for a commission, percentage, brokerage, or contingent fee. Breach of this warranty shall give the Government the right to annul the contract, or, in its discretion, to deduct from the contract price or consideration the amount of such commission, percentage, brokerage, or contingent fees. This warranty shall not apply to commissions payable by contractors upon contracts or sales secured or made through bona fide established commercial or selling agencies maintained by the contractor for the purpose of securing business.

Seventh. This contract is further to be subject to all the conditions imposed by law and the several acts of Congress relating to post offices and post roads.

Eighth. The New York Mail & Newspaper Transportation Co. and its sureties hereby further warrant that the tubes, powerplants, receiving and dispatching apparatus, machinery, equipment, and devices furnished in connection with the tube system shall not infringe any patent of which they are not the owners or assignees, or otherwise lawfully entitled to use, and do hereby covenant with the said party of the first part and its officers or agents that they will at all times well and truly safekeep and bear harmless and fully indemnify the United States and any of its officers or agents, free from all damages or claims for damages, cost of expense in law or equity, that may at any time arise or be set up for any infringement of the patent right of any person or corporation in consequence of the use by the Department of the tubes, powerplants, receiving and dispatching apparatus, machinery, equipment, or devices furnished by the contractor under this contract for use in connection with the operation of the tube system.

Ninth. The Postmaster General may, in his discretion, continue the contract in force for a period not exceeding 6 months beyond June 30, 1947, the original expiration date of the 5-year term specified herein, provided further, that the contract, if so continued, may be extended by mutual agreement for an additional period not to exceed 6 months.

In witness whereof, the parties hereto have hereunto subscribed their names as of the date first above written.

NEW YORK MAIL & NEWSPAPER TRANSPORTATION CO.,
Carl F. Deitz, *Contractor.*
CARL F. DIETZ, *President.*
(L. Mildred Barnes, witness to signature of contractor.)
LAMSON CORPORATION OF DELAWARE,
F. D. Weeks,
F. D. WEEKS, *Treasurer (Surety).*
(L. Mildred Barnes, witness to signature of surety.)
LAMSON CORP.,
F. D. Weeks,
F. D. WEEKS, *Treasurer (Surety).*
(L. Mildred Barnes, witness to signature of surety.)
The UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
By FRANK O. WALKER,
*Postmaster General.*
(Witness to signature of Postmaster General.)
DOUGLAS WOLF.
Approved as to form and legality:
VINCENT M. MILES,
*Solicitor for the Post Office Department.*
Approved as to terms of contract:
WALTER MYER,
*Fourth Assistant.*

---

CONTRACT FOR THE RENTAL OF PNEUMATIC TUBES ON ROUTE 504001, BOSTON, MASS.

This article of contract, made this 19th day of September 1947 between the United States of America (acting in this behalf by the Postmaster General), and the Boston Pneumatic Transit Co., a corporation created and existing under the laws of the State of Massachusetts, by Carl F. Dietz, its president; and Maryland Casualty Co., of Baltimore, Md., its surety.

Whereas the contract for rental of pneumatic tubes on route 504001, Boston, Mass., beginning February 1, 1937, terminated by limitation January 31, 1947; extended in accordance with its terms for a term of 5 months beginning February 1, 1947, ending June 30, 1947; further extended in accordance with its terms for a term of 1 month beginning July 1, 1947, ending July 31, 1947.

Whereas no proposal has been received in response to an advertisement issued by the Postmaster General on the 21st day of April, 1947, for continuation of pneumatic-tube service at Boston, Mass., and 39 United States Code 434 provides for the making of a temporary contract without advertising.

Witnesseth, that whereas the Boston Pneumatic Transit Co. has been accepted as contractor for furnishing a pneumatic-tube system for the transmission of mail on pneumatic-tube route 504001 connecting the general post office, North Railroad Station, and South Postal Annex in the city of Boston, Mass., for the performance of all the obligations contemplated by this contract at the rate of $24,000 per annum for the entire tube system constructed, accepted, and maintained in accordance with the terms hereof for a term of 11 months beginning August 1, 1947, and ending June 30, 1948.

Now, therefore, the said contractor and its sureties do jointly and severally undertake, covenant, and agree with the United States of America and do bind themselves to—

First. Provide and maintain a pneumatic-tube system connecting the general post office, north railroad station, and south postal annex, consisting of double lines of tubes not less than 8 inches in diameter, inside measurement.

Second. Furnish a powerplant to be operated by electric power and capable of transmitting the carriers at average speed of 30 miles per hour between points connected by tubes, receiving and dispatching apparatus, carriers (mail containers) not less than 6⅞ inches in diameter and 21 inches in length, inside measurement, of uniform construction interchangeable between the several lines, and any other machinery, equipment, or device necessary for the efficient operation of pneumatic tubes.

Third. Have the tube system available for the transmission of mail 20 hours per day on a schedule to be prescribed by the Postmaster General.

Fourth. Repair, in an expeditious manner, the tube lines, powerplant, receiving and dispatching apparatus, carriers, machinery, equipment and devices, constituting the tube system contemplated by this contract.

Fifth. Make repairs to the premises connected with the tube system, resulting from damage occasioned by the installation of the tubes, powerplant, receiving and dispatching apparatus, machinery, equipment, and devices.

Sixth. Remove the tubes, powerplant, receiving and dispatching apparatus, machinery, equipment, and devices from the points connected by the system, at the expiration of the term of the contract, or the termination of the contract, at the expense of the said contractor, if requested to do so by the Postmaster General.

Seventh. Restore the premises upon which alterations have been made to permit of the installation of the tubes, powerplant, receiving and dispatching apparatus, upon discontinuance of tube service at any point connected with the system, to the condition in which they were received, ordinary wear and tear excepted, if requested to do so by the Postmaster General.

Eighth. Discharge any person employed by the contractor in connection with the maintenance and repair of the tube system when requested to do so by the Postmaster General.

Ninth. Change the location of the tube lines and receiving and dispatching apparatus within the building, when such changes are made necessary by reason of the remodeling or rebuilding of the quarters in which the tube terminals are located.

Tenth. Account for, and pay over to the Postmaster General, any money belonging to the United States, which may come into the possession of the contractor, its sureties or employees.

For which service: When properly performed and the evidence thereof shall have been filed in the Office of the Fourth Assistant Postmaster General, the said Boston Pneumatic Transit Co., contractor, is to be paid by the United States at the contract rate hereinbefore named; payments to be made monthly and as soon after the close of each month as accounts can be adjusted and settled; said pay to be subject, however, to be reduced or discontinued by the Postmaster General as hereinafter stipulated.

It is mutually understood and agreed that the Postmaster General will—

First. Allot in the premises under the control of the Department, space for the instal-

tion of the tubes, power plant, receiving and dispatching apparatus, and other appliances necessary in connection with the use of the tube system.

Second. Provide the manpower necessary to operate the tube system.

Third. Furnish electric power necessary for the operation of the tube system.

It is further stipulated and agreed, that the Postmaster General may annul, cancel, and terminate and end this contract for—

(a) Repeated failure of the tube system to operate due to conditions within the control of the contractor.

(b) Repeated failure on the part of the contractor to make necessary repairs to the tube system promptly.

(c) For failure to have the tube system in a condition for efficient operation on August 1, 1947, or within a reasonable time thereafter—the contractor having failed to exercise due diligence in constructing the system.

(d) Violation of the postal laws and the several acts of Congress relating to post offices and post roads and such regulations as are incorporated in the Postal Laws and Regulations, edition of 1940.

(e) Refusal of contractor to discharge any person employed by the contractor in connection with the maintenance and repair of the tube system when requested to do so by the Postmaster General.

(f) Failure of contractor to change the location of the tube lines, and receiving and dispatching apparatus within the building, made necessary by reason of the remodeling or rebuilding of the quarters in which the tube terminals are located.

(g) For failure of the Congress to appropriate funds for the operation of the system.

(h) Whenever the contractor shall become a Member of or Delegate to Congress.

(i) Whenever, in the discretion of the Postmaster General, the public interest so requires.

It is further stipulated and agreed that—

First. In the event of the purchase of the pneumatic tube system by the United States this contract shall be canceled, without additional compensation to the contractor.

Second. Annulment, cancellation, termination or ending for any of the causes recited above in this contract shall not impair the right of the Postmaster General to claim damages from the contractor or its sureties and such damages may, for the purpose of set-off or counterclaim in the settlement of any claim of said contractor or its sureties against the United States, whether arising under this contract or otherwise, be assessed and liquidated by the General Accounting Office of the United States.

Third. The Postmaster General reserves the right to withhold from the pay of the contractor such sums as he may deem proper to impose as fines or deductions for failure to furnish and maintain the tube system in a satisfactory state of repair, or for any other cause within the control of the contractor that impairs the efficiency of the tube system.

Fourth. Employees of the contractor engaged in the maintenance and repair of the tube system shall not handle mail, but will be required to take the oath of office prescribed by Section 30 of the Postal Laws and Regulations, Edition of 1940.

Fifth. No Member of or Delegate to Congress shall be admitted to any share in or part of this contract or any benefit to arise therefrom.

Sixth. It is further stipulated, that the contractor warrants that he has not employed any person to solicit or secure this contract upon any agreement for a commission, percentage, brokerage, or contingent fee. Breach of this warranty shall give the Government the right to annul the contract, or, in its discretion, to deduct from the contract price or consideration the amount of such commission, percentage, brokerage, or contingent fees. This warranty shall not apply to commissions payable by contractors upon contracts or sales secured or made through bona fide established commercial or selling agencies maintained by the contractor for the purpose of securing business.

Seventh. This contract is further to be subjected to all the conditions imposed by law and the several acts of Congress relating to Post Offices and Post Roads.

Eighth. The Boston Pneumatic Transit Co. and its sureties hereby further warrant that the tubes, powerplant, receiving and dispatching apparatus, machinery, equipment and devices, furnished in connection with the tube system shall not infringe any patent of which they are not the owners or assignees, or otherwise lawfully entitled to use, and do hereby covenant with the said party of the first part and its officers or agents that they will at all times well and truly safekeep and bear harmless, and fully indemnify the United States and any of its officers or agents, free from all damages or claims for damages, cost of expense in law or equity, that may at any time arise or be set up for any infringement of the patent right of any person or corporation in consequence of the use by the Department of the tubes, powerplant, receiving and dispatching apparatus, machinery, equipment or devices furnished by the contractor under this contract for use in connection with the operation of the tube system.

In witness whereof, the Fourth Assistant Postmaster General, acting for the Postmaster General in accordance with the provisions of 39 United States Code 430, has signed and attested this contract and caused the great seal of the Post Office Department to be affixed thereto on the date and year hereinafter stated.

WALTER MYERS,
*Fourth Assistant Postmaster General.*

---

STATE OF NEW YORK,
*County of Onondaga, ss:*

Sworn before the subscriber, postmaster at Syracuse, State of New York, this 19th day of September A. D. 1947; and I also certify that the person above named is not a postmaster, assistant postmaster, or a clerk employed in a postoffice, nor a member of the immediate family of a postmaster, or assistant postmaster, and is, to the best of my knowledge and belief, above the age of 21 years.

MYRON J. PARKINSON,
*Acting Postmaster of Syracuse, N. Y.*

---

*New York Mail & Newspaper Transportation Co.—Schedule of salaries and wages paid, calendar year 1947*

| | |
|---|---|
| J. F. Devaney, superintendent | $7,800.00 |
| P. J. Donohue, engineer | 5,433.34 |
| Frederick Landen, engineer | 4,875.47 |
| Michael Griffin | 3,976.01 |
| Arthur Naylor | 3,867.33 |
| Charles Nemec | 3,639.04 |
| John Schlitt | 3,417.98 |
| Charles Shaw | 3,301.81 |
| Hugh Gallagher | 3,250.29 |
| William Gray | 2,866.40 |
| Benjamin Rauschkolb | 2,855.51 |
| William Sheridan | 2,788.30 |
| Salvatore Albanese | 2,607.32 |
| William Ladislaw | 2,386.99 |
| Linzor West | 2,385.95 |
| Eugene T. Gibbons | 2,250.10 |
| Antonio Sabatino | 174.83 |
| Sam Sabatino | 149.85 |
| Total | 58,035.52 |
| In addition there was paid to Lamson Corp. of Delaware for services rendered by officers, executives, and clerical help | 6,336.46 |
| Total | 64,371.98 |

EXHIBIT 5

[S. Rept. No. 1241, 80th Cong., 2d sess.]

PROVIDING FOR CERTAIN ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES IN THE POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT, INCLUDING RETAINMENT OF PNEUMATIC-TUBE SYSTEMS

Mr. LANGER, from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, submitted the following report to accompany S. 2510:

The Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, having considered the bill (S. 2510) intended to permit adjustment of rates of payment for retainment of pneumatic tube distribution service in New York City, including the Borough of Brooklyn, report favorably thereon and recommend that the bill, without amendment, do pass.

GENERAL STATEMENT

During the final decade of the 19th century, the Post Office Department began developing the distribution of mail in several of the larger cities by way of pneumatic tubes. Notable installations included New York City, Boston, Philadelphia, Chicago, and St. Louis.

During the earlier years of operation of pneumatic tube facilities the Post Office Department invited bid proposals in several other cities, including Washington, D. C., Kansas City, Mo., San Francisco, Pittsburgh, Baltimore, and Cincinnati. In certain instances, no proposals were submitted and in others pneumatic tube service was discontinued at the instance of Postmaster General Burleson and later never resumed.

The pneumatic tube operations in New York City, including Brooklyn, and in Boston, have continued down through the years. In New York City, 26.969 miles of double tube are in operation. The owner of the tube system is the New York Mail & Newspaper Transportation Co., a subsidiary of the Lamson Corp., of Delaware.

The present tube system services the following post offices and stations in Greater New York: Church Street Annex to Canal Station; Canal Station to Station A; Station A to Station O; Station O to the General Post Office; General Post Office to Times Square Station; General Post Office to Grand Central Annex; Times Square Station to Station G; Station G to Station N; Station N to Sta-W; Station W to Station H; Station H to Station I; Station I to Station J; Station J to Station L; Grand Central Annex to Station Y; Station Y to Station K; Station K to Station U; Station U to Station L; Church Street Annex to Station D; Station D to Madison Square Station; Madison Square Station to Station F to Grand Central Annex; Church Street Annex to Station P via Wall Street Sation; Church Street Annex to General Post Office, Brooklyn.

Pneumatic mail tubes are reminders of the systems in department stores through which cash and credit transactions are cleared from various points in the store to a central office, except that, in the cases of mail installations, the tubes are much larger. The containers are 2 feet long and 8 inches in diameter, of stainless metal moving through lubricated cylinders to their destinations. Approximately 5 million pieces of mail daily have been distributed for almost 50 years through the Greater New York system. The inside measurement of the cylinders is 22 inches long and 7 inches in diameter. They weigh approximately 21 pounds, each cylinder having a capacity of 9 pounds and holding as many as 400 or 500 letters. The cylinders are dispatched at intervals of 12 seconds and travel at the rate of 30 miles per hour. Air compressors supply the motive power.

The general post office in Manhattan is the nerve center for the entire system. The approximately 27 miles of double-track tube cross and recross Manhattan, linking the 22 substations together and with the general

post office in Brooklyn. From the Battery, these tubes extend to the main post office in Brooklyn and in Manhattan. Some of the lines are on the subway roof while others are below the roof. Upon arriving at the Chrysler Building the tubes go 12 feet below the skyscraper. They are 18 feet below Grand Central Station.

This system is a private invention, leased annually by the Government from the New York Mail & Newspaper Transportation Co., which company maintains the system in working order, although the post office supplies the manpower for its operation.

The tubes are in service daily from 5 a. m. to 10 p. m. except on Saturday when they cease operation at 10 a. m. The system is not in operation on Sundays or on legal holidays. A full day's operation means that approximately 95,000 tube carriers have traveled all or part of the entire distance of the system. On the outside of each tube carrier there is a label showing the destination of the carrier, which is not opened until it reaches the proper destination. Registered mail, under the usual precautions, is part of the delivery system through the tubes.

Test carriers are sent through the tube lines before daily operations begin. Pressure of from 3 to 8 pounds per inch is maintained.

The value of the pneumatic-tube system was dramatically brought into bold relief during Christmas week of 1947 when a 22.8-inch snowfall all but paralyzed New York City but in no way interrupted the orderly distribution of mails through this well-established pneumatic-tube device.

Today when mail matter must move quickly to meet all kinds of timetable deadlines—plane, railroad, and steamer—to insure its early delivery, the underground pneumatic-tube system is invaluable. Without it the post office would have to operate a larger fleet of trucks to transport the mail.

Pneumatic-tube service is used for the transportation of ordinary letter mail, air-mail, special-delivery mail, registered mail, daily newspapers in limited quantities, and miscellaneous letter-size pieces.

Pneumatic-tube service is dependable inasmuch as it is not affected generally by street surface traffic or by weather conditions.

The present pneumatic-tube system has a distinct value as a medium of transportation for first-class mail because of the effectiveness of the system, connecting as it does 23 points including the General Post Office in Brooklyn, thus establishing a circular system converging at Church Street Station, provision being made for a cross-town service between east- and west-side lines, from the General Post Office to Grand Central Station, and from Manhattanville to Triborough Stations.

The committee fully recognizes the fact that the lessors of the pneumatic-tube system in Greater New York are entitled to a fair return on the expense of maintaining the network; at the same time the committee is mindful of the duty of the Post Office Department to provide the best methods of transmission at the lowest possible cost.

It is appropriate, therefore, that there be a flexibility provided for the convenience of both parties in a day of rising replacement and maintenance costs and rapid depreciations. Therefore, the committee has established a minimum and a maximum rate between which the Post Office Department is left with considerable latitude for receiving bids and bidders are left with the same leeway in preparing and submitting proposals for the supply of the facilities. The amounts of $10,500 as a minimum and $12,000 as a maximum rate, therefore, have been proposed. The present rate is $9,382 per mile.

EXHIBIT 6

[Public Law 848—80th Cong.]

[Chapter 761—2d sess.]

[S. 2510]

An act to provide for certain administrative expenses in the Post Office Department, including retainment of pneumatic-tube systems, and for other purposes

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That the provisions of the acts of April 21, 1902; May 27, 1908; and June 19, 1922 (39 U. S. C. 423), relating to contracts for transmission of mail by pneumatic tubes in New York, N. Y., including the borough of Brooklyn, are hereby amended to provide that the annual rental contract payment rate for the use of the 26.969 miles of double-line pneumatic-tube facilities shall not exceed $12,000 per mile: *Provided, however*, That the rate shall be inclusive of maintenance expenses but shall be exclusive of all operating expenses.

Approved June 30, 1948.

---

EXHIBIT 7

[H. Rept. 2431, 80th Cong., 2d sess.]

PROVIDING FOR CERTAIN ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES IN THE POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT, INCLUDING RETAINMENT OF PNEUMATIC-TUBE SYSTEMS

Mr. REES, from the committee of conference, submitted the following conference report to accompany S. 2510:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 2510) to provide for certain administrative expenses in the Post Office Department, including retainment of pneumatic-tube systems, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the House amendment insert the following: $12,000; and the House agree to the same.

EDWARD H. REES,
KATHARINE ST. GEORGE,
TOM MURRAY,
*Managers on the Part of the House.*

WILLIAM LANGER,
ZALES N. ECTON,
HERBERT R. O'CONOR,
*Managers on the Part of the Senate.*

STATEMENT OF THE MANAGERS ON THE PART OF THE HOUSE

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 2510) to provide for certain administrative expenses in the Post Office Department, including retainment of pneumatic-tube systems, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

The Senate bill amends the provisions of law relating to contracts for transmission of mail by pneumatic tubes in New York, N. Y., including the Borough of Brooklyn, so as to provide that the annual rental contract payment rate for the use of the 26.969 miles of double-line pneumatic-tube facilities shall not exceed $12,000 per mile nor be less than $10,500 per mile.

The amendment of the House provided that the maximum rate should not exceed $11,000 per mile, and eliminated the minimum payment figure contained in the Senate bill.

The conference agreement restores the $12,000 per mile maximum rate as provided by the Senate bill, and eliminates the $10,500 per mile minimum in accordance with the House amendment.

EDWARD H. REES,
KATHARINE ST. GEORGE,
TOM MURRAY,
*Managers on the Part of the House.*

---

EXHIBIT 8

OFFICE OF THE POSTMASTER GENERAL,
*Washington, D. C., August 25, 1950.*

The VICE PRESIDENT,
*United States Senate.*

MY DEAR MR. VICE PRESIDENT: I am submitting herewith, for consideration by the Congress, legislation relating to contracts for the transmission of mail by pneumatic tubes or other mechanical devices.

The legislation is designed to clarify and enact into positive law, the provisions of law relating to the transmission of mail by pneumatic tubes or other mechanical devices. The present laws on this subject, which would be repealed by the proposed legislation are contained in prior appropriation acts (sec. 423, title 39, United States Code), as amended by the act of June 30, 1948 (Public Law 848, 80th Cong.). The provisions codified in 39 U. S. C. 423 were contained in the act of April 21, 1902 (32 Stat. 114), as amended by the acts of March 2, 1907 (34 Stat. 1211), May 27, 1908 (35 Stat. 412), and June 19, 1922 (42 Stat. 661).

Under existing law the amount permitted to be paid the contractor for the use of pneumatic tubes is limited to $17,000 per mile per annum which "shall cover power, labor, and all operating expenses," except in the city of New York, including the borough of Brooklyn, where not to exceed $12,000 per mile, inclusive of maintenance expenses, but exclusive of operating expenses, may be paid under authority of the act of June 30, 1948. The limitation of $17,000 was fixed by the act of April 21, 1902, and, with the exception of the increase in amount to be paid per annum in the city of New York, including the borough of Brooklyn, has not been modified.

The act of April 21, 1902, also prohibited contracts for the transmission of mail by pneumatic-tube service "which will create an aggregate annual rate of expenditure, including necessary power and labor to operate the tubes, and all other expenses of such service in excess of 4 percent of the gross postal revenue" of the city in which such service would be established. This provision of the 1902 act is obsolete.

At the present time contracts are in effect for the transmission of mails by pneumatic-tube service at Boston, Mass., and New York, N. Y. The contracts expire December 31, 1950.

This legislative proposal transmitted herewith would permit the Postmaster General to enter into contracts, for terms of not to exceed 10 years (the terms now authorized by law), for the transmission of mails by pneumatic tubes or other mechanical devices. The maximum per annum rate authorized to be paid for such service at New York would be increased from not to exceed $12,000 per mile to not to exceed $15,500 per mile for a period of 10 years, after which time the annual rate of expenditures per mile shall not exceed $12,000. The per annum rate paid at other cities for the transmission of mails by pneumatic tubes would be at the most favorable rates obtainable, subject to amounts appropriated therefor by Congress.

It is estimated that the enactment of this legislation will not increase the expenditures of this Department more than $53,000 per annum.

As the existing contracts expire December 31, 1950, it is urged that the proposed legislation be enacted during the present session of Congress.

The Bureau of the Budget has advised this Department that there would be no objection to the presentation of this draft bill for the consideration of the Congress.

Sincerely yours,

J. M. DONALDSON,
*Postmaster General.*

---

EXHIBIT 9

COMPTROLLER GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES,
*Washington, August 30, 1950.*

Hon. OLIN D. JOHNSTON,
*Chairman, Committee on Post Office and Civil Service,*
*United States Senate.*

MY DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I have your letter of August 29, 1950, transmitting a copy of a bill—introduced on August 28, 1950, as S. 4102—entitled "A bill relating to contracts for the transmission of mail by pneumatic tubes or other mechanical devices," together with a copy of a report of the Postmaster General relative thereto.

As indicated in the report of the Postmaster General, the bill, if enacted, would clarify and enact into positive law the various provisions of existing law relating to the transmission of mail by pneumatic tubes or other mechanical devices. However, it is noted that under the bill the limitation contained in existing law limiting the amount permitted to be paid to contractors—other than in the city of New York including the Borough of Manhattan—to $17,000 per mile per annum which "shall cover power, labor, and all operating expenses" would be entirely removed. Also, the bill would increase for the next 10 years the amount which, under existing law, may be expended for such services in the city of New York, including the Borough of Manhattan, from $12,000 to $15,500 per mile per annum, inclusive of maintenance expenses but exclusive of operating expenses.

While this office has no information as to the need or desirability of removing or changing the limitations contained in existing law as noted above, the general purposes of the legislation do not appear objectionable.

Sincerely yours,

LINDSAY C. WARREN,
*Comptroller General of the United States.*

---

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON POST OFFICE AND CIVIL SERVICE,
*August 25, 1950.*

Hon. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
*United States Senate,*
*Washington, D. C.*

DEAR SENATOR HUMPHREY: Because of the urgency of the legislation covered by the attached suggested draft and explained in the letter from the Postmaster General to the Vice President, I am, at the request of the Department, endeavoring to expedite action on this measure in every possible way.

We should have the Vice President's referral by Monday and since this referral is routine it occurs to me that you may wish to read this over and authorize me to prepare a bill for you to introduce on Monday which might possibly be considered by your subcommittee informally through a discussion by you and Senators FREAR and ECTON so that the bill could be submitted to the full committee on Wednesday, August 30, since this may be the last committee meeting for several weeks.

I realize that this is proceeding much faster than usual but we do not have to worry as to agency reports since we have the approval of the Post Office Department and the Bureau of the Budget on the proposed legislation and I think I can clear it with the Comptroller General by Wednesday.

You will note from the first paragraph on page 2 of the Postmaster General's letter that certain pneumatic-tube contracts in New York and Boston will expire on December 31, and it is important that there be congressional action on this matter as early as possible to avoid the danger of the legislation going over to the 82d Congress.

With kindest regards, I am,

Sincerely yours,

J. AUSTIN LATIMER,
*Staff Director and Chief Clerk.*

---

EXHIBIT 10

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the Postmaster General may enter into contracts, for terms not exceeding 10 years, for the transmission of mail by pneumatic tubes or other mechanical devices.

SEC. 2. Contracts for the transmission of mail by pneumatic tubes or other mechanical devices shall be subject to the provisions of laws relating to the letting of mail contracts, except as otherwise provided in this act. Advertisements shall state in general terms only the requirements of the service and shall be in the form best calculated to invite competitive bidding. The Postmaster General may reject any and all bids. No contract shall be awarded except to the lowest responsible bidder tendering full and sufficent guaranties to the satisfaction of the Postmaster General of his ability to perform satisfactory service.

SEC. 3. In the city of New York, including the Borough of Brooklyn, the annual rate of expenditure for the transmission of mail by pneumatic tubes shall not exceed $15,500 per mile per annum of double line pneumatic-tube facilities for a period of 10 years, after which time the annual rate of expenditures per mile shall not exceed $12,000. This rate shall be inclusive of maintenance expenses but shall be exclusive of all operating expenses.

SEC. 4. All laws or parts of laws inconsistent or in conflict with this act are hereby repealed. This shall include, but is not limited to, the following laws:

(a) The provisions of the acts of April 21, 1902; March 2, 1907; May 27, 1908; and June 19, 1922 (39 U. S. C. 423), relating to contracts for transmission of mail by pneumatic tubes; and

(b) The act entitled "An act to provide for certain administrative expenses in the Post Office Department, including retainment of pneumatic-tube systems, and for other purposes," approved June 30, 1948 (62 Stat. 1163).

The Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, to whom was referred the bill (S. 4102), relating to contracts for the transmission of mail by pneumatic tubes or other mechanical devices, having considered the same, report favorably thereon without amendment and recommend that the bill do pass.

STATEMENT

This bill is designed to clarify and consolidate the provisions of existing law relating to the transmission of mail by pneumatic tubes or other mechanical devices. This legislation is made necessary by reason of the fact that some provisions of existing statutes are obsolete and others need revision.

The bill was introduced at the request of the Postmaster General. This measure would permit the Postmaster General to enter into contracts, for terms of not more than 10 years, for the transmission of mail by pneumatic tubes or other mechanical devices. The maximum per annum rate authorized to be paid for such service at New York would be increased from not to exceed $12,000 per mile to an amount not exceeding $15,500 per mile, for a period of 10 years, after which time the annual rate shall not exceed $12,000 per mile. The bill permits annual rates for pneumatic service in other cities at the most favorable rates obtainable, subject to amounts appropriated therefor by the Congress.

Cost: The Post Office Department estimates that the additional cost from this legislation will not exceed $53,000 per annum.

AGENCY REPORTS

The attached letter from the Postmaster General sets forth the need for this legislation. The Bureau of the Budget interposes no objection to the introduction of this bill. The attached report from the Comptroller General calls to the committee's attention the fact that, except as to New York City, ceilings existing in present law are removed. The committee, however, feels that the language of the bill and the requirement as to competitive bidding are sufficient on this point.

OFFICE OF THE POSTMASTER GENERAL,
*Washington, D. C., August 25, 1950.*

The VICE PRESIDENT,
*United States Senate,*

MY DEAR MR. VICE PRESIDENT: I am submitting herewith, for consideration by the Congress, legislation relating to contracts for the transmission of mail by pneumatic tubes or other mechanical devices.

The legislation is designed to clarify and enact into positive law, the provisions of law relating to the transmission of mail by pneumatic tubes or other mechanical devices. The present laws on this subject, which would be repealed by the proposed legislation, are contained in prior appropriation acts (sec. 423, title 39, U. S. C.), as amended by the act of June 30, 1948 (Public Law 848, 80th Cong.). The provisions codified in 39 United States Code 423 were contained in the act of April 21, 1902 (32 Stat. 114), as amended by the acts of March 2, 1907 (34 Stat. 1211), May 27, 1908 (35 Stat. 412), and June 19, 1922 (42 Stat. 661).

Under existing law the amount permitted to be paid the contractor for the use of pneumatic tubes is limited to $17,000 per mile per annum which "shall cover power, labor, and all operating expenses," except in the city of New York, including the Borough of Brooklyn, where not to exceed $12,000 per mile, inclusive of maintenance expenses, but exclusive of operating expenses, may be paid under authority of the act of June 30, 1948. The limitation of $17,000 was fixed by the act of April 21, 1902, and, with the exception of the increase in amount to be paid per annum in the city of New York, including the Borough of Brooklyn, has not been modified.

The act of April 21, 1902, also prohibited contracts for the transmission of mail by pneumatic-tube service "which will create an aggregate annual rate of expenditure, including necessary power and labor to operate the tubes, and all other expenses of such service in excess of 4 percent of the gross postal revenue" of the city in which such service would be established. This provision of the 1902 act is obsolete.

At the present time contracts are in effect for the transmission of mails by pneumatic-tube service at Boston, Mass., and New York, N. Y. The contracts expire December 31, 1950.

The legislative proposal transmitted herewith would permit the Postmaster General to enter into contracts, for terms of not to exceed 10 years (the terms now authorized by law), for the transmission of mails by pneumatic tubes or other mechanical devices. The maximum per annum rate authorized to be paid for such service at New York would be increased from not to exceed $12,000 per mile to not to exceed $15,500 per mile for a period of 10 years, after which time the anual rate of expenditures per mile shall not exceed $12,000. The per annum rate paid at other cities for the transmission of mails by pneumatic tubes would be at the most favorable rates obtainable, subject to amounts appropriated therefor by Congress.

It is estimated that the enactment of this legislation will not increase the expenditures

of this Department more than $53,000 per annum.

As the existing contracts expire December 31, 1950, it is urged that the proposed legislation be enacted during the present session of Congress.

The Bureau of the Budget has advised this Department that there would be no objection to the presentation of this draft bill for the consideration of the Congress.

Sincerely yours,

J. M. DONALDSON,
*Postmaster General.*

---

COMPTROLLER GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES,
*Washington, August 30, 1950.*

Hon. OLIN D. JOHNSTON,
*Chairman, Committee on Post Office and Civil Service,*
*United States Senate.*

MY DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I have your letter of August 29, 1950, transmitting a copy of a bill—introduced on August 28, 1950, as S. 4102—entitled "A bill relating to contracts for the transmission of mail by pneumatic tubes or other mechanical devices," together with a copy of a report of the Postmaster General relative thereto.

As indicated in the report of the Postmaster General, the bill, if enacted, would clarify and enact into positive law the various provisions of existing law relating to the transmission of mail by pneumatic tubes or other mechanical devices. However, it is noted that under the bill the limitation contained in existing law limiting the amount permitted to be paid to contractors—other than in the city of New York including the borough of Manhattan—to $17,000 per mile per annum which "shall cover power, labor, and all operating expenses" would be entirely removed. Also, the bill would increase for the next 10 years the amount which, under existing law, may be expended for such services in the city of New York, including the borough of Manhattan, from $12,000 to $15,500 per mile per annum, inclusive of maintenance expenses but exclusive of operating expenses.

While this office has no information as to the need or desirability of removing or changing the limitations contained in existing law as noted above, the general purposes of the legislation do not appear objectionable.

Sincerely yours,

LINDSAY C. WARREN,
*Comptroller General of the United States.*

---

CHANGES IN EXISTING LAW

In compliance with subsection (4) of rule XXIX, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, changes in existing law made by the bill (S. 4102), as reported, are shown as follows (existing law proposed to be omitted is enclosed in black brackets).

ACT OF APRIL 21, 1902

"Act of April 21, 1902, making approriations for the service of the Post Office Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1903 (32 Stat. 114).

"[For the transmission of mail by pneumatic tubes or other similar devices, $500,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary: and the Postmaster General is hereby authorized to enter into contracts for a period not exceeding 4 years, after public advertisement once a week for a period of 6 consecutive weeks in not less than 5 newspapers, 1 of which shall be published in each city where the service is to be performed. That the contracts for this service shall be subject to the provisions of the postal laws and regulations relating to the letting of mail contracts, except as herein otherwise provided, and that no advertisement shall issue until after a careful investigation shall have been made as to the needs and practicability of such service and until a favorable report, in writing, shall have been submitted to the Postmaster General by a commission of not less than three expert postal officials, to be named by him; nor shall such advertisement issue until in the judgment of the Postmaster General the needs of the postal service are such as to justify the expenditure involved. Advertisements shall state in general terms only the requirements of the service and in form best calculated to invite competitive bidding.]

"[That the Postmaster General shall have the right to reject any and all bids; that no contract shall be awarded except to the lowest responsible bidder, tendering full and sufficient guaranties, to the satisfaction of the Postmaster General, of his ability to perform satisfactory service, and such guaranties shall include an approval bond in double the amount of the bid.]

"[That no contract shall be entered into in any city for the character of mail service herein provided which will create an aggregate annual rate of expenditure, including necessary power and labor to operate the tubes, and all other expenses of such service in excess of four per centum of the gross postal revenue of said city for the last preceding fiscal year.]

"[That no contract shall be made in any city providing for 3 miles or more of double lines of tube which shall involve an expenditure in excess of $17,000 per mile per annum, and said compensation shall cover power, labor, and all operating expenses.]

"[That the Postmaster General shall not, prior to June 30, 1904, enter into contracts under the provisions of this act involving an annual expenditure in the aggregate in excess of $800,000; and thereafter only such contracts shall be made as may from time to time be provided for in the annual appropriation act for the postal service; and all provisions of law contrary to those herein contained are repealed]."

ACT OF MARCH 2, 1907, MAKING APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE SERVICE OF THE POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT FOR THE FISCAL YEAR ENDING JUNE 30, 1908, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES (34 STAT. 1211)

"[For the transmission of mail by pneumatic tubes or other similar devices, $1,250,000, and the Postmaster General is hereby authorized to enter into contracts not exceeding, in the aggregate, $1,388,759, under the provisions of the law, for a period not exceeding 10 years: *Provided*, That said service shall not be extended in any cities other than those in which the service is now under contract under authority of Congress, except the Borough of Brooklyn, of the city of New York, and the cities of Baltimore, Md.; Cincinnati, Ohio; Kansas City, Mo.; Pittsburgh, Pa.; and San Francisco, Calif.]"

ACT OF MAY 27, 1908, MAKING APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE SERVICE OF THE POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT FOR THE FISCAL YEAR ENDING JUNE 30, 1909, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES (35 STAT. 412)

"[For the transmission of mail by pneumatic tubes or other similar devices, $1 million; and the Postmasteer-General is hereby authorized to enter into contracts not exceeding, in the aggregate, $1,388,759, under the provisions of the law, for a period not exceeding 10 years.]

"[And the Postmaster General is hereby authorized and directed to investigate and report to Congress not later than January 1, 1909, the feasibility and desirability of the Government purchasing or installing the equipment for pneumatic-tube service, and thereafter operating the same in the cities where such service is now in operation, and also ascertain and report the approximate cost of purchase and likewise of installation and the cost of maintenance and operation]"

ACT OF JUNE 19, 1922, MAKING APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT FOR THE FISCAL YEAR ENDING JUNE 30, 1923, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES (42 STAT. 661)

"[SEC. 5. For the transmission of mail by pneumatic tubes or other similar devices in the city of New York, including the Borough of Brooklyn of the city of New York, at an annual rate of expenditure not in excess of $18,500 per mile of double line of tubes, including power, labor, and all other operating expenses, $513,911.50: *Provided*, That the provisions not inconsistent herewith of the acts of April 21, 1902, and May 27, 1908, relating to the transmission of mail by pneumatic tubes or other similar devices, shall be applicable hereto: *Provided further*, That either party to the contract for the transmission of mail by pneumatic tubes or other similar devices may apply to the Interstate Commerce Commission at any time after October 1, 1922, and before July 1, 1923, for a revision of this rate, its decision to be effective after July 1, 1923, but in no case shall the rate exceed $19,500 per mile.]"

ACT OF JUNE 30, 1948 (62 STAT. 1163) TO PROVIDE FOR CERTAIN ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES IN THE POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT, INCLUDING RETAINMENT OF PNEUMATIC-TUBE SYSTEMS, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

"[That the provisions of the acts of April 21, 1902; May 27, 1908; and June 19, 1922, relating to contracts for transmission of mail by pneumatic tubes in New York, N. Y., including the Borough of Brooklyn, are hereby amended to provide that the annual rental contract payment rate for the use of the 26.969 miles of double-line pneumatic-tube facilities shall not exceed $12,000 per mile: *Provided, however*, That the rate shall be inclusive of maintenance expenses but shall be exclusive of all operating expenses.]"

---

[H. Rept. No. 3144, 81st Cong., 2d sess.]

CONTRACTS FOR THE TRANSMISSION OF MAIL BY PNEUMATIC TUBES

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee, from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, submitted the following report to accompany S. 4102:

The Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, to whom was referred the bill (S. 4102) relating to contracts for the transmission of mail by pneumatic tubes or other mechanical devices, having considered the same, report favorably thereon without amendment and recommend that the bill do pass.

STATEMENT

This bill will permit the Postmaster General to enter into contracts for terms of not to exceed 10 years (the terms now authorized by law), for the transmission of mails by pneumatic tubes or other mechanical devices. The maximum per annum rate authorized to be paid for such service at New York would be increased from not to exceed $12,000 per mile to not to exceed $15,500 per mile for a period of 10 years, after which time the annual rate of expenditures per mile shall not exceed $12,000.

The owners of the pneumatic-tube system in New York City must convert the system from nonstandard direct current to standard alternating current. The source of power supply, the Consolidated Edison Co. of New York, Inc., has requested that it be advised on or before December 31, 1950, whether or not the power machinery operating the pneumatic-tube system will be converted to the use of alternating current. If this concern is notified that the conversion will be made, then it will continue to supply nonstandard direct current for a reasonable length of time in order to permit the work of making the conversion to be completed.

The exact cost of the conversion cannot be determined accurately without detailed field investigation, but it is estimated that the conversion cost will approximate $300,000. The owners of the tube system operating in the city of New York, the New York Mail & Newspaper Transportation Co., cannot absorb the expense of making this conversion of the machinery, pay operating and maintenance expenses, and obtain a fair profit on its capital outlay at the existing statutory rate of pay, namely, $12,000 per mile.

The per annum rate paid at other cities for the transmission of mails by pneumatic tubes will be at the most favorable rates obtainable, subject to amounts appropriated therefor by Congress.

The bill also clarifies existing law with respect to such pneumatic-tube contracts. These contracts expire December 31, 1950, and expeditious action on this legislation is required in order that its terms may be utilized in negotiations for the new contract.

The Post Office Department estimates the enactment of this legislation will not increase expenditures of the Department in excess of $53,000 per annum. The legislation has the approval of the Bureau of the Budget and was introduced at the request of the Post Office Department.

The letter sent to the Speaker of the House with regard to this legislation is as follows:

OFFICE OF THE POSTMASTER GENERAL,
*Washington, D. C., August 25, 1950.*

Hon. SAM RAYBURN,
*Speaker of the House of Representatives.*

MY DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I am submitting herewith, for consideration by the Congress, legislation relating to contracts for the transmission of mail by pneumatic tubes or other mechanical devices.

The legislation is designed to clarify, and enact into positive law, the provisions of law relating to the transmission of mail by pneumatic tubes or other mechanical devices. The present laws on this subject, which would be repealed by the proposed legislation, are contained in prior appropriation acts (sec. 423, title 39, U. S. C.), as amended by the act of June 30, 1948 (Public Law 848, 80th Cong.). The provisions codified in 39 United States Code 423 were contained in the act of April 21, 1902 (32 Stat. 114), as amended by the acts of March 2, 1907 (34 Stat. 1211), May 27, 1908 (35 Stat. 412), and June 19, 1922 (42 Stat. 661).

Under existing law the amount permitted to be paid the contractor for the use of pneumatic tubes is limited to $17,000 per mile per annum which "shall cover power, labor, and all operating expenses," except in the city of New York, including the Borough of Brooklyn, where not to exceed $12,000 per mile, inclusive of maintenance expenses, but exclusive of operating expenses, may be paid under authority of the act of June 30, 1948. The limitation of $17,000 was fixed by the act of April 21, 1902, and, with the exception of the increase in amount to be paid per annum in the city of New York, including the Borough of Brooklyn, has not been modified.

The act of April 21, 1902, also prohibited contracts for the transmission of mail by pneumatic-tube service "which will create an aggregate annual rate of expenditure, including necessary power and labor to operate the tubes, and all other expenses of such service in excess of 4 percent of the gross postal revenue" of the city in which such service would be established. This provision of the 1902 act is obsolete.

At the present time contracts are in effect for the transmission of mails by pneumatic-tube service at Boston, Mass., and New York, N. Y. The contracts expire December 31, 1950.

This legislative proposal transmitted herewith would permit the Postmaster General to enter into contracts, for terms of not to exceed 10 years (the terms now authorized by law), for the transmission of mails by pneumatic tubes or other mechanical devices. The maximum per annum rate authorized to be paid for such service at New York would be increased from not to exceed $12,000 per mile to not to exceed $15,500 per mile for a period of 10 years, after which time the annual rate of expenditures per mile shall not exceed $12,000. The per annum rate paid at other cities for the transmission of mails by pneumatic tubes would be at the most favorable rates obtainable, subject to amounts appropriated therefor by Congress.

It is estimated that the enactment of this legislation will not increase the expenditures of this Department more than $53,000 per annum.

As the existing contracts expire December 31, 1950, it is urged that the proposed legislation be enacted during the present session of Congress.

The Bureau of the Budget has advised this Department that there would be no objection to the presentation of this draft bill for the consideration of the Congress.

Sincerely yours,

J. M. DONALDSON,
*Postmaster General.*

---

CHANGES IN EXISTING LAW

In compliance with paragraph 2a of rule XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, changes in existing law made by the bill, as passed the Senate, are shown as follows (existing law proposed to be omitted is enclosed in black brackets):

ACT OF APRIL 21, 1902, MAKING APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE SERVICE OF THE POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT FOR THE FISCAL YEAR ENDING JUNE 30, 1903 (32 STAT. 114)

"[For the transmission of mail by pneumatic tubes or other similar devices, $500,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary; and the Postmaster General is hereby authorized to enter into contracts for a period not exceeding 4 years, after public advertisement once a week for a period of 6 consecutive weeks in not less than five newspapers, one of which shall be published in each city where the service is to be performed. That the contracts for this service shall be subject to the provisions of the postal laws and regulations relating to the letting of mail contracts, except as herein otherwise provided, and that no advertisement shall issue until after a careful investigation shall have been made as to the needs and practicability of such service and until a favorable report, in writing, shall have been submitted to the Postmaster General by a commission of not less than three expert postal officials, to be named by him; nor shall such advertisement issue until in the judgment of the Postmaster General the needs of the postal service are such as to justify the expenditure involved. Advertisements shall state in general terms only the requirements of the service and in form best calculated to invite competitive bidding.

"[That the Postmaster-General shall have the right to reject any and all bids; that no contract shall be awarded except to the lowest responsible bidder, tendering full and sufficient guaranties, to the satisfaction of the Postmaster-General, of his ability to perform satisfactory service, and such guaranties shall include an approval bond in double the amount of the bid.

"[That no contract shall be entered into in any city for the character of mail service herein provided which will create an aggregate annual rate of expenditure, including necessary power and labor to operate the tubes, and all other expenses of such service in excess of 4 percent of the gross postal revenue of said city for the last preceding fiscal year.

"[That no contract shall be made in any city providing for 3 miles or more of double lines of tube which shall involve an expenditure in excess of $17,000 per mile per annum, and said compensation shall cover power, labor, and all operating expenses.

"[That the Postmaster-General shall not, prior to June 30, 1904, enter into contracts under the provisions of this act involving an annual expenditure in the aggregate in excess of $800,000; and thereafter only such contracts shall be made as may from time to time be provided for in the annual appropriation act for the postal service; and all provisions of law contrary to those herein contained are repealed.]"

ACT OF MARCH 2, 1907, MAKING APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE SERVICE OF THE POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT FOR THE FISCAL YEAR ENDING JUNE 30, 1908, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES (34 STAT. 1211)

"[For the transmission of mail by pneumatic tubes or other similar devices, $1,250,000, and the Postmaster General is hereby authorized to enter into contracts not exceeding, in the aggregate, $1,388,759, under the provisions of the law, for a period not exceeding 10 years: *Provided*, That said service shall not be extended in any cities other than those in which the service is now under contract under authority of Congress, except the Borough of Brooklyn, of the city of New York, and the cities of Baltimore, Md.; Cincinnati, Ohio; Kansas City, Mo.; Pittsburgh, Pa., and San Francisco, Calif.]"

ACT OF MAY 27, 1908, MAKING APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE SERVICE OF THE POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT FOR THE FISCAL YEAR ENDING JUNE 30, 1909, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES (35 STAT. 412)

"[For the transmission of mail by pneumatic tubes or other similar devices, $1 million; and the Postmaster General is hereby authorized to enter into contracts not exceeding, in the aggregate, $1,388,759, under the provisions of the law, for a period not exceeding 10 years.

"[And the Postmaster General is hereby authorized and directed to investigate and report to Congress not later than January 1, 1909, the feasibility and desirability of the Government purchasing or installing the equipment for pneumatic-tube service, and thereafter operating the same in the cities where such service is now in operation, and also ascertain and report the approximate cost of purchase and likewise of installation and the cost of maintenance and operation.]"

ACT OF JUNE 19, 1922, MAKING APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT FOR THE FISCAL YEAR ENDING JUNE 30, 1923, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES (42 STAT. 661)

"[SEC. 5. For the transmission of mail by pneumatic tubes or other similar devices in the city of New York, including the Borough of Brooklyn of the city of New York, at an annual rate of expenditure not in excess of $18,500 per mile of double line of tubes, including power, labor, and all other operating expenses, $513,911.50: *Provided*, That the provisions not inconsistent herewith of the acts of April 21, 1902, and May 27, 1908, relating to the transmission of mail by pneumatic tubes or other similar devices, shall be applicable hereto: *Provided further*, That either party to the contract for the transmission of mail by pneumatic tubes or other similar devices may apply to the Interstate Commerce Commission at any time after October 1, 1922, and before July 1, 1923, for a revision of this rate, its decision to be effective after July 1, 1923, but in no case shall the rate exceed $19,500 per mile.]"

ACT OF JUNE 30, 1948

"[An act to provide for certain administrative expenses in the Post Office Department, including retainment of pneumatic-tube systems, and for other purposes

"[*Be it enacted, etc.*, That the provisions of the acts of April 21, 1902; May 27, 1908;

and June 19, 1922 (39 U. S. C. 423), relating to contracts for transmission of mail by pneumatic tubes in New York, N. Y., including the Borough of Brooklyn, are hereby amended to provide that the annual rental contract payment rate for the use of the 26.965 miles of doubleline pneumatic-tube facilities shall not exceed $12,000 per mile: *Provided, however,* That the rate shall be inclusive of maintenance expenses but shall be exclusive of all operating expenses.]"

## LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM—ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, after further comments by three Senators, which I understand are to be made at this time, I should like to express the hope that the Senate may proceed to the call of the calendar, which was scheduled for today prior to entering into the unanimous-consent agreement with respect to the remarks of the Senator from Minnesota.

Although I believe the transaction of morning business has been partly concluded, through the yielding for that purpose by the Senator from Minnesota in the course of his remarks, I understand there is further routine business to be transacted and it might be well to have it all appear in the RECORD following my statement. I assume that further routine business will be transacted in each instance by unanimous consent.

It is not my plan to hold the Senate in session beyond 5 o'clock this afternoon, in accordance with my original plan. I hope we can conclude the call of the calendar by that time.

Tomorrow it will be my purpose to have the Senate consider the conference report on the Commodity Credit Corporation bill, which I understand the House is to consider either today or tomorrow. That will be the order of business.

Either later this afternoon or tomorrow morning I shall get in touch with the minority leadership and furnish to it a list of the bills, some of which have already been announced, which I hope the Senate will be able to consider during the remainder of the week.

There will be no night sessions of the Senate, as such, this week.

## ADDITIONAL PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Additional petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. SALTONSTALL (for himself and Mr. KENNEDY):

Resolutions of the General Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

"Resolution relative to a study and revision of Taft-Hartley law

"*Resolved*, That the General Court of Massachusetts urges the Congress of the United States to cause a study to be made of the Taft-Hartley law, so-called, with a view to revising those provisions of said act, if any, which such study may reveal as tending to be detrimental to the legitimate aims and interests of labor; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That copies of these resolutions be sent forthwith by the secretary of the Commonwealth to the President of the United States, to the presiding officer of each branch of Congress, and to the Members thereof from this Commonwealth.

"House of representatives, January 21, 1954, adopted.

"LAWRENCE R. GROVE, *Clerk*.

"Senate, January 27, 1954, adopted, in concurrence.

"IRVING N. HAYDEN, *Clerk*.

"A true copy.

"Attest:

"EDWARD J. CRONIN,
*"Secretary of the Commonwealth."*

(The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate resolutions of the General Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, identical with the foregoing, which were referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.)

By Mr. SALTONSTALL (for himself and Mr. KENNEDY):

Resolutions of the General Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts; to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

"Resolutions memorializing the Congress of the United States in favor of the passage of legislation granting aid to the Israeli Government

"Whereas there is now pending before Congress bills to grant aid to the Israeli Government; and

"Whereas it is the purpose of these bills to give financial aid in the form of grants to the government of the ancient and traditional democracy now known as the Israeli State; and

"Whereas such assistance to the people of Israel in developing their natural resources, expanding their agricultural and industrial economy will mean a great productive capacity and will further the promotion of the security and general welfare of the United States and of Israel and will strengthen the ties of friendship between the people of the United States and of Israel; and

"Whereas such grants would further the basic objectives of the charter of the United Nations: Therefore be it

"*Resolved*, That the Members in the Congress of the United States of America be and they hereby are respectfully requested by the General Court of Massachusetts to give intensive study and consideration to such bills now pending in the Congress of the United States, and to use their best efforts to have this proposed legislation enacted into law; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That copies of these resolutions be forwarded by the secretary of state to the presiding officers of each branch of Congress, and to the Members thereof from this Commonwealth.

"House of representatives, January 21, 1954, adopted.

"LAWRENCE R. GROVE,
*"Clerk."*

"Senate, January 27, 1954, adopted, in concurrence.

"IRVING N. HAYDEN,
*"Clerk."*

"A true copy.

"Attest:

[SEAL] "EDWIN J. CRONIN,
*"Secretary of the Commonwealth."*

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate resolutions of the General Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, identical with the foregoing, which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

## ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY—RESOLUTION OF COMMON COUNCIL, MILWAUKEE, WIS.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I was deeply gratified to receive a resolution adopted by the Common Council of the City of Milwaukee, regarding the victory of St. Lawrence Seaway legislation in the Senate.

I am personally appreciative of the gracious thoughts expressed with regard to myself, but I believe that the congratulations conveyed by the common council are applicable to all those of my colleagues who voted for this sound legislation.

I present the resolution for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to lie on the table, and to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"Whereas after more than 30 continuous years of effort by advocates of the St. Lawrence Seaway project, the United States Senate has by a decisive vote of 51 to 33, passed enabling legislation to authorize construction of navigation works for the seaway, within United States territory, on a self-liquidating basis; and

"Whereas the legislation which finally gained the approval of the Senate was conceived and sponsored by Senator ALEXANDER WILEY, of Wisconsin, who during present and past congressional sessions has been the recognized leader and advocate of the seaway in the Senate; and

"Whereas the St. Lawrence Seaway and power project has been strongly recommended by the National Security Council, the Cabinet, the Joint Chiefs of Staff, the President, and other high authorities as necessary to the national economy, the national defense, and the security of this Nation; and the people of this city, this State, and the entire Nation are indebted to Senator WILEY for his courageous and persistent leadership on this great issue, during long and discouraging years of effort: Now, therefore, be it

*"Resolved by the Common Council of the City of Milwaukee*, That we hereby officially commend Senator ALEXANDER WILEY, of Wisconsin, and his associates in the Senate, for their leadership and their successful and determined effort to carry enabling legislation for the St. Lawrence Seaway and power project to a decisive victory in the Senate of the United States, and thus advancing toward final authorization a project greatly in the national and the international interest of this country, and essential to our prosperity and our national security."

OFFICE OF THE CITY CLERK,
*Milwaukee, Wis., February 4, 1954.*

I hereby certify that the foregoing is a copy of a resolution adopted by the Common Council of the City of Milwaukee on January 26, 1954.

STANLEY J. WITKOWSKI,
*City Clerk.*

## BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. AIKEN (by request):

S. 2911. A bill to provide for the development of a sound and profitable domestic wool industry under our national policy of expanding world trade; to encourage increased domestic production of wool for our national security; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. BUTLER of Maryland:

S. 2912. A bill for the relief of D. Alston Davis, Jr., and Willard D. Gilbert; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOUGLAS:

S. 2913. A bill to establish an effective program for the planning and construction of

needed public works and to create the Office of Public Facilities Administrator; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. MURRAY:

S. 2914. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. MURRAY when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

S. 2915. A bill to authorize the modification of the existing project for the Columbia River at the mouth, Oregon and Washington, in order to improve facilities for navigation;

S. 2916. A bill to authorize the modification of the existing project for Bellingham Harbor in the State of Washington in order to provide for a small-boat basin;

S. 2917. A bill to authorize the modification of the existing project for the Quillayute River in the State of Washington in order to improve facilities for navigation;

S. 2918. A bill to authorize the modification of the existing project for Port Angeles Harbor in the State of Washington in order to provide for a mooring basin; and

S. 2919. A bill to authorize the modification of the existing project for Everett Harbor in the State of Washington in order to improve facilities for navigation; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. HOLLAND (for himself and Mr. SMATHERS):

S. J. Res. 125. Joint resolution requesting the President to issue a proclamation designating 1 day each year as National Library Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

## FAIR LABOR STANDARDS AMENDMENTS OF 1954

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act. I ask unanimous consent that the bill, together with a summary and analysis of the bill, be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SCHOEPPEL in the chair). The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill, summary, and analysis will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 2914) to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. MURRAY, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That this act may be cited as the "Fair Labor Standards Amendments of 1954."

DEFINITIONS

SEC. 2. Section 3 (j) of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended (hereinafter referred to as the "act") is amended to read as follows:

"(j) 'Produced' means produced, manufactured, mined, handled, or in any other manner worked on in any State; and for the purposes of this act an employee shall be deemed to have been engaged in the production of goods if such employee was employed in producing, manufacturing, mining, handling, transporting, or in any other manner working on such goods, or in any process or occupation necessary to the production thereof, in any State."

(b) Section 3 of such act is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"(p) 'Activity affecting commerce' includes any activity necessary to commerce or competing with any activity in commerce, or where the payment of wages at rates below those prescribed by this act would burden or obstruct or tend to burden or obstruct commerce or the free flow of commerce.

"(q) 'Hired farm labor' includes the labor of any person employed on a farm, except the labor of the farmer and his immediate family.

"(r) 'Farm enterprise' comprises all tracts of land, whether contiguous or not, under one management, located in a county and immediately adjacent counties on which any of the operations enumerated in section 3 (f) is carried on.

"(s) 'Man-day' means any day on which hired farm labor is performed."

MINIMUM WAGES

SEC. 3. (a) Section 6 (a) (1) of such act is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 6. (a) Every employer shall pay to each of his employees who is engaged in commerce or in the production of goods for commerce, and every employer who is engaged in any activity affecting commerce shall pay to each of his employees employed in or about or in connection with any enterprise where he is so engaged, wages at the following rates:

"(1) not less than $1.25 an hour;

"(2) in the case of any employee in Puerto Rico or the Virgin Islands, not less than the rate in effect for such employee prior to the enactment of this act plus an amount equal to the sum by which the rate prescribed in paragraph (1) of this subsection exceeds 75 cents an hour: *Provided*, That upon the expiration of 1 year from the date of enactment of this act such rate shall be not less than such rate plus one-third of the difference between such rate and the rate prescribed in paragraph (1), upon the expiration of 2 years not less than such rate plus two-third of the difference between such rate and the rate prescribed in paragraph (1), and upon the expiration of 3 years not less than the rate prescribed in paragraph (1) of this subsection."

(b) Such section 6 (a) is further amended by striking out "(2)" and inserting in lieu thereof "(3)."

(c) Section 6 (c) of such act is hereby repealed.

MAXIMUM HOURS

SEC. 4. (a) Section 7 (a) of such act is amended to read as follows:

"(a) Except as otherwise provided in this section, no employer shall employ any of his employees who is engaged in commerce or in the production of goods for commerce, and no employer who is engaged in any activity affecting commerce shall employ any of his employees in or about or in connection with any enterprise where he is so engaged—

"(1) for a workweek longer than 37½ hours during the first 2 years after the effective date of this act;

"(2) for a workweek longer than 35 hours after the expiration of the fourth year from such date,

unless such employee receives compensation for his employment in excess of the hours above specified at a rate not less than 1½ times the regular rate at which he is employed."

(b) Section 7 (b) of such act is amended by striking out paragraph (3) thereof.

(c) Section 7 of such act is further amended by striking out subsection (c) and renumbering the succeeding subsections accordingly.

WAGE ORDERS IN PUERTO RICO AND THE VIRGIN ISLANDS

SEC. 5. Section 8 of such act is hereby repealed.

CHILD-LABOR PROVISIONS

SEC. 6. Subsection (c) of section 12 of such act is amended by inserting at the end thereof the following: "and no employer who is engaged in any activity affecting commerce shall employ any oppressive child labor in or about or in connection with any enterprise where he is so engaged."

EXEMPTIONS

SEC. 7. Section 13 of such act is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 13. (a) The provisions of sections 6 and 7 shall not apply with respect to (1) any employee employed in a bona fide executive, administrative, or professional capacity (as such terms are defined and delimited by regulations of the Administrator); or (2) any employee employed in any retail or service establishment by an employer having not more than five such establishments and having a total annual volume of sales or services of not more than $500,000; or (3) any employee employed in a hotel or inn having an annual volume of hotel business of not more than $500,000; or (4) any employee employed in agriculture during any calendar quarter, by a farm enterprise which used less than 600 man-days of hired farm labor during each of the preceding four quarters; or (5) any employee to the extent that such employee is exempted by regulations or orders of the Administrator issued under section 14.

"(b) The provisions of section 7 shall not apply with respect to any employee of an employer subject to the provisions of part I of the Interstate Commerce Act.

"(c) The provisions of section 12 relating to child labor shall not apply with respect to any employee 14 years of age or over employed in agriculture outside of school hours for the school district where such employee is living while he is so employed, or to any child employed as an actor or performer in motion pictures or theatrical productions, or in radio or television productions.

"(d) The provisions of sections 6, 7, and 12 shall not apply to any employee engaged in the delivery of newspapers to consumers at their residences. The provisions of section 12 shall not apply to any employee otherwise engaged in the delivery of newspapers to consumers when such employee is employed outside of school hours for the school district where such employee is living and is 16 years of age or over."

LEARNERS, APPRENTICES, AND HANDICAPPED WORKERS

SEC. 8. Section 14 of such act is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 14. The Administrator, to the extent necessary in order to prevent curtailment of opportunities for employment, shall by regulations or by orders provide for (1) the employment of learners, of apprentices, except indentured apprentices, and of messengers employed primarily in delivering letters and messages, under special certificates issued pursuant to regulations of the Administrator, as such wages lower than the minimum wage applicable under section 6, but not less than $1 an hour, and subject to such limitations as to time, number, proportion, and length of service as the Administrator shall prescribe, and (2) the employment of individuals whose earning capacity is impaired by age or physical or mental deficiency or injury, under special certificates issued by the Administrator, at such wages lower than the minimum wage applicable under section 6, but not less than $1 an hour, and for such period as shall be fixed in such certificates."

PENALTIES

SEC. 9 (a). The last sentence of section 16 (c) of such act is amended by striking out the word "two-year" and inserting in lieu thereof the word "four-year."

(b) Section 6 (a) of the Portal-to-Portal Act of 1947 is amended by striking out the word "two" and inserting in lieu thereof the word "four."

EFFECTIVE DATE

SEC. 10. This act shall take effect upon the expiration of 120 days from the date of its enactment.

The summary and analysis presented by Mr. MURRAY is as follows:

SUMMARY AND ANALYSIS OF A BILL TO AMEND THE FAIR LABOR STANDARDS ACT

I. MINIMUM WAGE

Section 3 (a) of the proposed bill would amend section 6 (a) of the act to increase the statutory minimum wage from 75 cents to $1.25 an hour.

The present 75-cent minimum wage was inadequate when the Fair Labor Standards Act was amended in 1949 and is completely outmoded today. The inflationary rise in the cost of living since 1950 when the amended Fair Labor Standards Act took effect has placed a particular hardship on low-wage workers. Moreover, the general wage level has increased considerably during this period.

The Bureau of Labor Statistics, after an intensive study, has estimated a city worker's family budget for a family of four for October 1951. This budget is defined as "the total dollars necessary to provide family health, worker efficiency, nurture of children and social participation by all members of the family." It is a minimum budget for adequate family living.

The estimate made by the Bureau of National Affairs, a private research organization, in bringing up-to-date the BLS budget places the average cost of this budget in June 1953 at $4,275. The factory workweek in 1953 averaged 40.5 hours. Assuming the average worker was employed 50 weeks during the year, he would have worked 2,025 hours. To earn $4,275 he would have required an hourly wage of about $2.11, far above the $1.25 minimum wage rate provided for in the proposed bill.

The Women's Bureau of the Department of Labor has compiled the budgets prepared in 12 States and the District of Columbia in connection with the administration of minimum wage laws applying to women workers. These budgets represent the minimum necessary living expenses for a self-supporting woman without dependents. The estimated November 1953 cost of these budgets ranges from $1,693 in Massachusetts to $2,729 in New Jersey. Except for the Massachusetts budget, they are all more than $2,000 and 5 are $2,400 or more. Assuming 2,000 hours of employment, a worker receiving $1.25 an hour would have an annual income of $2,500. Since these budgets are for single women without dependents, it is obvious that the average worker with a family to support would need a much larger income to maintain even the minimum standard of living.

The minimum wage has failed to keep pace with the general increase in wages. Thus from June 1938, when the Fair Labor Standards Act was enacted, to December 1953, average hourly earnings of factory workers increased from $0.62 to $1.79, a rise of $1.17. By contrast, the minimum wage has risen by only 50 cents. Enactment of the $1.25 minimum provided for in the proposed bill will still mean that the increase in wages since 1938 of the lowest paid workers employed at the minimum will be considerably less than the increase in the general wage level.

II. MAXIMUM HOURS

Section 4 (a) of the proposed bill would amend section 7 (a) of the act to decrease the maximum workweek from 40 to 37½ hours during the first 2 years after the act takes effect and to 35 hours thereafter.

The gradual reduction of working hours combined with increased real income have contributed greatly to the growth of our national economy. There has been a tremendous increase in the productivity of American industry since World War II. Unless the increased productivity is accompanied by a reduction in the number of hours worked, without reduction in incomes, this technological progress could, instead of enhancing the living standards and welfare of American workers, threaten full employment and continued progress in our economic life. Continuing reduction in the workweek without loss of pay is necessary to assure full employment and an ever-rising standard of living as well as greater opportunities for leisure-time activities for American workers.

Our immediate goal should be the establishment of a standard 35-hour week, which has already been achieved through collective bargaining for large numbers of workers. In order that a transition to the 35-hour week should not be too abrupt, the proposed bill permits a gradual adjustment to the shorter workweek by providing for a 2-year period of transition. During the 2-year transition period, the maximum workweek would be 37½ hours. Thereafter, the maximum workweek would be established at 35 hours.

III. COVERAGE

*A. General application of the law*

The proposed bill would extend the application of the Fair Labor Standards Act to cover all activities affecting commerce.

At the present time, the FLSA applies only to employees engaged in commerce or in the production of goods for commerce. The coverage of the law is thus far more restrictive than the Nation's other major piece of labor legislation, the Labor-Management Relations Act. There is no reason why the FLSA should not cover the same categories of workers as the labor-management relations law.

*B. Large-scale retail and service establishments*

Section 7 of the proposed law would extend coverage of the law to employees of large-scale hotels, chain stores, restaurants, and other similar retail and service establishments. This would be accomplished by modifying section 13 (a) (2) of the present law, which gives a complete exemption to all retail and service establishments.

The modern department store, grocery chain, and similar large-scale enterprises, have become part of America's big business. These firms whose business amounts to many millions of dollars annually, are quite capable of meeting the requirements of the Nation's basic labor standards legislation. The proposed bill incorporates the same tests for determining coverage under the law as the proposals made in 1949 and would continue to exempt from coverage the small hotel, the corner grocery store, and similar small business.

*C. Industrialized agriculture*

Sections 2 and 7 of the proposed bill modify the blanket exemption of the present law for employees employed in agriculture. The exemption would be modified so that only workers on large-scale corporate mechanized farms would be covered by the law.

Workers on these farms are hired just as any factory employee might be. They are paid by the hour or, in some cases, by the week or month, and they are discharged, fired, or laid off just as any machine operator might be. The work of hired farm laborers performing similar repetitive operations such as picking fruit or harvesting crops is strikingly similar to the operations performed on a factory assembly line. There is no reason why these workers should not be covered under the law.

*D. Agricultural and seafood processing*

The present law contains a maze of partial and complete exemptions for various types of agricultural and seafood processing. These exemptions were written into the law through the influence of the special interest groups who have benefited by them. They should be swept away so that workers in these industries, including the seasonal employees, would be given the protection of the law: 13 (a) (10), agricultural processing industries; 13 (a) (5), seafood and fishing industries; 13 (a) 15), forestry and logging operations; 13 (b) (4), canning of fish; 7 (c), processing of agricultural and seafood products; 7 (b) (3), seasonal exemption.

*E. Transportation*

There are a number of special exemptions for transportation employees written into the law. These need to be drastically changed so as to give workers in these industries the full protection of the law: 13 (a) (9), electric railway, trolleys, and motor buses; 13 (a) (12), taxicab companies; 13 (a) (14), seamen; 13 (b) (3) air carriers; 13 (b) (1) buses and trucks.

*F. Other industries*

A number of other exemptions which were written into the law at the request of special interest groups are eliminated from the act by the proposed bill. There is no reason why the benefits of wage and hour legislation should not be extended to these groups of workers: 13 (a) (8), small newspapers; 13 (a) (11), small telephone exchanges; 13 (2) (13), small contract telegraph agencies.

IV. PUERTO RICO AND THE VIRGIN ISLANDS

Sections 3 (a) and 5 of the proposed bill amend the act to provide for an increase of 50 cents in the minimum-wage rates established by the Administrator under the present industry committee procedure for industries in Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands. It also provides for a 3-year step-up so that the statutory minimum rate of $1.25 will apply to all industries in Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands 3 years after the $1.25 statutory minimum-wage rate takes effect elsewhere in the United States. During the 3-year interim the minimum-wage rate for each industry in Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands is to be increased at the end of each year by one-third of the difference between the minimum rate which would take effect with the enactment of the proposed bill and $1.25.

It is essential that the minimum wage in Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands be increased to the mainland level as quickly as is feasible in order to raise the standard of living in the population of those territories and to eliminate the competitive advantage of employers in Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands over their counterparts on the mainland. As long as workers in Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands are forced to seek jobs at extremely low wages, employees on the mainland will be continued to be threatened by the ever-present possibility that their employers will move their plants in order to take advantage of the extremely low wages prevailing in Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands.

Since these Territories are part of the United States, their industries should be integrated as rapidly as possible with the United States economy and that means rapid elimination of the differential in wage rates. Because such changes cannot be made immediately, the proposed bill provides for a 3-year transitional period to permit Puerto Rican industries to make whatever adjustments are necessary to permit them to pay the statutory minimum wage applicable elsewhere in the United States.

V. LEARNERS, APPRENTICES, AND HANDICAPPED WORKERS

Section 8 of the proposed bill would amend section 14 of the act to provide that subminimum wages established for learners, apprentices (except indentured apprentices) and handicapped workers be set at not less than $1 an hour.

During a transitional period, it may be necessary that under special arrangements employers be permitted to pay certain be-

ginning or marginal workers less than the statutory minimum wage. However, it is most important that a floor be placed under the subminimum wage that may be paid to such workers. The lowest subminimum wage that should be permitted to be paid to such workers should be $1 an hour. It is understood that in some industries the subminimum wage may be set at more than $1 and that from time to time subminimum wages under $1 an hour will be increased to whatever extent is possible without preventing curtailment of opportunities for employment.

VI. CHILD LABOR

Section 7 of the proposed bill amends section 13 (c) and (d) of the act to prohibit employment of children under the age of 14 in agriculture. It also bans employment of children less than 18 in so-called street trades except that children 16 years of age or over may be employed in such occupations outside of school hours.

All available evidence indicates that the employment of children under the age of 14 in agriculture is harmful to their health and proper growth.

The moral hazards involved in employment of young children in so-called street trades are so great that children under the age of 16 should not be permitted to be employed in such occupations under any circumstances and children between the ages of 16 and 18 should be permitted to do such work only after school hours.

VII. ADMINISTRATION

Section 9 of the proposed bill would amend section 6 (a) of the Portal-to-Portal Act of 1947 as well as 16 (c) of the Fair Labor Standards Act, to increase the statute of limitations from 2 to 4 years.

Workers ought not to be limited in their opportunity to recover wages to which they are entitled which have been denied them by unlawful acts of their employer. The present 2-year statute of limitations is too short a time in many cases for all of the necessary preliminary action to be undertaken in order to recover wages which have been unlawfully withheld from employees. The proposed bill would, therefore, increase the statute of limitations from 2 to 4 years in order that workers will not continue to be denied, through no fault of their own, compensation to which they are legally entitled under the requirements of the act.

## INVESTIGATION OF COMMUNIST MOVEMENT IN GUATEMALA AND ITS EFFECT ON PRICE OF IMPORTED COFFEE

Mrs. SMITH of Maine submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 211), which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Whereas it is reported that the Communist movement has gained such economic and political strength within the Republic of Guatemala that it now largely dominates and controls economic and political affairs within that country; and

Whereas it appears that the prices charged by Guatemalan producers for coffee imported into the United States have been drastically increased, and that such increases have been a contributing factor in the establishment of the exorbitant prices now charged consumers for coffee within the United States: Therefore be it

*Resolved*, That it is the sense of the Senate that the President should—

(a) direct the appropriate agencies of the Government to conduct promptly such investigation as may be necessary to ascertain (1) the extent to which the Communist movement now controls economic and political affairs within the Republic of Guatemala, and (2) the extent to which unjustified increases in the price of coffee imported into the United States have been imposed by Guatemalan producers; and

(b) take such action as may be required to exclude from importation into the United States all coffee originating in the Republic of Guatemala until such time as he is satisfied that (1) the economic and political affairs of that country no longer are dominated and controlled by the Communist movement, and (2) the unjustified prices for coffee imposed by producers in that country have been reduced to reasonable levels.

## EXTENSION OF RENEGOTIATION ACT OF 1951—AMENDMENT

Mr. FERGUSON submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 6287) to extend and amend the Renegotiation Act of 1951, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

## CONVEYANCE TO FORMER OWNERS OF CERTAIN LANDS IN ALBENI FALLS RESERVOIR PROJECT, IDAHO—CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Armed Services be discharged from further consideration of the bill (S. 2804) to provide for the conveyance of certain lands in the Albeni Falls Reservoir project, Idaho, to former owners of such lands, and that the bill be referred to the Committee on Public Works.

I have taken the matter up with the Parliamentarian and find that the bill was improperly referred to the Committee on Armed Services, inasmuch as the subject matter of the bill rightly comes under the jurisdiction of the Public Works Committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

## EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

## EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. LANGER, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

Edward William Day, of Rhode Island, to be United States district judge for the district of Rhode Island;

Edwin F. Hunter, Jr., of Louisiana, to be United States district judge for the western district of Louisiana; and

Calvin C. McGregor, of Hawaii, to be seventh judge, first circuit, circuit courts, Territory of Hawaii.

By Mr. BUSH (for Mr. LANGER), from the Committee on the Judiciary:

Carroll C. Hincks, of Connecticut, to be United States circuit judge, second circuit.

By Mr. MUNDT (for Mr. LANGER), from the Committee on the Judiciary:

George T. Michelson, of South Dakota, to be United States district judge for the district of South Dakota.

By Mr. IVES (for Mr. LANGER), from the Committee on the Judiciary:

John Marshall Harlan, of New York, to be United States circuit judge, second circuit, vice Augustus N. Hand, retired.

By Mr. DIRKSEN, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

Elmer J. Schnackenberg, of Illinois, to be United States circuit judge, seventh circuit.

## SIMON E. SOBELOFF TO BE SOLICITOR GENERAL—EXECUTIVE REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Mr. President, as in executive session, from the Committee on the Judiciary, it is my privilege to report favorably the nomination of my friend Simon E. Sobeloff, Chief Justice of the Court of Appeals of Maryland, to be Solicitor General of the United States.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination will be received as in executive session, and will be placed on the Executive Calendar.

## ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

By Mr. DWORSHAK:

Statement by him regarding the Atomic Energy Commission's reactor testing station on the Lost River Desert of eastern Idaho.

## THE STRENGTH OF THE AMERICAN ECONOMY

Mr. HUNT. Mr. President, there has come to my attention a speech delivered by Mr. L. D. Silberstein, chairman of the board of the Pennsylvania Coal & Coke Co., over facilities of the United States Department of State's Voice of America program, from New York City, on January 28.

Mr. President, this speech by Mr. Silberstein is the type of factual and optimistic propaganda which seems to me to be very effective, and I desire to congratulate the Voice of America on propaganda of this type, and Mr. Silberstein for the service he has rendered his country in delivering, through the facilities of the State Department, this message to the people behind the Iron Curtain.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the speech be printed in the body of the RECORD, for it is a message of encouragement to the people of the United States, as well as to the people of other countries.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The American economy is strong and sound. The future is bright and encouraging.

I have just returned from a 3-week trip through Western Europe. I was astonished to hear the talk about the coming American depression. As an industrialist who is

familiar with European and American business, I can assure people of Western Europe that there will be no serious American recession. I can further assure you that any talk of another 1929 is absurd.

For one thing the American people and the American Government will not stand for an American depression. In the last 20 years the American people have learned that Government can do something to stop a depression. President Eisenhower has pledged that we'll have no boom or bust economy. He will keep the pledge.

I am optimistic about the future. I am optimistic enough so that I am recommending to the companies with which I am associated that they carry out further expansion programs in the near future.

The companies of which I am an officer go into steel, coal, oil, electrical equipment, machinery, and shipping. I see bright futures for all of them.

There is an erroneous belief in Europe that American prosperity is a wartime prosperity. This is not true. American prosperity in this, the second half of the 20th century, is based on the great change that has taken place in American life during the past 2 decades. During that time the savings of the average man have increased gigantically, and the reserves of business have mounted in proportion.

During the month of December alone over 8,000 new businesses and companies were formed in the United States.

Merely to satisfy the normal day-to-day needs of a population of 160 million American people, grown accustomed to living at a comfortable standard, will call for an active rate of employment among American workers. The overseas demand for our products is an additional backlog. Many peacetime projects, private as well as public, were hitherto postponed by reason of war priorities. These will at last get under way.

A further favorable factor that can be counted on in 1954 is the country's strong credit position. With no evidence of inordinate overborrowing on the part of the public, or of strain in the banking situation, we can count on a liberal flow of banking credit, at a low rate, to support whatever activity is undertaken.

But the most important and least known guarantor of our economy is the atomic age. The atom promises to double the United States gross national product in the next 15 years.

During the past 10 years the Government of the United States has poured approximately $13 billion into atomic energy and atomic experimentation. During 1954 the fruits of this effort will begin to be felt by American industry.

I predict that the entire food industry of the United States will soon be revolutionized by atomic developments. Some of the developments already in sight, thanks to the atomic age, include the following:

1. Methods for increasing plant growth and yield per acre which exceed the greatest previous dreams of agricultural scientists.

2. A revolution in food processing and food shipping which will make it possible to preserve food and prevent decay on an increased scale. Atomic radiation of food will soon permit a loaf of bread to stay a year or more without deteriorating, according to the scientists. It will be possible to preserve meats without refrigeration for months and possibly years while improving the taste and quality.

3. We are on the eve in the United States of a revolution in power which will permit lower cost production of metals and a better life for the peoples of the free world.

4. Forthcoming peacetime use of atomic energy will permit a new revolution in chemicals and further developments of such natural resources as coal and oil to provide a whole new range of exciting new products from industry for the service of mankind.

5. Atomic medicine is already fighting effectively against certain types of cancer and blood diseases and opening scores of new secrets of man's health to science, promising an even longer life to mankind.

Thanks to the leadership of President Eisenhower, these peacetime uses of the atomic age will soon be made available on an increased scale to our neighbors and allies of the free world. The opening of this atomic revolutionary age will give America and the western world an economic lift that surpasses the vision of most of mankind. The wonderful part is that some of it is here today. It's not just a dream of tomorrow.

The atomic revolution will cause readjustment in industry, just as atomic weapons are now causing readjustment in the composition of our military forces.

The atom today is a practiced tool of the national economy. It is providing new work and opening new frontiers for utilities, chemical companies, petroleum companies, aircraft companies, shipbuilding companies, drug companies, and food companies.

Armed for the future such as this, America must go forward.

In the brief time available to me, I cannot cover all of the optimistic sides of the economy. But you can bet that free science is America's answer to the depression talk. Our electronics industry has just completed production of the first 20 million black-and-white television sets. After a brief pause for retooling, it is preparing to produce 20 million color TV sets.

The American automobile industry still has vast new frontiers; more than 60 percent of the autos on the road are now more than 3 years old and provide a gigantic replacement market.

Our housing industry still enjoys tremendous pent-up demand. The best insurance for the economic future is the faith of the American people that every tomorrow can and must be a better one.

---

## QUESTION OF PERSONAL PRIVILEGE—USE OF PNEUMATIC TUBES IN NEW YORK CITY POST OFFICE

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Notwithstanding the order of the Senate as to the call of the calendar, is it the understanding of the Chair that the Senator from Illinois asks unanimous consent to proceed at this time?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I ask unanimous consent that I may make a brief reply to the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator from Illinois may proceed.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I may say to Members of the Senate who may be interested that I intend to respond briefly to the observations made by the Senator from Minnesota, speaking to a question of personal privilege. I take judicial notice of 1 or 2 observations which have been made on the floor of the Senate before I respond concretely to the observations of the Senator from Minnesota.

The first was raised by my very felicitous and esteemed friend the Senator from South Carolina, who wondered whether any more hearings were going to be held by the Subcommittee on Post Office Appropriations.

I think the record will bear me out—and I am sure my distinguished friend the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] will bear me out—that he and I were the last two members of the subcommittee to conduct such hearings, and that we started out in a blaze of glory, but that we were forsaken early in the afternoon.

After some hours of taking testimony on the post-office bill, he and I were the only ones left at the hearing. I finished the bill by myself.

So many presumptions have been raised that it might be advisable to have a little truth about these things. It is presumed, of course, when a bill goes through by unanimous consent that every Senator knows all about it and that every Senator is fully informed on the subject with which the bill deals.

Let us take an incident which has been discussed by the Senator from Minnesota. He discussed it on the 13th of September 1950, in connection with a subject which had been before the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. I was not in the Senate at the time. What I am about to quote will be found in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 96, part 11, at page 14665:

> Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator from Minnesota acted only upon information he had from the Post Office Department, and on the urgency of the request. I could not help but feel that since it was a very technical subject, about which I knew very little, the only advice to follow would be that of the Postmaster General, who seems to be doing a job of economizing in the Post Office Department.

Would anyone say that is a presumption to the effect that the Senator from Minnesota knew all about it? I would not dare say to the people of Illinois that I knew all about all things that go on, when I serve on 5 subcommittees of the Committee on Appropriations, on 7 subcommittees of the Committee on the Judiciary, and on 3 subcommittees of the Committee on Government Operations. To do so I would really need roller skates to get from one subcommittee to another, without even then knowing entirely everything about every subject matter which is considered by the various committees.

But that is quite beside the point. I cannot allow such assertions as have been made to go out to the country without making some answer.

I was astonished at the amount of information and material which we received from a statement made on a question of personal privilege. The Senator from Minnesota knows that I bear him the utmost of good will. It has always been that way. I would no more knowingly hurt him, Mr. President, than I would hurt a member of my own family. If I accomplish his defeat in Minnesota, that is another thing. He understands that. He understands that I am the chairman of the Republican Senatorial Campaign Committee. I shall be glad to find a Republican to sit in the Senator's place in this body if I can, but I shall always be circumspect and shall also be devoted to the truth and show a fidelity to the facts.

So, Mr. President, let us start at the beginning of the matter. This is not casual with me, because it came up on the 26th of January 1954, while we were taking testimony downstairs on the Post Office Department appropriation bill. I

have the advance sheets from the Government Printing Office which have come back for correction. I knew nothing about it until that time. I am beginning to find out a good deal about it. Usually, as is the case with one who has served on the Appropriations Committee in the House of Representatives, almost the first thing we do is to find out what has been done in the House of Representatives with reference to the Post Office appropriations bill for the fiscal year 1955.

As a matter of fact, Mr. President, I served on the Subcommittee on Appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Department in the House. Hearings were had on the 8th day of December, 1953. The facts are there for all the world to see. I always send for the House hearings and I thumb through them to see what a good job has been done. On page 73 of the hearings is a question regarding the use of pneumatic tubes in New York City. That was the 8th of December. That was 60 days ago. Anyone can read it for himself. When the hearing was about completed, one member of the committee said:

Mr. Chairman, I suggest that we request the Postmaster General to make a complete report to this committee as soon as he feels he is in a position to do so.

Who made that request, Mr. President? A Republican? Certainly not. It was Representative GARY, of Virginia, a Democrat, and a good member of that committee. He was a member of the committee when I was in the House, and I served with him.

As I say, Mr. President, that was 60 days ago. I wondered if this matter would come up, and it did. It came up on the 26th of January when we started hearings on the Post Office appropriation bill in the Senate Committee on Appropriations. There was an allusion to it. As a matter of fact, it began with a question from the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY]. He asked about the pneumatic tubes. It probably came to his attention. The question was asked as to who had introduced the authorizing legislation.

The Postmaster General said that the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] had introduced it.

I can find no place, Mr. President, where the Postmaster General spoke in derogation of our friend from Minnesota. I find nothing in the press releases; I find nothing whatsoever in the hearings that can be characterized as a derogatory remark about the Senator from Minnesota.

How did this matter get into the mill, Mr. President? That is very simple. Newspaper reporters have a chance to go through the hearings, and they spot what they think is a story. So, on the 22d or 23d of December, Martin Hayden, who works for the North American Newspaper Alliance, picked up the story. I do not know that I would know him if I saw him, but he sent the story out on the wire, and he did a pretty thoroughgoing job. The story is over his byline, and it appeared in the St. Paul Pioneer Press and in other newspapers as well.

Was Mr. Summerfield gunning for someone? Certainly not.

It is a fact, Mr. President, that neither I nor Mr. Summerfield nor any other person in Washington has any control with reference to the Republican national committeeman in Minnesota, who is a newspaper publisher. The story came to his newspaper in Clarissa, Minn.

Mr. President, I went to school there and lived there for 5 years. I have affection for the people there, and I am familiar with them. I used to read the St. Paul Pioneer Press every morning when I was a student at the University of Minnesota.

It was in December that Martin Hayden wrote that story, and as I read the story, he probably called the junior Senator from Minnesota with reference to it. That was not Mr. Summerfield. That was not any member of the Republican Party; it was not the chairman of the Senatorial Campaign Committee. It was a newspaper story, and there came telephone calls. It seems to me that our very good friend from Minnesota undertakes to set up a strawman——

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield with pleasure.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Did the Senator take note of the fact that the tube contract was canceled on December 1, and that the subcommittee hearing was a closed hearing?

Mr. DIRKSEN. That is correct.

Mr. HUMPHREY. It was verified on Saturday by Representative CANFIELD and by——

Mr. DIRKSEN. I have the story here.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I have it, too.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I assume no responsibility for it. I am merely trying to make sure that the record is correct. And, Mr. President, I think a correction of the record is required because of some of the very invidious statements which have been uttered on the floor.

The Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN] tried to make it appear that the Postmaster General has not been able to divorce himself from his former job as the chairman of the Republican National Committee. I think it is unfair to make that kind of a statement and to reflect upon him in that fashion. It has been done here a number of times. I do not like to see it go by without some answer, because I think it is my responsibility as a Member of this body and as a member of the Republican Party to be sure that the record is straight in every respect.

I know what happens in these hearings. The records are supposed to be impounded until there is a release date. They are given to the press, oftentimes, so that the members of the press can get their stories written against the day when the hearings will be released, for usually a long period of time intervenes before the release date is placed on the copies of the hearings.

But the fact of the matter is that the hearing was held on the 8th of December, approximately 2 months ago, so that many things could have happened.

Mr. President, I shall not weary the Senate by reciting all the details. I have a copy of the postal inspector's report. We asked to have it placed in the Senate hearings, and it is there where everyone can read it.

The junior Senator from Minnesota is correct in stating that the tube service has been in operation since 1897, and the contract has been renewed from time to time. It is said that in the Republican 80th Congress the contract was renewed. That is correct. It was renewed for a period of 18 months at $11,000 a mile.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator is correct.

Mr. DIRKSEN. For 18 months, Mr. President, the inspectors had been looking into the subject. I was still a Member of the House in the 80th Congress. They had the right to extend the contract for 6 more years. Then it came up in 1950.

There is nothing wrong with making a contract for not to exceed 10 years, but, Mr. President, there was no cancellation clause in the contract and there was no penalty clause so that the Government might be spared a penalty if the contracts were cancelled. Is not that correct?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Does the Senator from Illinois realize that the act of 1948 was merely an amendment to the basic act of 1922, and that the language providing for a 10-year contract was in the original authorization act of 1922, and that the act of 1948 was merely an authorization act, and that the same language prevailed?

Mr. DIRKSEN. What about the cancellation clause?

Mr. HUMPHREY. As the Senator from Minnesota read into the RECORD, the company realized the cancellation clause depended on the Committee on Appropriations, and the president of the company so stated. Was the Senator from Illinois absent when the junior senator from Minnesota read that?

Mr. DIRKSEN. The Senator from Illinois never left the floor. He is fully advised.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator's attention must have been distracted when I read that.

Mr. DIRKSEN. This matter came to the floor of the Senate in September 1950. I procured the inspector's report. I know what I read in the reports—when I get time to read them. I read from page 3 of the inspector's report, as follows:

On May 18, 1950—

Roughly 6 or 7 months before action was taken on the floor of the Senate—

Acting Assistant Postmaster General Cornwell addressed a memorandum to the Postmaster General summarizing the situation and concluding that in the interests of economical administration the use of the tubes should be discontinued at the termination of the then current contract, December 31, 1950.

I did not make that report.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. When were those reports made available as public records? On February 5 of the past week?

Mr. DIRKSEN. They were made available to the Subcommittee on Appropriations almost as soon as we asked for them.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Will the Senator from Illinois kindly answer my question? When were those reports made available as public records?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I have the record here.

Mr. HUMPHREY. When were they made available?

Mr. DIRKSEN. This is an official hearing of the Subcommittee on Post Office Department Appropriations of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Are they printed as public records?

Mr. DIRKSEN. The hearings are in process of being stitched now. This material came from the Government Printing Office.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Was this information available in public form, so that it could have been available to the junior Senator from Minnesota?

Mr. DIRKSEN. All I can say to the Senator from Minnesota is that when I first heard about the matter, I said we ought to have the contract and ought to have the record. The Postmaster General sent the record, and there it is. It has been printed, and the Senator from Minnesota can see it.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Will the Senator from Illinois yield for a further question?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. As a result of the investigation to which the Senator from Illinois has referred, did or did not the Postmaster General, the responsible officer of the Post Office Department, recommend the continuation of the use of the pneumatic tubes?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Let us examine the report for a moment and see what it says.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I asked, Did or did not the Postmaster General, who was responsible for the Department, and the Bureau of the Budget recommend continuation of the use of the pneumatic tubes?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Does the Senator from Minnesota mean the former Postmaster General?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes; that is the person about whom we are talking.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Is the Senator from Minnesota speaking of former Postmaster General Donaldson?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am speaking of the former Postmaster General, a trained civil-service man.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The Senator from Minnesota is speaking of Jesse Donaldson. That brings the situation into focus.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes.

Mr. DIRKSEN. If I had been the junior Senator from Minnesota, I do not believe I would have invited this discussion, but I believe it is our responsibility to see why Jesse Donaldson, who came from Shelbyville, Ill., in the first instance, should have signed the contract.

When the matter came before the Senate—and I believe my friend the junior Senator from Minnesota will bear me out in this statement—I think the Senator from Minnesota said on the Senate floor, "This is urgent." Did not the Senator use that language?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Indeed I did.

Mr. DIRKSEN. He said he did not know much about the technical details, but he accepted the word of the Postmaster General.

I am not quarreling about that. But my friend the distinguished junior Senator from Minnesota has now nicely left the door open. If I do not do another thing as a member of the Committee on Appropriations or of the Committee on Government Operations, I shall want to see that contract investigated, to find out what its urgency was in 1950.

I say now that that is no reflection upon the distinguished junior Senator from Minnesota. I would not for the world reflect upon his integrity.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the Senator from Illinois. That at least clears up one aspect of all these spurious charges which have been made in words such as scandal, graft, and corruption.

Does the distinguished Senator from Illinois feel, as a Member of the Senate, that the report of the Senate Committee on Post Office and Civil Service of the 80th Congress was a valid or an invalid report?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I never saw the report, as a matter of fact.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator, then, indeed was not keeping up with his homework. That was an official report, and it was attached to the bill. The Senator was a Member of the House of Representatives.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I wish the Senator from Minnesota would try to quit "kidding" the public and quit "kidding" our constituents. The talk about the presumption that Members of Congress know everything that goes on in the Senate and the House is a lot of nonsense, and everyone knows it. There is not a Senator who can keep up with half of the occurrences in Congress, including, of course, the utterances of my very dear friend, the junior Senator from Minnesota. [Laughter.]

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the Senator. Was the Senator from Illinois a member of the House Committee on Appropriations in 1948?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes; in 1948 I was.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Does the Senator from Illinois realize that at that time there had been a full-scale investigation as to the amount of money involved in, and the efficiency of the tube system, and that a complete study had been made and published in the form of hearings and an official report of a committee of the United States Senate, which were made available to every committee of Congress? Does the Senator realize that?

Mr. DIRKSEN. The Senator from Illinois realizes it very well. The Senator from Illinois knows that when the House completes its hearings, the volume of hearings is 10 times as big as the hearings on the Senate side. There is a mountain of justification. So I do not pretend now to the people of the United States that within the compass of 24 hours and my physical energy I can go through all that material and keep abreast of everything that goes on. I shall not spoof the people in that way.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I wish to say that I do not believe there is anyone in the Senate who is more determined to apply himself to his responsibilities, and who is more able, but I wish to remind the Senator from Illinois that this is a special report entitled "Pneumatic Mail Tube Service," only 56 pages long. It was prepared as the result of a desire to investigate the efficiency and the need of the service. It is not a hit-and-miss proposition.

By the way, the report was made available to the House of Representatives and to the United States Senate, as well.

I ask the Senator from Illinois, simply on the basis of information, and of a real investigation, which included an investigation by postal inspectors, members of the Senate committee, and officials of the Department, as well, did the junior Senator from Minnesota have reason to believe that the system had been thoroughly investigated and was worthy of trust?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I do not know what the junior Senator from Minnesota wishes to believe or had reason to believe. I know I have to hew such things out for myself within the limitations of time, as best I can.

I desire to ask the Senator from Minnesota not to take all of my time, because I wish to make my record.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Does the Senator from Illinois believe that the report referred to was an honest report or a dishonest report?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I would not know, for the very good reason that I have seen thousands of reports. When I have gone into them, I have thrown many of them to one side, on the theory that they were pretty oblique or pretty slanted.

Mr. HUMPHREY. May I ask how the Senator from Illinois voted on the bill in 1948?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I do not know, as a matter of fact.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The vote was unanimous, I may say to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Let me comment on that now. That is one of the lovely canards circulated around here. I was not in the Senate in 1950. But while I was a Member of the House of Representatives and since I have been a Member of the Senate I have accepted my responsibilities. Do not think I duck them.

On September 13, 1950, the bill to which the Senator from Minnesota has referred came up on the calendar. There were some questions asked. The distinguished senior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] raised a question. I think he considered the amount in the bill was too high. This is what the Senator from Minnesota said to the Senate:

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator from Minnesota acted only upon the information we had from the Post Office Department and on the urgency of the request. I could not help but feel that since it was a very technical subject, about which I knew very little, the only ad-

vice to follow would be that of the Postmaster General, who seems to be doing a job of economizing in the Post Office Department. I did not think he would go overboard in his recommendation.

That was the Senator from Minnesota speaking. The only advice to follow, he said, would be that of the Postmaster General. I assume, from the Senator's own words, that he accepted it.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Not only is that a fair statement, but the distinguished Senator from Delaware [Mr. FREAR] was a member of the subcommittee, as also was the distinguished former Senator from Montana, Mr. Ecton. As members of the full Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, they had in their possession, for consideration in connection with their deliberations, not only the recommendations of the Post Office Department and of the Bureau of the Budget, and a letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, but also a report submitted in the 80th Congress.

I remind the Senator from Illinois that we are referring to the 81st Congress. I, too, love investigations, but I thought the investigation of the 80th Congress was sufficiently current for the problem so that the Senate possibly could accept the unqualifiedly unanimous report of the committee in the 80th Congress.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I do not quarrel with my friend, the distinguished junior Senator from Minnesota. I simply point out that whether it was the 80th Congress or not, a Democratic Postmaster General made the contract.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Does that make it bad?

Mr. DIRKSEN. No; unless it is bad on its face, or unless investigation shows it to be bad .

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Does the Senator from Illinois realize that the bill for which the junior Senator from Minnesota had responsibility was an authorizing or enabling bill?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Certainly. The language is in the RECORD.

Mr. HUMPHREY. It is quite clear that it was not a contract?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Certainly. It was to enable the Postmaster to make a contract.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Therefore, is it quite clear that any statement to the effect that such a bill might involve graft is as fallacious as anything could be?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I would be the last person to reflect upon the integrity of the junior Senator from Minnesota, but the Senator rose in the Senate on a question of personal privilege and set up a strawman, and made that a vehicle for what seemed like an attack on the Postmaster General. That sort of thing I will not take without an answer. That is all.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. As the Senator from Minnesota should know, the Postmaster General never for a moment reflected upon the Senators' integrity. There is not a word anywhere in the releases or in the statements before the House or the Senate Committee on Appropriations in which the Postmaster General spoke, by innuendo or by indirection, in derogation of the junior Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I appreciate the testimony the Senator has given about the Postmaster General and his high regard for me, at least to the effect that he has never made any derogatory statements about me. I believe the record is quite clear now that nobody has ever made any derogatory statements about the Senator from Minnesota, except that they are in newspapers all over the country. When the Postmaster General says that he can save a million dollars, and can move the mail now sent by pneumatic tubes with two trucks for $25,000, and says further that the Senator from Minnesota "protesteth too much," I do not have to be hit on the head with a club to know what that means. The Senator from Illinois is one of the most able and adroit politicians, in the best sense of that word——

Mr. DIRKSEN. The Senator flatters me.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I have great respect for him in many ways. I want him once more to unfold to his colleagues, in his candor, what the facts are about politics. Since he has told us that of course we do not have time to read all the reports submitted to Congress and that it is time to quit fooling the public about such matter, I should like to have him tell us about the strange coincidence that a little bill, which has been a part of the legislative system for many years, suddenly becomes a political issue, not only in Clarissa, Minn., a lovely little community where the people read the newspapers, but in Detroit, New York, Minneapolis, and St. Paul.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I shall not yield further, because the Senator from Minnesota had nearly 2½ hours to speak today. He started out with reference to Abraham Lincoln and his fidelity to fact and his devotion to truth. But Lincoln said something else. He said that if he responded to every attack made on him, he would not have any time to do any business, and that he might just as well shut up shop.

Who made the attack on the Senator from Minnesota? Was it the Postmaster General? No. It was a newspaperman. Who wrote the article? Was the Postmaster General responsible for it? Was the junior Senator from Minnesota responsible? Certainly not.

Mr. President, I have been around the Congress for 22 years and I have taken it on the chin many times, but if I paid attention to all the criticisms and all the suggestions made, I would not have time for anything else.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. I am trying to get clear in my mind what the facts are in regard to the alleged urgency for the passage of the bill.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I do not know what the urgency was.

Mr. MORSE. That is the question I wish to ask the Senator. Is it the Senator's understanding from the record that Postmaster General Donaldson in 1950 made representations that there was some urgency for the passage of the bill?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Definitely, so, because the junior Senator from Minnesota said so on the floor of the Senate; he said it was urgent.

Mr. MORSE. So far as the Postmaster General testified in the hearings——

Mr. DIRKSEN. I have not seen that. This matter arose all of a sudden. But I took account of it when it was presented to the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate on the 26th of January.

Mr. MORSE. Is it the Senator's understanding, as it is mine, however, that the Postmaster General at that time asked for the passage of the bill?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Does the Senator mean in 1950?

Mr. MORSE. Yes.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I think he did.

Mr. MORSE. I mean, did he ask for the authorization?

Mr. DIRKSEN. He made a vigorous request for it, I have no doubt.

Mr. MORSE. Has it been the Senator's observation that when an administration spokesman, whether a Republican or Democratic Postmaster General, proposes a bill, and the chairman of the appropriate committee introduces the bill, it is a common practice for the "people downtown," as we say, to urge the immediate passage of the bill on the ground that they face a great problem which will become greater if the bill is not speedily passed?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I may say to the Senator that I have been around when they would say that the sun could not set until the bill was on the statute books. I do not labor that point, because it is not a part of what I desire to address myself to, namely, my resentment at any attack on the Postmaster General, because he did not attack anyone, he did not put in circulation any newspaper report. He did his duty by responding to the committees of the House and the Senate, and here is VAUGHAN GARY, a fine Democratic Member of the House, saying, "Mr. Chairman, I think the matter ought to be investigated." That was 60 days ago.

Mr. MORSE. My only reason for asking the question about the matter of the urgency was that in the course of the colloquy with the Senator from Minnesota, the Senator from Illinois spoke about the Senator from Minnesota's asking for the passage of the bill as being urgent, and left with me the impression, or, may I say most kindly, I think his remarks might be subject to the interpretation of being an inference, that perhaps the Senator from Minnesota was urging the passage of the bill for some motive other than simply to relay to the

Senate the statement of the Postmaster General that it was urgent.

Mr. DIRKSEN. No; I said that the Postmaster General told him it was urgent.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator quoted from the report of the House committee hearings about the appropriations for the fiscal year 1955.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The Senator says I quoted?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes.

Mr. DIRKSEN. No; I did not.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator quoted Representative GARY, I believe.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Oh, yes; from the House hearings.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I wonder if the Senator will let we read from page 73 where Mr. Summerfield said:

> I have just picked up a memorandum that I would like to comment on briefly to your committee. On March 10, 1950, a committee appointed by the Postmaster General under Order No. 42425, comprised of H. B. Montague, post-office inspector; A. R. Gehman, Assistant Superintendent, Division of Vehicle Service; and A. E. Newton, Assistant Director of Division of City Delivery Service, made a report stating that the pneumatic-tube service at New York should be continued, and recommending the issuance of an advertisement for bids.

I mention this because one of the committee is said to be a postal inspector, and, by the way, the Advisory Committee on the Post Office recently made a statement that we cannot rely on the postal inspectors about matters involving mechanical experience. I have that statement in the testimony.

In view of the 1950 recommendation of the Chief of the Inspectors, of the Assistant Superintendent of the Division of Vehicle Service, of the Assistant Director of the Division of City Delivery Service, and the full committee that was assigned to make the report, and which reported that the tube service should be continued, I ask the Senator from Illnois whether there was not evidence for the continuance of the service?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I am sure the Senator from Minnesota would not want to stand on that.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I will take a chance on it.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Now let us look at the date of that recommendation. That was March 10, was it not?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes.

Mr. DIRKSEN. What did the same committee say on May 15?

Mr. HUMPHREY. The same committee?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes.

Mr. HUMPHREY. They made a report showing a saving then estimated at $280,634.63 per annum by supplanting the pneumatic-tube service with motor-trucks.

Mr. DIRKSEN. That is correct.

Mr. HUMPHREY. But there is something else in the postal service besides saving. If all that is desired is saving, let the Department cut out rural free delivery.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I hope the Senator from Minnesota is not going to start quibbling about this, because the whole idea was to improve the service.

Mr. President, I shall not yield further, because I am going to make the record.

Mr. HUMPHREY. And I will be right here to help the Senator.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Very well. The Senator has been reading from a report of the testimony. He was reading about a report dated March 10. Then comes the same committee on the 15th of May saying the Department should discontinue the tube service because by so doing $280,634.63 could be saved.

Then comes another report. On the 18th of May comes Acting Assistant Postmaster General Cornwell saying that the tubes should be discontinued at the termination of the contract. Then there were still other reports.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Not yet, because I desire to make this record.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Will not the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. No; not until I make the record.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois declines to yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, on May 28, only a little while later, the inspectors then engaged in a comprehensive survey of the postal service at New York issued a report showing that the tubes were operated certain hours during each day, and so forth; and then suggested their discontinuance. That information was here.

When did the bill come to the floor of the Senate? It came here in September. Those recommendations were available.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield for a correction?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Let me suggest to the Senator from Illinois that the Postmaster General was asked by Representative CANFIELD whether, when they recommended a renewal of the contract, they recommended discontinuance of the pneumatic tube service. Mr. Summerfield replied, "That is right."

I suggest that when the officers of the Department are subpenaed, it will be found that what Mr. Donaldson asked for was an alternative in case the service had to be discontinued, in case the Government was unwilling to help pay for the amortization of the cost of new equipment.

I suggest that the distinguished Senator from Illinois is getting himself into a situation he will not wish to be in, and I ask him to be careful, because I have checked with the officials and they are willing to be subpenaed; and when they are subpenaed, it will be found that the request made to the committee was not about whether the system should be discontinued; but the request made to the postal committee which made the investigation was, "If we have to discontinue it because the Consolidated Electric has said it will not furnish direct current any longer, how much will it cost to change to trucks, and how much of a saving will there be?"

Following those recommendations, the Postmaster General and the Bureau of the Budget made a decision, based on the surveys, that request should be made for continuation of the tube service and to amortize the cost of the new installations.

I would say Mr. Summerfield is grossly in error; and I trust it is an error which was not premeditated at all, but occurred simply because he had not had time to ascertain the facts.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I will stand on what I have said and on what I now say. I am willing to abide by the results of any investigation.

However, there are a few other fallacies to be disposed of. Reference has been made to the time element and the difficulty of carrying 6 million additional letters on 2 additional trucks. That was the crux of the matter.

Let me point out that at this time there are operating in New York City mail trucks which are not entirely loaded and which can carry infinitely more mail. It will require only two additional trucks to stop the duplication and to save money.

In a minute I shall refer to the saving. My friend, the Senator from Minnesota, pointed out the cost to the Post Office Department, and said the Department would buy 70 trucks.

As a matter of fact, the Post Office Department is going to buy 2,500 trucks and will allocate them for all sorts of purposes all over the country. But that does not mean the Department was going to assign 70 trucks in order to supplement the service in New York City.

Mr. President, the Postmaster General said he could do the work in New York City with two additional trucks, because at this time there are on the job in New York City many mail trucks which are rumbling over the cobblestones directly above the pneumatic tubes.

As to the savings, let me make the record here for a moment: The savings are shown in the record, at least. Three hundred and fifty-eight thousand dollars a year will be saved on rental; $63,000 a year will be saved on power; $85,000 a year will be saved on maintenance and personnel; $3,900 a year will be saved on telephone service; $495,000 a year will be saved on workers, for it will be possible to integrate those employees into the postal service of New York, and thus replace the temporary employees who are working there now.

So, Mr. President, when the Postmaster General said he could save $1 million a year, the record establishes it.

At this time, of course, the job the Postmaster General has is to determine how he can cancel the contract, even though it does not contain a cancellation clause.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield to me?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Is the Senator from Illinois aware of the 1948 report in which it is estimated that to change from the pneumatic-tube service to service by trucks would cost an additional $57,000?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes; I am aware of it.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Is the Senator from Illinois aware of the fact that in 1950—and, of course, many figures have been referred to in the course of the discussion of this matter——

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Is the Senator from Illinois aware that when Mr. Summerfield says he can save $1,000,000 a year, in 1950 the officials thought they could save $287,000, and the committee headed by Representative CANFIELD suggested that $460,000 could be saved? I point out that somewhere between the estimated saving of $1,000,000 and the $57,000 it would cost to convert the system, and the $287,000 figure of May 15, 1950, and the $460,000 estimated saving, as testified before the committee headed by Representative CANFIELD, perhaps we can obtain some facts.

It appears to me that what the Postmaster General has done is to cancel the contract and then to scurry around in an effort to find some facts.

Mr. DIRKSEN. No, Mr. President; the Postmaster General is not having any difficulty.

The Senator from Minnesota could have obtained some more facts in 1950, because he then stood on the floor of the Senate and said he was taking the advice of the Postmaster General; and the Senator from Minnesota then said he did not know anything about the matter. That is the effect of the statement the Senator from Minnesota made on the floor of the Senate; I am only repeating what he said.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I would not expect the Senator from Illinois to think that I would proclaim myself an expert.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Certainly not.

Mr. HUMPHREY. However, since the bill was unanimously reported by the committee, I would at least like to believe that my 12 colleagues on the committee were much better versed in this matter than I was. As a matter of fact, the 12 other Members of the Senate who were members of the committee were in favor of the bill, and subsequently the Senate itself was in favor of the bill.

As the distinguished Senator from Illinois himself knows, two Republican Senators sat on the floor of the Senate every time there was a calendar call, and had their folders before them, and checked on every bill. That is a matter of procedure and record for which I commend the Republican leadership. The Senator from Illinois also knows that no objection was raised to that particular bill.

Furthermore, I would hope the Senator from Illinois would expect us to accept the testimony. After all, the 80th Congress had a full investigation made. The report of that investigation was a part of our record and a part of the total procedure of the Senate. I think it ill behooves the Senator from Illinois to say that the junior Senator from Minnesota was not informed. The junior Senator from Minnesota said he was not an expert.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I will not yield longer. The junior Senator from Minnesota said so on this floor.

Mr. HUMPHREY. He said he was not an expert on these matters.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Very well; he has confessed his case. So let us not discuss it any longer.

Mr. President, when I began my remarks I had no intention of getting into an altercation with the junior Senator from Minnesota. I try to be reasonably constrained.

But the junior Senator from Minnesota saw in all the newspaper publicity—over which we have no control whatever—a "smear" on the part of the Republican high command; that is the language he used on the floor of the Senate. I think it is an outrage for him to make such a statement without having some supporting data. He used my name. He said I was the one who would get the McCarthy subcommittee to investigate this matter.

Mr. HUMPHREY. No, I did not say that. I said the Senator from Illinois, who is also chairman of the Republican senatorial campaign committee, asked in the Senate appropriations, or suggested, that the matter be referred to the permanent subcommittee on investigations.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Oh, it has been suggested, but the junior Senator from Illinois did not ask for it, Mr. President.

I simply wish to keep the record straight.

I will help to defeat the junior Senator from Minnesota any old time, but I will never utter a dishonorable word or take advantage of him.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I apreciate that.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I simply want the record to be kept straight, and I wish to see to it that Cabinet members do not become the victims of an ex parte case when a Member of the Senate sets up a strawman and then attempts to knock him down.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, if the Senator from Illinois is now trying to establish Senate rules for debate in regard to Cabinet members——

Mr. DIRKSEN. No; I am not.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Let me say that I have heard Cabinet members literally excoriated in the Senate, without any defense being made here in their behalf, and at a time when Republican Members have participated in that blood bath.

Mr. DIRKSEN. That may be.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Furthermore, I have paid tribute to the good character and honesty of the Postmaster General. I simply say that what has happened is quite peculiar. It may simply be a happenstance and sheer coincidence; but in view of all the Senator from Illinois knows about politics——

Mr. DIRKSEN. Oh, Mr. President, the Senator from Minnesota knows infinitely more about it. [Laughter.]

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, from what little I know about politics, I say I think it is quite interesting to see that this measure suddenly receives attention; and all at once articles about it spring into print; and all sort of words, including such words as "scandal," "graft," "public dereliction of duty," and so forth, are used.

Mr. President, these statements did not come from the leader of the Epworth League. They came from the Republican national committeeman, who has been in consultation with high officialdom in Washington in recent days.

Some of these words also came even from Members of the Senate. Members of the Senate are quoted in Mr. Hayden's story.

Mr. DIRKSEN. What does that prove?

Mr. HUMPHREY. It proves that American politics has apparently reached the point where, rather than discuss an issue on its merits, such words as "graft" and "corruption" are used and attached to people's names without one scintilla of evidence.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Why does not the Senator talk with Martin Hayden, who wrote the story? Why not talk with the publishers of the St. Paul Pioneer Press? Why not go to Clarissa, Minn., and talk with Mr. Etzell? To be sure, he is the Republican National Committeeman there. Have we any control over him? Indeed not. My friend from Minnesota, I think, finds an amazing significance in something which appears in the press. I hesitate even to suggest it, but perhaps it brought a slight tremor with respect to the outcome in 1954. I will take that remark out of the RECORD, because it is only a pleasantry.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I want the Senator to leave it there.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I have seen Charley Etzell only once in my life. I do not think I would recognize him if he walked into the Senate Chamber this afternoon. Have we control over him? Did the Postmaster General set this thing in motion?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Did he?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Did the Senator find a single derogatory statement about himself in the language of the Postmaster General?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Did he?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I ask the Senator to cite me the language to which he refers.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Judging from the product which has emanated, I have more evidence to show that the Postmaster General did set this thing in motion than the Senator from Illinois has to show that he did not.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The Senator used 2½ hours to discuss this subject. I am waiting for him to cite the Postmaster General's language.

That is enough. I surrender the floor. I will let the record speak for itself.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I will yield for a question. The Senator from New York made the comment that the Postmaster General could not dissociate himself from his former position as national chairman.

Mr. LEHMAN. I did.

Mr. DIRKSEN. That was an unfair and unkind thing to say about Arthur Summerfield, a great businessman, a man of character in his own right. The

Senator from New York would demean him here, where he cannot answer.

Mr. LEHMAN. I certainly made that statement.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The Senator certainly did, this afternoon.

Mr. LEHMAN. I do not apologize for it, and I do not retract that statement.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Good.

Mr. LEHMAN. It certainly is a very remarkable situation when we see the former chairman of the Republican National Committee, who is now Postmaster General, make the statement which reflects on the Senator from Minnesota that a contract involving a cost of $1,007,000 could be replaced by just 2 additional trucks costing $22,168.44. Of course, that is nonsense.

Mr. DIRKSEN. If the Senator——

Mr. LEHMAN. The Senator has yielded to me for a comment. If he does not mind, I should like to continue my comment.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I am not going to allow the Senator from New York to make a comment. I yielded for a question. The Senator is not going to take all my time.

I suppose that the former Democratic chairman, Bob Hannegan, and the former chairman, Jim Farley, could, as Postmaster General, dissociate themselves from the fact that they were both former national party chairmen. Does the Senator from New York place them in a little different cubicle? However, if the Senator had heard my remarks a moment ago as to how the saving would be effected, and how much it would be, he would have gotten the whole story.

Mr. LEHMAN. I heard the Senator from Illinois make that statement, but it does not make sense to me.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Of course, the Senator's capacity for understanding is not within my control.

Mr. LEHMAN. It does not make sense to me that the entire $1,007,000 could be saved, except for a cost of $22,168.44.

The Senator from Illinois referred to trucks rattling over the cobblestones——

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I should like to add one further observation. I decline to yield further.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair reminds Members of the Senate that the rules of the Senate require that a Senator who wishes another Senator to yield must first address the Chair.

Does the Senator from Illinois yield to the Senator from New York?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I decline to yield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois declines to yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. What Senators forget about the pneumatic-tube system is that it carries only 32 percent of the first-class mail. It carries no heavy mail in New York City. There are a few trucks, whether they are empty or full, rattling over the cobblestones in downtown Manhattan. So 68 percent of the first-class mail and all the heavy mail must be transported by trucks.

The Postmaster General believes that if the trucks were fully loaded, full efficiency could be obtained through the use of the trucks, in carrying both heavy mail and first-class mail, and that the pneumatic-tube service, which is a sort of two-way, inflexible service, could be done away with, at a saving of $1 million.

The fact of the matter is that in 1948 the pneumatic-tube system could carry 50 percent of the first-class mail. Today it can carry only 32 percent. As the volume of mail goes up the capacity of the tube, percentagewise, goes down, and it becomes a rather inefficient operation. That is the mechanics of the problem. We shall have more to say about it later. I merely wished to be sure that no ex parte record would be left here this afternoon with respect to a very fine Postmaster General.

Mr. President, I surrender the floor.

Mr. SYMINGTON obtained the floor.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SYMINGTON. I yield for a question.

Mr. GORE. Will the Senator yield in order that I may suggest the absence of a quorum, provided he does not lose the floor?

Mr. SYMINGTON. I am glad to yield for that purpose under those conditions.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Missouri may yield to me in order that I may suggest the absence of a quorum, provided he does not lose the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded and that further proceedings under the call be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

---

## THE FEDERAL EMPLOYEE SECURITY PROGRAM

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, during recent weeks there has been much intelligent debate on the floor of the Senate as to whether there should be further amendment to the Constitution of the United States.

Despite sharp differences of opinion, I am sure we have all been impressed by the dignity and restraint with which this debate has been conducted from both sides of the aisle.

In direct contrast to the statesmanlike atmosphere on the Senate floor, however, have been recent mean and false attacks made outside the Congress by various leaders of the Republican Party.

I have noted these attacks with deep regret.

In this troubled world, they can only affect adversely the security and prosperity of our country.

On January 9, last, in Springfield, Mo., I said in connection with these growing attacks:

> It may be that in this session, as during the last session, President Eisenhower will receive more support from the Democrats than he will from the Republicans.
>
> The President has a growing problem, however. His close friend and political ally, Governor Dewey, recently made a speech which, to the best of my knowledge, is the first time every member of an opposition party has been indicted.
>
> We Democrats will continue to vote for what we believe is best for the country. But I don't see how such a blanket condemnation of all Democrats by anyone as close to the administration as Governor Dewey can help the President in his efforts to obtain bipartisan support.
>
> As our beloved SAM RAYBURN quietly mentioned the other evening, Democratic backs are sore from the mounting criticism from prominent associates of the President.

People who indiscriminately condemn all members of the Democratic Party should remember they are reflecting on the patriotism of such men as the dean of the Senate, that symbol of integrity, the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], on Mr. RAYBURN, and on men with such records as that of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], a marine who gave his own blood at Peleliu and Okinawa that America could remain free.

Nevertheless, these attacks continue.

The Republican Party is in numerical minority in the Senate. It barely has a majority in the House.

Therefore the President knows he must depend on Democratic votes for the success of his program, as well as on Republican votes.

When they believe his requests are in the interest of the country's security and prosperity, Democrats will vote with the President, because they are Americans before they are Democrats.

Is it either fair or proper, however, for the President, dependent on the patriotism and support of Democratic Members, to continue to permit not only his party leaders, but even members of his own official family, to smear these same Democrats whose support he knows he must have?

I had hoped that this recent "rat-alley" partisan approach, so contrary to the truth, would cease. But the attacks are expanding. Now they not only include all Democrats who, for any reason, have left office since this new administration came into power, but also all Democrats who still remain in Government service.

In other words, apparently an effort is now being made to place the blot of subversion against thousands of Democrats in the Government who have never been accused of anything; Democrats who resigned of their own free will and accord, and Democrats whose only crime is that they have been transferred from one Government department to another.

Last October the White House announced the separation of 1,456 Government employees, under the Republican Federal employees security program.

In his state of the Union message, President Eisenhower raised this figure to 2,200.

The original Government announcement asserted that of this total of 1,456, 863 had been dismissed, and 593 had resigned.

It also stated that some of those dismissed were actually appointees of the new administration.

As mentioned, some of this number have merely been transferred to other Government jobs. Some have died. Some were automatically eliminated because of "reductions in force" directives.

Those are the facts. Now let us look at the way the facts have been distorted.

In Chicago, on November 6, Attorney General Brownell implied that 1,456 Government employees were being thrown out because they were subversives.

The record shows his implication to be false.

The same day, the President's own counsel, Bernard Shanley, in a speech at Newark, stated that "1,456 subversives have been kicked out of Government jobs since the President assumed office."

This statement by Mr. Shanley was doubly false. A great many of that number were not discharged as subversives; and, as stated, many hundreds of the 1,456 were not "kicked out."

Why did not the administration clear up this part of these false attacks by announcing just how many of these 1,456 were discharged for subversion?

They did not and have not—in fact, the falsity of these implications continued to grow.

Late in November, the Republican National Committee finance chairman, Carlton G. Ketchum, stated "President Eisenhower and his team have gotten rid of nearly 1,500 Communists, fellow travelers, and their ilk, whom the Trumanites had left in office."

President Eisenhower would be the first to agree that this statement is false in fact and false in implication.

In his speech in Hartford last December 16, Governor Dewey implied that most if not all of these 1,456 Government employees were spies and traitors, and that they had all been dismissed.

The record shows that implication was false.

As late as last January 21, Postmaster General Summerfield, a member of the President's Cabinet and former chairman of the Republican National Committee, stated, "Almost 2,200 people who were security risks are no longer using up your tax money. I am here to tell you that we will not hire any new ones. Somehow I do not feel too amicably inclined toward people who make treason a preoccupation."

The able, independent, and fact-finding Washington Evening Star has had something to say about that false blast from a member of the President's Cabinet against many Democrats whose only fault lay in the fact they had resigned of their own free will, or had been transferred, or had been discharged automatically by "reductions in force," or had died.

The Star said:

> The link between "2,200" and "treason" seemed, in the context of the address, to be quite direct. And it was inaccurate to say that none of the 2,200 was "using up your tax money," since some were known to be still on Government payrolls.

Finally, as of only last Saturday, the assistant to the President, Sherman Adams, expressed his idea of how to get Democratic support for the President's program by calling those in Congress who do not always agree with him, political sadists.

On Sunday morning, after reading that statement, I went to my dictionary and looked up the word "sadism." There was one definition for it, and the same definition is contained in the dictionary in the Marble Room of the Senate. It states sadism is "perversion marked by extreme cruelty."

I believe Governor Adams was ignorant of the meaning of the charge he was making against all Democrats who did not agree with him on these economic issues. It is my personal belief he owes an apology to the Democratic Members of the Senate and of the House he criticized. If I may respectfully say so, if he does not make apology, he should not hold his high office.

Are we to accept, as a political necessity of our time, the complete loss of respect to any opposition, and no respect whatever for human decency?

Every American citizen knows that the United States is in danger as the result of the steadily growing military strength of Soviet communism. That is no secret to the people.

Military experts warned last summer that a truce in Korea, although it would contain the blessing of at least temporarily stopping the bullets, might also furnish another successful opportunity for the Communists to regroup and rebuild their strength.

These experts also warned that the Communist military pressure, as mercury in the palm of one's hand, would probably shift to Indochina.

As we have read recently in the news, that is only too true. The situation in Indochina has now deteriorated to the point where it has just been found necessary to send 200 additional Americans as aid to that unfortunate country in its desperate effort to resist the advance of the Kremlin.

Berlin appears to be at stalemate. The political situations in France and Italy vary week to week from crisis to crisis.

Above all, therefore, as I see it, as we face outward, it would appear we need unity at home.

America can lick any problem if it has unity, because unity brings high morale, and that morale furnishes the will to succeed.

Our country faces internally an unbalanced budget, large farm surpluses, and increased unemployment in industry.

At the same time we have these internal problems along with the external dangers, however, some leaders of the Republican Party continue to look backward instead of forward.

For reasons best known to themselves, they sow dissension and discord among the American people, at a time when the United States faces probably the greatest peril in its history.

Is it not time for the President to tell the people his position with respect to the unjust attacks now being carried on by many Republicans, including members of his own White House staff, and his own Cabinet?

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Missouri yield?

Mr. SYMINGTON. I am happy to yield to the distinguished Senator from Alabama.

Mr. HILL. Is it not true that if the President remains silent in the face of these attacks which have come from men who are his very closest advisers and his intimates in determinig the policy of his administration, many persons will feel that he is a silent partner in these attacks and accusations?

Mr. SYMINGTON. I thank the distinguished senior Senator from Alabama. I have great respect and affection for the President of the United States, but I believe the Senator has expressed well the thinking that is rapidly spreading across our beloved country. In my opinion, if the President does not disown this type and character of smear on those persons he is counting on to help him with his program, it is going to be realized by all the people within a short time.

Mr. HILL. Does not the Senator share my view that many persons voted for Mr. Eisenhower to be President of the United States because they felt that he had never been in partisan politics, and was free from any of the prejudice, bitterness, and personal feelings which sometimes enter into partisan politics, and therefore, because he had not been in partisan politics and was free of what might be called the things which are sometimes the liabilities of partisan politics, he could go forward as a new leader, lift up the horizon, and stimulate and encourage the people of the Nation, the people of all parties, to a course of action by our country in a way that probably would not be achieved by someone brought up in politics? Is not that correct?

Mr. SYMINGTON. I agree with my friend from Alabama, I think he is entirely correct in his thinking.

Mr. HILL. If the President by his silence gives his assent to these statements and becomes, as I have said, a silent partner, will he not fail, will he not be in default in the leadership which so many millions of persons hoped and expected he would give the Nation?

Mr. SYMINGTON. Again, I agree with my distinguished colleague from Alabama. At the end of my talk I had expressed the same thought as that advanced by the Senator from Alabama, not so well as he has expressed it, but in the same general way. I would state, with complete respect, that the President is not only the head of the Republican Party, but is also the President of all the people.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Missouri yield?

Mr. SYMINGTON. I shall be happy to yield to the distinguished Senator from New York.

Mr. LEHMAN. Is it not a fact that what is happening today is that we are being exposed to what amounts almost to a national panic by the hysterical description of an army of traitors honeycombing our Government and menacing us on every hand, in our schools, in the press, in labor unions, in the theatrical world and even in our churches? Is it not a further fact that leading persons

in public life, seemingly of great responsibility, including the Governor of my own State of New York, and some of the highest officials in the National Government, have stooped to the furtherance of this false impression?

Mr. SYMINGTON. I would rather not comment in detail on what the Senator from New York has stated in his able manner. I can only say that the atmosphere of the Government, and the atmosphere inside the Senate Chamber at times this afternoon, distressed me. As Benjamin Franklin said, if we do not all hang together, we will hang separately. It seems there must be some way in which we can have unity behind our President.

I should like to pay my respects to the distinguished majority leader, the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND], who for many years has had my affection and deep respect. He has great problems confronting him. There are more Democrats in the Senate than there are Republicans. He works conscientiously and intelligently with the Members on this side of the aisle. Sometimes it seems to me he should receive more support from his own administration with respect to his problems on this floor.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Missouri yield further?

Mr. SYMINGTON. I yield.

Mr. LEHMAN. Is it not a fact, as the Senator has indicated in his very able address, that the figure of 2,200 which has been used by many persons in high places in the Federal Government and in State governments, including the Governor of my own State, has reference to persons who were dismissed because of reductions in force brought about by budgetary cuts, to some who were transferred from one Government agency to another, to some who were dismissed because of unsatisfactory personal habits, and to some who were dismissed for purely political reasons?

There is indication that some included in the total of 2,200 were dismissed because of real concern regarding their loyalty, not to speak of real proof as to Communist affiliation which is claimed as being slightly involved.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I answer my distinguished colleague from New York by saying that, with the exception of those dismissed for purely political reasons—and, to be honest, I do not know about those—the Senator is correct with respect to those in the other categories. I should like to point out that in all those categories not a single case of disloyalty is involved. Therefore it is grossly false and unfair to many decent Americans to stigmatize them and their families by using such figures as 1,456, 1,500, or 2,200, as being subversives, as Mr. Ketchum has done.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Missouri yield?

Mr. SYMINGTON. I shall be glad to yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I desire to make a very brief comment and to commend the Senator from Missouri for what I believe to be a very fine, thoughtful, and moderate statement with respect to the problems he has discussed. It is an exceedingly timely statement.

I think we all realize that the American people expect us to act responsibly and to have a high regard for one another in this Chamber, as well as high regard for our Government at the executive level. We have all, at times, been guilty of some excess of language. At times, maybe, we have exaggerated when we should not have done so, but I think we should constantly try to keep in mind what the Senator from Missouri has so well pointed out, that there is nothing to be gained by wide and wholesale accusation and abusive language or invective that cannot be substantiated by facts.

I simply wish to thank the Senator. I really feel he has rendered a great service and has again marked himself as one of our real leaders.

While it is not my privilege frequently to visit the State of Missouri, I wish to say that we are very happy that the State of Missouri has sent its distinguished son, in the person of the junior Senator from Missouri, to work with us in the Senate. I think Missouri is a marvelous State. I congratulate the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I congratulate my distinguished friend, the junior Senator from Minnesota. One of the reasons I find myself privileged to have the great honor of being junior Senator from Missouri is that the junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] was kind enough to speak for me as ably in Missouri in 1952 as he has spoken for himself this afternoon in 1954.

Sould the junior Senator from Minnesota desire me to go to Minnesota and tell the people of that State what I think about his character, his industry, his accomplishments, and his contributions to the Government of the United States, I shall look forward with very much pleasure to doing so.

Mr. President, as I was saying, if the President of the United States endorses the attacks now being made by many Republicans, including members of his White House staff and his Cabinet, should he not so tell the American people, and why?

If he does not endorse them, then those of us who believe this growing discord is affecting the security of the United States have the right to ask what he intends to do about it.

If these vicious and untruthful attacks continue, the resulting national disunity can only play directly into the hands of any possible enemy.

At this point, I may say we hear much talk about the dangers of communism. But there is great danger to the American people in internal disunity. A look at a map will disclose that in 10 short years the Communists have increased the number of people under their control from 200 million to 800 million; and it may be noted that invariably this increase in the number of countries succumbing to communistic control can be attributed to the creation of the same type of internal disunity now being developed in the United States.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SYMINGTON. I yield.

Mr. HILL. Is it not true that those who would divide us, those who would separate us, those who would turn us one against the other, play right into the hands of the Communists?

Mr. SYMINGTON. The senior Senator from Alabama, with an experience vastly greater than mine, knows that what he says is entirely correct.

Mr. President, the decision as to whether or not such a policy shall continue is up to the President. I would ask the President to let us know where he stands in connection with the increasing savage attacks being made on all Democrats, because not only is he the head of the Republican Party, he is also the President of all the people of the United States.

## ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to make a speech out of order.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I shall not object, of course, to the request of the distinguished Senator from South Carolina, who had spoken to me earlier. But I wish to say that I shall have to object to any further unanimous-consent requests on the part of Senators to make speeches ahead of the calendar call. Last week it was stated and, I thought, had been thoroughly understood that the calendar would be called this afternoon. I expect to hold the Senate in session tonight until the calendar call has been completed.

I merely wish to say that if any Senators desire to make speeches following the call of the calendar, I shall be glad to have the Senate remain in session to enable them to do so. But under the circumstances, and in view of the unanimous-consent request previously entered into, I shall have to object to further yielding for speeches this afternoon until the calendar shall have been called.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I have not the floor; the Senator from South Carolina has the floor.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I will yield briefly to the Senator from Montana, provided I do not lose the floor.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I wish to say to the distinguished Senator from California that some Senators have speeches they desire to make this afternoon. I wonder if we could not make our speeches first, and then proceed with the call of the calendar. We have already listened to 3 or 4 speeches this afternoon; why create discrimination?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I may say to the Senator from Montana that this is one of the problems the majority leader frequently tries to adjust for the convenience of Senators. I think the distinguished Senator from Montana will at least agree that there has been bipartisan discrimination, if there has been discrimination at all, because the distinguished junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the distin-

guished junior Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON], and the distinguished junior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON] are on the Democratic side of the aisle. The only Senator on this side of the aisle who has had the floor was the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], who desired to make a brief response to the junior Senator from Minnesota.

So I think there can be no charge that there has not been a leaning over backward to accomodate unanimous-consent requests on the part of distinguished Senators on the Democratic side of the aisle. But it is necessary to call a stop somewhere.

In fairness to my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, I may say that there will be no attempt to cut off any Senator who has a speech he wishes to deliver today. I shall hold the Senate in session to permit Senators to make their speeches. But I shall ask for the regular order when the distinguished Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON] has concluded his remarks.

## POSTAL POLICY CONFUSION

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I am taking the floor today with some reluctance, because the matter of which I must speak is distasteful to me—as it must be, I think, to any man of good will. Nonetheless, the time has come when it is imperative that someone should challenge the methods, if not the motivations, of our Postmaster General in his efforts to stampede through the Senate and the House of Representatives certain legislation he is anxious to see enacted.

I note that my distinguished colleague, the junior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] has questioned the legality of the Postmaster General's action in authorizing the expenditure of $12,000 of Post Office Department funds to conduct a public-opinion poll which was apparently designed to bring pressure on the Members of Congress. I agree with the distinguished gentleman from Tennessee that use of postal funds in this way was certainly unethical, if not illegal as well.

But this is only the latest of a series of actions by the Post Office Department which have had the effect, if not the intention, of deceiving the American people.

I should like to list a number of intentional or unintentional misstatements made by the Postmaster General recently in condemning the Citizen's Advisory Council Report recently submitted to the Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee.

Mr. Summerfield, the Postmaster General, referred to the advisory council, which was established by the United States Senate under Senate Resolution 49, as the Fuller committee. His purpose apparently was to imply that the council was under the domination of Walter Fuller, one of the council members, and that Mr. Fuller's recommendations resulted not from his judgment as to the best interests of the country, but from a selfish and shortsighted loyalty to his own business.

Through oversight—I prefer to look upon it as that, rather than deliberate evasion—the honorable Postmaster General neglected to mention the nine other members of the advisory council, all of whom had a voice and a part in preparing the recommendations contained in the council's report.

I am confident that it was a mental lapse on the Postmaster General's part that he did not tell us that among the other members of the Fuller Committee was Mrs. Theodore S. Chapman, first vice president of the General Federation of Women's Clubs. Now I like to think that Mrs. Chapman did not bow to the wishes of the magazine publishers, or any other special-interest group, in her deliberations and in her efforts and contributions to the report of the advisory council.

Mr. Summerfield, in his anxiety to name Mr. Fuller, completely overlooked another member of the council—William C. Doherty, president of the National Association of Letter Carriers, and a vice president of the American Federation of Labor. I still am not convinced, despite the implications of Mr. Summerfield, that Mr. Doherty is under the domination of the magazine publishers and willing to put his signature of endorsement on any document placed before him.

Did the Postmaster General forget to tell us, or was it by design that he neglected to mention the name of M. Albert Linton, chairman, board of directors, Provident Mutual Life Insurance Co. of Philadelphia and Robert Ramspeck, a distinguished former Member of the House of Representatives, and later Chairman of the Civil Service Commission, and now vice president of Eastern Air Lines? Are we to infer that Mr. Ramspeck is also a publisher's pawn?

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to place in the RECORD a full list of the advisory council membership as appointed and approved by the Senate Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

There being no objection, the list was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MEMBERS OF THE ADVISORY COUNCIL TO THE SENATE POST OFFICE AND CIVIL SERVICE COMMITTEE

Walter D. Fuller, chairman of the board, the Curtis Publishing Co., Philadelphia, Pa.

Eugene C. Pulliam, president, Indianapolis Star and News, Indianapolis, Ind.

M. Albert Linton, chairman of the board, Provident Mutual Life Insurance Co. of Philadelphia, Philadelphia, Pa.

Ed M. Anderson, editor and publisher, North Carolina weekly newspapers, Forest City, N. C.

Mrs. Theodore S. Chapman, first vice president, General Federation of Women's Clubs, Jerseyville, Ill.

William C. Doherty, president, National Association of Letter Carriers, Washington, D. C.

John E. Tillotson, director, Associated Third-Class Mail Users, Kansas City, Mo.

Edward B. Rubin, vice president, Spiegel, Chicago, Ill.

Paul D. Sanders, editor and copublisher, the Southern Planter, Richmond, Va.

Robert Ramspeck, vice president in charge of Federal and State regulatory matters, Eastern Air Lines, Washington, D. C.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I have the utmost confidence in the integrity and honesty of these outstanding men and women.

Such aspersion by the Postmaster General is shocking. Let me say with all frankness that I believe Mr. Summerfield owes an apology to Mr. Fuller, to the entire advisory council, and to the Senate of the United States.

To imply that the findings of the council represent simply the views of one man, and that those views reflect simply the short-term interests of magazine and newspaper publishers, is a reflection not only on the members of the advisory council, but on the members of the Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee.

Only a few days ago were we exposed to the latest instance of the deviations from the truth of the Postmaster General. In an address before the National Industrial Conference Board in New York, Mr. Summerfield again publicly attacked the actions and motivations of the Senate Advisory Council, saying:

> A so-called advisory council whose membership is dominated by representatives of these special interests, released a report with conclusions with which we violently disagree.

Then, apparently remembering his audience, the Postmaster General said:

> I am happy and proud to say that in refreshing contrast to this report (the advisory council's report) is the report of the National Industrial Conference Board entitled, "Economies of Postal Service Business."

The Postmaster General continues on in his praise of the National Industrial Conference Board report, saying:

> These findings offer many helpful suggestions. They are tools we can use. In no sense can they be construed as special pleading for continuance of special privilege.

Mr. President, the National Industrial Conference Board report which Mr. Summerfield so unequivocally praises is a basic part of the Advisory Council's report which Mr. Summerfield is going out of his way to condemn. However, inconsistency seems to be part of the nature of the esteemed head of the postal system of our country, so perhaps we should make allowances accordingly.

I have been recently quoted as withholding approval of the Advisory Council report. I wish to correct this misinterpretation. In its 364 pages the report contains 28 different recommendations. I am sure that no one Senator, myself included, would agree in detail with them all. But I consider the report as a whole to be a magnificent job by dedicated men and women.

The Postmaster General claimed in his press release that "the findings of this 364-page document"—that is, the report of the Advisory Council—"were withheld from us until today." Now, that simply is not so. This body has reason to know that the council report was made available to the Post Office Department some days before the Postmaster General released his prepared statement, a statement in violation of good ethics, as it was released before the release time of the report.

Nor was the council created, as the Postmaster General says, "to assist the Post Office Department." The council was created to assist the Post Office and Civil Service Committee of the United States Senate in drawing up sensible postal legislation.

Unfortunately, this type of designed distortion is not new for the present management of the Post Office Department. I have in my hand a statement made by Mr. Summerfield as recently as last October. This is what he said in an appearance on the nationwide television program Facts Forum:

Mr. SUMMERFIELD. The first thing that we did when we took office was to carefully analyze every department of the Post Office and figure out ways and means of reducing the cost at the same time increasing the efficiency.

He said further:

By new efficiencies, reduction in overlaying operations, etc., and then with some additional adjustments in rates * * * I am happy to say to you that now our anticipated deficit for this fiscal year instead of $752 million will be something in excess of $400 million, or a saving to you, ladies and gentlemen, the taxpayers of this country, of more than $1 million every working day.

Now, if my colleagues heard that over the air, would they not have the impression that the Postmaster General has cut expenses in the Post Office Department by a million dollars a day? Of course they would, and that is exactly what he wanted them to think. But has he done that? He has not.

But there must be a saving, one may say, because the Postmaster General tells me the deficit is down to about $440 million, and I am sure the Postmaster General is an honest man.

Mr. President, let us look at the figures. As directed by the 82d Congress, and with the authorization of the Interstate Commerce Commission, the rates on fourth-class mail were raised by $159 million a year, effective October 1, 1953. The Postmaster General has raised international postage rates by $24 million. Increases in the price of stamped envelopes, box rents, and miscellaneous domestic fees amount to $16,400,000. So he has gotten $199,400,000 from higher rates, alone.

But that is not the whole story. By authorization of Congress the Post Office Department has also, and quite properly, transferred the cost of airline subsidies to the Civil Aeronautics Board. That is $80,655,000 off the Post Office books. Other bookkeeping shifts bring the total to about $116 million. That is a grand total of more than $316 million. So it appears that instead of spending less of the taxpayers' money he is actually spending more. Perhaps there are some overall savings, but I should like to see them spelled out.

We have been told repeatedly that the service of the Post Office Department has greatly increased during the last 12 months.

I am not prepared to tell you, Mr. President, with factual background, whether the postal service has been better, or worse, since the new team took over. I do not have access to the popular opinion polls and survey teams for the guidance and analysis available to the Postmaster General.

There is evidence, however, that some advocates for the new regime in Washington are not quite ready to "buy" all that is claimed in the way of better postal service since the new management took over the Department.

Mr. President, I hold in my hand a clipping from the Chicago Daily Tribune of January 21, 1954, which, I believe, reveals some worthwhile facts. From the clipping it will be found that publisher McCormick has a few misgivings about Mr. Summerfield's claims of superior postal service. Apparently the Chicago Tribune decided to find out for itself whether Mr. Summerfield or his predecessors did a better job of handling the mails. According to the results, the incumbent still has a little to learn about postal operations. Anyway, he came off second best in Mr. McCormick's survey.

I now read from the article:

TEST REVEALS MAIL SLOWER IN LAST YEAR

A test of the United States mail indicates that service may have slowed about 4½ percent since last year.

The Tribune has repeated an experiment made last year when 384 letters were posted between Chicago and suburbs and 16 major cities. The total elapsed time for delivery of all letters in 1953 was 16,942 hours. The total in 1954 was 17,726 hours.

I willingly admit that 384 letters fall far short of the millions handled daily by the Post Office Department. But let us assume that it is a sufficient number to provide an adequate sampling figure.

Certainly the results are as conclusive as those attained by Mr. Summerfield, who tells us that his poll of 2,000 persons gives unquestionable indication that the American people are anxious to pay a higher rate of postage for their mailing privileges.

By the way, Mr. President, I understand that Mr. Summerfield paid either $10,000 or $12,000 for the poll of the 2,000 persons.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Carolina yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PAYNE in the chair). Does the Senator from South Carolina yield to the Senator from Tennessee?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield.

Mr. GORE. Did I correctly understand the Senator from South Carolina to say that the Postmaster General expended approximately $12,000 of the money of the taxpayers, to poll 2,000 persons?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. That was his statement to the Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. GORE. Would that amount to approximately $6 per person who was asked the questions?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I believe that is correct; 6 times 2 is 12.

Mr. GORE. Is the Senator from South Carolina aware of the amount of compensation the census enumerators received when they took the very long and complicated questionnaire to the millions of people of the United States?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I do not recall the exact cost.

Mr. GORE. If the Senator from South Carolina does not recall the exact cost, I should like to say to him that the enumerators received an average of 10.2 cents per person questioned.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I remember that it was approximately 10 cents.

Mr. GORE. That is a far cry from $6 per person.

Since the Senator previously referred to my having questioned the propriety and legality of the poll, let me say I also question the economy and advisability of it.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I, also, question the advisability, and whether it is ethically proper for the Postmaster General to do it, and also whether it is legal. That is my position.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, if the Senator from South Carolina will yield further to me, let me say that in view of his statement that he questions the legality of it, I should like to read a section of the United States Code.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I am glad to yield for that purpose.

Mr. GORE. I read section 1913, title 18, of the United States Code:

No part of the money appropriated by any enactment of Congress shall, in the absence of express authorization by Congress, be used directly or indirectly to pay for any personal service, advertisement, telegram, telephone, letter, printed or written matter, or other device, intended or designed to influence in any manner a Member of Congress, to favor or oppose, by vote or otherwise, any legislation or appropriation by Congress, whether before or after the introduction of any bill or resolution proposing such legislation or appropriation; but this shall not prevent officers or employees of the United States or of its departments or agencies from communicating to Members of Congress on the request of any Member or to Congress, through the proper official channels, requests for legislation or appropriations which they deem necessary for the efficient conduct of the public business.

Whoever, being an officer or employee of the United States or of any department or agency thereof, violates or attempts to violate this section, shall be fined not more than $500, or imprisoned not more than 1 year, or both; and after notice and hearings by the superior officer vested with the power of removing him, shall be removed from office or employment.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. That is a question the Attorney General will have to answer.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at this point?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. In view of the statement by the distinguished Senator from Tennessee, I should like to place in the RECORD a letter dated February 4, 1954, addressed to Mr. Lindsay C. Warren, Comptroller General of the United States, by the Postmaster General, a copy of the contract in question, a copy of the letter stating the legality of the expenditure, by the Acting Solicitor of the Department, a copy of the letter dealing with the so-called Hatch Act relationship to this subject and approving the legal-

ity of the action taken by the Postmaster General, signed by Mr. Walter Yeagley, First Assistant, Criminal Division, Department of Justice, and a copy of a letter addressed to Mr. Charles R. Hook, Jr., by Mr. Stuart A. Rice, Assistant Director for Statistical Standards.

There being no objection, the matters referred to were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OFFICE OF THE POSTMASTER GENERAL,
*Washington, D. C., February 4, 1954.*

Hon. LINDSAY C. WARREN,
*Comptroller General of the United States.*

DEAR MR. WARREN: This will acknowledge your letter of January 26, 1954, with which you transmitted a copy of a letter dated January 21, 1954, addressed to you by Senator ALBERT GORE. The subject matter of the Senator's letter was the report on a public-opinion survey entitled "The Public Looks at Postal Rates." You request a factual report in this matter together with such other comments as I may desire to make.

Upon taking over the duties of the Postmaster General I was faced with the prospect of an annual deficit of upward of $700 million unless drastic action was taken to revise the structure, policies, and practices of the postal establishment. One of the apparent needs was a realistic postal-rate policy. Men of experience in the business and professional world were recruited to take over many of the top-level positions in the Post Office Department.

Annually since 1952 the Congress has appropriated funds for the activation of a Division of Postal Rates in the Post Office Department. My predecessor never activated such a Division. I have obeyed this directive of Congress to use appropriated funds for this purpose, and the Division is now a live and active unit operating under the direction of an Assistant Postmaster General. Its function is to make continuing studies of the postal-rate structure and to recommend changes therein when such appear necessary. To do this it cannot operate in a vacuum. It must seek the views of the general public and take into account the possible public reaction to any proposed change. Accordingly it was determined in this Division of Postal Rates to sample public opinion with respect to some of our present policies.

The views of our Solicitor were sought. He advised that it would be lawful to contract for a public-opinion survey under the provisions of 55a, title 5, United States Code, and our appropriations act for 1954.

The views of the Director of the Bureau of the Budget were also requested with respect to this matter. The Federal Reports Act of 1942 recognized that the executive branch of the Government must procure information from the general public. The act directs the Director of the Bureau of the Budget to coordinate the "information collecting services" of all agencies of the Government to the end that the cost of procuring such information would be reduced and that the information obtained be of maximum use to all the Government agencies. It should be noted that under section 3 (d) of the Federal Reports Act of 1942 (5 U. S. C. 139a (d)), the Bureau of the Budget is charged with the duty of determining whether or not the collection of any information by a Federal agency is necessary for the proper performance of the function of such agency, or for any other purpose. The Bureau of the Budget approved the proposed plan. Its approval necessarily carries with it the determination that collecting the information was a proper function of the Post Office Department.

Public opinion sampling is now recognized as a highly specialized field of work allied to, or a subdivision of, the profession of statistics. While such sampling receives its widest publicity in connection with the determination of the probable outcome of elections, it has been widely used by industry as a guide to the conduct of affairs. Business concerns do not normally maintain their own sampling services but rely on the work of such outside firms as Wengel Service Corp. The value of such a survey is dependent, of course, upon the expertness of the organization which conducts it, since objective specifications controlling the quality of the work cannot be written. For these reasons it was administratively determined necessary to the general administration of the Post Office Department to make a contract with Wengel Service Corp.

With respect to the allegation that the information thus obtained, when transmitted to each Member of Congress, constitutes a violation of section 1918 of title 18, United States Code, I believe that you will be interested to note that I have taken this matter up with the Department of Justice. That Department has advised me that under the circumstances it does not believe that the transmission of this information to Members of Congress was a violation of that law.

My letter of January 20, 1954, to the Members of Congress was sent in response to oral requests made to me by several Members that they be furnished copies of the report when it became available. The letters, as you may see by examination of the one submitted to you by Senator GORE, are mere transmittals of the report for the information of the addresses. They do not request the addresses to take any action one way or another on legislative problems. The sole purpose of these letters was to furnish all Congressmen with information in the posession of the Department which a few of them had requested. I did not consider it proper to furnish this information to some Members without making it available to all the Members of Congress.

Since the report was transmitted to Members of the Congress I have received a number of letters in which thanks have been expressed for the receipt of the information.

It is inconceivable that Congress, in enacting the cited law, intended to require a Cabinet officer to withhold from Members of Congress information properly gathered by him in the operation of his department.

For your information I am attaching hereto a copy of the contract entered into with Wengel Service Corp., a copy of the opinion of the Solicitor of this office, a copy of the opinion addressed to me by the Department of Justice and a copy of the opinion of the Bureau of the Budget. If you desire any further information, I will be happy to supply it.

Sincerely yours,
ARTHUR E. SUMMERFIELD,
*Postmaster General.*

---

This contract, entered into this 21st day of December 1953, by and between the United States of America, hereafter called the Government, and Wengel Service Corp., a corporation organized and existing under the laws of the State of New York, of the city of Princeton in the State of New Jersey, hereinafter called the contractor:

Witnesseth—

Whereas the contractor is an organization of experts in the field of ascertaining public opinion; and

Whereas the Post Office Department desires to obtain the expert services of the contractor in connection with the administration of the Department, pursuant to title 5, United States Code, section 55a and title 2 of the Treasury and Post Office Departments Appropriations Act, 1954;

Now, therefore, in consideration of the premises and of the mutual covenants and agreements herein contained, and for other good and valuable consideration, the parties hereto agree as follows:

Article 1. Services to be rendered: The contractor shall furnish a report on or before January 15, 1954, to the Post Office Department concerning public opinion on the adequacy of postal service and on the acceptability of changes in postal service and postal rates. Such report shall be based upon a survey conducted in accordance with established principles of sampling on a quota basis and an analysis of such survey. The questionnaire used in such survey shall be approved by the Department.

Article 2. Compensation: The Government will pay the contractor upon submission of the report and on appropriate vouchers the sum of $11,500, provided, however, the compensation shall be increased by the amount of overtime compensation paid by the contractor to its employees at established rates for any overtime work necessary to complete the report on the date fixed in article 1, but such increase shall not exceed $575. The compensation fixed in this article shall be full compensation to the contractor for all work in connection with making a survey, analyzing the responses and preparation and submission of the report as provided in article 1.

Article 3. Nondiscrimination in employment: In connection with the performance of work under this contract, the contractor agrees not to discriminate against any employee or applicant for employment because of race, creed, color, or national origin; and further agrees to insert the foregoing provision in any subcontracts hereunder.

Article 4. Officials not to benefit: No Member of or Delegate to Congress, or Resident Commissioner, shall be admitted to any share or part of this contract, or to any benefit that may arise therefrom; but this provision shall not be construed to extend to this contract if made with a corporation for its general benefit.

Article 5. Covenants against contingent fees: The contractor warrants that no person or selling agency has been employed or retained to solicit or secure this contract upon an agreement or understanding for a commission, percentage, brokerage, or contingent fee, excepting bona fide employees or bona fide established commercial or selling agencies maintained by the contractor for the purpose of securing business. For breach or violation of this warranty the Government shall have the right to annul this contract without liability or in its discretion to deduct from the contract price or consideration the full amount of such commission, percentage, brokerage, or contingent fee.

In witness whereof, the parties hereto have executed this contract as of the day and year first above written.

THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
By C. R. HOOK, Jr.,
*Acting Postmaster General.*

Witnesses:
A. J. ROBERTSON.
MILDRED B. OWENS.

WENGEL SERVICE CORP.,
By ARTHUR R. WENGEL,
*President.*

Witnesses:
CHARLOTTE S. HOLMES.
GEORGE B. OLSEN.

---

JANUARY 20, 1954.

To the POSTMASTER GENERAL:

This will confirm the oral opinion given to Assistant Postmaster General Robertson on December 7, 1953, with respect to the legality of the contract which the Department proposed to enter into with Wengel Service Corp. of Princeton, N. J.

The Postmaster General is authorized by section 55a of Title 5 United States Code and by Title 2 of the Treasury and Post Office Departments Appropriations Act, 1954, to

procure the temporary or intermittent services of experts or consultants without regard to section 5 of Title 41 United States Code.

It is the opinion of this office that the contract entered into is a lawful contract under the provisions of the sections above cited.

L. J. DOYLE,
*Acting Solicitor.*

---

JANUARY 20, 1954.

To the POSTMASTER GENERAL:

Pursuant to the request of the Attorney General, I have read your letter of January 20, 1954, by which you forwarded to each Member of Congress a copy of The Public Looks at Postal Rates. You said in that letter:

"We believe you will find this objective national opinion survey throws much helpful light on the degree of public approval of proposed increases in first-, second-, and third-class postal rates and should be helpful to you in your consideration of the problem."

With the purposes of that letter in mind, consideration has been given to section 1913 of Title 18 of the United States Code. It seems clear from a reading of that law that it was not the intent of Congress to prohibit or even discourage the head of a Government department from furnishing to Members of Congress any information which would be helpful to Members of Congress in considering any legislation then pending before them.

Your letter was in no sense argumentative, but merely forwarded certain data for their assistance in considering a bill presently before them. I do not see that any logical contention could be made that such action has been prohibited by Congress.

J. WALTER YEAGLEY,
*First Assistant Criminal Division, Department of Justice.*

---

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT,
BUREAU OF THE BUDGET,
*Washington, D. C. January 21, 1954.*

Mr. CHARLES R. HOOK, Jr.,
*Deputy Postmaster General,*
*Office of the Postmaster General,*
*Washington, D. C.*

DEAR MR. HOOK: This will confirm the oral approval given by this Office to Mr. Albert J. Robertson, Assistant Postmaster General, on December 7, 1953, covering the public opinion survey plans outlined in your letter of December 4 to Mr. Rowland R. Hughes, Deputy Director, Bureau of the Budget.

Our review of the survey, in accordance with the provisions of the Federal Reports Act of 1942, was expedited in recognition of the timing requirements presented. We are glad to know that the survey has been satisfactorily completed and the results made available to your office.

Budget Bureau Approval No. 46-5401 has been assigned to this project.

Sincerely yours,

STUART A. RICE,
*Assistant Director for Statistical Standards.*

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Carolina yield for a further insertion in the RECORD?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield.

Mr. GORE. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point certain matters following the insertions just made by the distinguished majority leader.

In view of the statement by the distinguished majority leader and the insertions he made in the RECORD, I ask that there be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks a letter dated January 20, 1954, from the Postmaster General, addressed to me, which letter was likewise addressed to all other Members of Congress.

I ask also to have printed in the RECORD at this point the press release which was attached to the letter just mentioned, and which bears the headline "Public Supports Postal Rate Raises."

I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter which the junior Senator from Tennessee addressed to the Comptroller General of the United States soliciting his opinion as to the legality of this expenditure, in view of the express statute which I have just read, and in view of the obvious purpose of the law.

I also ask to have printed in the RECORD a copy of the Comptroller General's reply, in which he says that he is asking the Postmaster General for a complete explanation before rendering a decision to me.

There being no objection, the letters and other matters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OFFICE OF THE POSTMASTER GENERAL,
*Washington, D. C., January 20, 1954.*

Hon. ALBERT GORE,
*United States Senate,*
*Washington, D. C.*

DEAR SENATOR GORE: I am sending with this letter a copy of The Public Looks at Postal Rates—a scientific opinion survey made for the Post Office Department by an independent research organization.

We have been anxious to know how the public felt about the proposed postal rate increases now before Congress.

Did the people understand why these increases were proposed? Did they approve these proposed increases? Were they in favor of operating the postal establishment on a self-supporting basis?

We wanted the answers to these and other questions—given without emotion or colored by special pleading.

We believe you will find this objective national opinion survey throws much helpful light on the degree of public approval of proposed increases in first-, second-, and third-class postal rates, and should be helpful to you in your consideration of this problem.

Sincerely yours,

ARTHUR E. SUMMERFIELD,
*Postmaster General.*

---

PUBLIC SUPPORTS POSTAL RATE RAISES

According to a nationwide public opinion poll, approximately 4 out of 5 Americans think the Post Office Department should be self-supporting.

This statement was announced today by Postmaster General Arthur E. Summerfield in releasing a scientific nationwide opinion survey just completed by the Wengel Service Corp., of Princeton, N. J.

In 200 cities and towns, as well as in rural areas in all 48 States and the District of Columbia, Wengel interviewers asked this question: "Do you think the Post Office Department ought to take in enough money from postage to pay all its costs, or is it all right if it doesn't take in enough to pay all its costs?"

The answers received divided as follows:

| | Percent |
|---|---|
| Ought to take in enough | 78 |
| All right if it doesn't | 14 |
| Other answers | 2 |
| No opinion | 6 |

The opinion that the Post Office Department should take in enough money from postage is held by all major segments of the population. The scientific survey included people of different ages and economic status in different geographical regions and sizes of communities in the same proportion that they occur in the population as a whole.

The public also rejected the principle of the Post Office Department subsidizing certain large users of the mail, casting a 2-to-1 vote in favor of making each class of mail pay its own way.

Their replies in response to this question were: "In your opinion, are there any of these classes of mail where the postage rates ought to be less than the cost of handling the mail?"

| | Percent |
|---|---|
| None of them | 67 |
| Yes | 18 |
| No opinion | 15 |

Only very small minorities, ranging from 2 percent in the case of third-class to 8 percent for first class, believe that any classes of mail should have rates that do not cover the cost of handling that mail.

After having been informed of current postal deficits, the public favored proposed increases of postage rates on individual classes of mail as follows:

Eighty-three percent approve of a rate increase in third-class mail.

Seventy-four percent approve of a rate increase in second-class mail.

Fifty-six percent approve of a rate increase in first-class mail.

The administration's rate bill now before Congress calls for increased postal rates estimated to yield $240 million annually.

Under these proposals, rates on the first ounce of out-of-town 3-cent letters would be increased 1 penny to yield approximately $150 million new revenue annually.

The increases proposed for second-class mail (magazines and newspapers) would reduce the deficit in that class only from $231 million a year to $211 million.

Postal figures show that magazines are responsible for 68 percent of the deficit in second-class mail. Rates for this class of mail are generally lower today than they were in 1925. In some important instances they are lower than they were in 1879.

Proposed increases in third-class mail (mostly advertising matter, circulars, and small packages) would reduce the deficit in that class from $159 millions to $107 millions a year.

The figures cited above are based on fiscal 1953 computations.

Fifteen million more dollars would be realized by increasing domestic air mail letter rates from 6 cents an ounce to 7 cents an ounce and by increased book rates anticipated to yield $3½ million in additional revenue.

Simultaneously with the release of the Wengel Survey to the press the Post Office Department sent copies to all Members of the Congress.

In a letter accompanying these reports, Postmaster General Arthur E. Summerfield wrote:

"I am sending with this letter a copy of The Public Looks at Postal Rates"—a scientific opinion survey made for the Post Office Department by an independent research organization.

"We have been anxious to know how the public felt about the proposed postal rate increase now before Congress.

"Did the people understand why these increases were proposed? Did they approve these proposed increases? Were they in favor of operating the Postal Establishment on a self-supporting basis?

"We wanted the answers to these and other questions—given without emotion or colored by special pleading.

"We believe you will find this objective national opinion survey throws much helpful light on the degree of public approval of proposed increases in first-, second-, and third-class postal rates and should be help-

ful to you in your consideration of the problem."

JANUARY 21, 1954.

Mr. LINDSAY C. WARREN,
*Comptroller General of the United States, General Accounting Office, Washington, D. C.*

DEAR MR. WARREN: I enclose herewith a letter from the Honorable Arthur E. Summerfield, Postmaster General of the United States, together with enclosures thereto consisting of a press release issued by the Post Office Department on January 20, 1954, and a copy of an opinion survey prepared for the Post Office Department by the Wengel Service Corp., of Princeton, N. J.

I am advised that the Postmaster General authorized the expenditure of approximately $12,000 to cover the cost of preparation of the enclosed survey and that payment therefor was made from the general funds of the Post Office Department. I am further advised that letters similar to that which I received, together with identical enclosures, were delivered to all Members of the Congress yesterday. These materials were circulated on the eve of the date upon which the House Post Office Committee was scheduled to consider legislation which would authorize increases in postage rates as proposed by the Post Office Department. I think it clear that these materials are calculated to influence Members of the Congress in their consideration of legislation the enactment of which is urged by the Postmaster General.

It appears to me that the action of the Postmaster General in authorizing the preparation and distribution of these materials and in authorizing payment therefor out of appropriated funds is in violation of the provisions of section 1913, Title 18, United States Code. I would appreciate your making whatever investigation is deemed necessary and providing me with an opinion as to the legality of the expenditure made in the manner outlined above. I request further that this opinion be provided with the least practicable delay.

Sincerely yours,

ALBERT GORE.

COMPTROLLER GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES,
*Washington, January 26, 1954.*

Hon. ALBERT GORE,
*United States Senate.*

MY DEAR SENATOR GORE: I have your letter of January 21, 1954, concerning an opinion survey entitled "The Public Looks at Postal Rates," obtained by the Post Office Department from the Wengel Service Corp., Princeton, N. J. You request my views concerning the legality of the expenditure involved.

The Postmaster General today is being asked to furnish at the earliest practicable date a complete report in the matter in order that adequate consideration may be given to the request contained in your letter. As soon as the report has been received, the matter will receive prompt consideration and you will be advised further relative thereto.

Sincerely yours,

LINDSAY C. WARREN,
*Comptroller General of the United States.*

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, Mr. Summerfield tells us that his poll of 2,000 gives unquestionable indication that the American people are anxious to pay higher rates of postage for their mailing privileges.

Mr. President, probably the question comes to your mind—as it has occurred to me—what is the reasoning behind these clearly contradictory statements? What is his objective? What does he hope to achieve? Frankly, I cannot answer those questions.

There have been no attacks on the Postmaster General. Nowhere that I can find has there been raised any question of the management of the Post Office Department. The postal service has been operating on a deficit basis for a number of years. Undoubtedly, some of this deficit could be reduced by better management within the Department. Some of it will continue no matter what the Post Office Department does or does not do.

It would appear to me that we are all attempting to move in the same direction—to give the people of this country the best possible service at the lowest possible cost. It would appear to me that any and all recommendations toward this end would be welcomed by any Postmaster General. Democrat or Republican.

There is glaring evidence here of a move to take not only the ratemaking power but the very policy power away from Congress and to place it in the hands of creatures of the Post Office Department.

Mr. President, the post office was not established as a business. It was established as a service. To be sure, it should be run on a business-like basis, but only so that it can provide the greatest possible service to the people of the United States.

This sad confusion, and the harsh words that have been passed and are being passed between the Post Office Department and Members of this great deliberative body, may yet serve a useful purpose if they impel us to reaffirm that abiding principle. Whether rates should be higher or lower, whether one class or another should carry a greater part of the load, is not at this moment the issue. I deeply trust that from our deliberations may come a statement of principle, so clear as to be unassailable through the generations to come, that the Post Office Department is a Government service to the people of the United States, established in the interests of the general welfare. From that principle all else proceeds. That principle this body must nail down.

Once there has been established in the Post Office Department an adequate and sensible cost determination system and all waste and inefficiency has been, to the most practical extent, eliminated, I will support and encourage all necessary rate increases to eliminate the remaining deficit and to attain a balanced budget.

Toward that end, I am going to insist that we take the time and the trouble to study and appraise the Advisory Council's report and its recommendations for improving the postal service to the people of this country and reducing the Department's perpetual deficit.

Mr. HUMPHREY and Mr. KNOWLAND addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from South Carolina yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield first to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, is the Senator familiar with the recent report of the Advisory Council on postal rates and postal policy? There has been a recent report. Is the Senator familiar with it?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I am.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I believe the Advisory Council was established during the chairmanship of the distinguished Senator from South Carolina, pursuant to a recommendation of the Hoover Commission.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. That is true, but we did not get any appropriation to carry out the recommendation.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Does the Senator realize that in recent days the Advisory Council has made a recommendation in reference to the postal inspection service?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. It has.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Advisory Council consists of some of the leading business executives of the United States, does it not?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. That is true.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Some of whom are publishers.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Yes.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Council consists of persons who are versed in postal matters.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Yes.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Does the Senator know that recommendation No. 3 in the recent report of the Advisory Council reads as follows:

> The inspection service has gone far afield from its original role as protector of the integrity of the mails. By evolution, down through the years, it has become almost exclusively responsible for management of the postal establishment. This marriage of law enforcement and management has been a constant and increasing case in incompatibility that has had an ill effect on the efficiency and economy of the postal service. The inspection service, on the one hand, does not command the confidence, cooperation, and participation of the rank and file of postal employees in matters of management; thus, progressive movement is limited. On the other hand, the inspection service, as an entity, is not equipped by training or experience to provide the technical skill required to streamline and modernize the operations of the postal establishment by taking full advantage of recent-day developments in the fields of engineering and management.

Does the Senator recall that observation?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I recall it. That is also in keeping with my views. I made a speech in California last September before the Postmasters' National Convention, and I stressed that point fully at that time.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Is it fair, therefore, to conclude that while the inspection service has a limited function to perform, it does not necessarily, nor should it necessarily, represent the policy determination of the Post Office Department?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I think it is a mistake when it enters that field.

Mr. HUMPHREY. In other words, it is the duty of those in management positions, such as Assistant Secretaries, the Under Secretary, the Postmaster General, the Superintendent of Mails, and other top managerial officers, ultimately to arrive at the decision as to policy. Is that correct?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I believe it should go even further down, to the postmasters.

Mr. HUMPHREY. To the postmasters themselves?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. To the postmasters throughout the United States.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I was very much interested in the Senator's observation with regard to the survey reported by the Chicago Tribune. I believe the Senator was in the Chamber when I made my remarks with reference to the service in New York. Is it fairly correct to say that mail may be handled by trucks, or by rail, as a matter of fact, in the mass transportation of mail, but that it is the duty of the Post Office Department to implement the service?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. That is correct.

Mr. HUMPHREY. And to give good service.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Yes; and to deliver mail as quickly as possible.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Does the Senator from South Carolina recall when the former Postmaster General stopped the two-a-day delivery system in the residential areas of the Nation?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I do.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Does the Senator recall the uproar that arose in Congress when the Postmaster curtailed the two-a-day deliveries in the residential areas?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I most certainly do.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Why did Representatives and Senators feel that the stopping of the two-a-day delivery in the residential areas was wrong? Was it not because they felt it curtailed service?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. It curtailed service. If the Senator will recall, the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service unanimously disapproved of the plan at the time.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Does the Senator from South Carolina recall that President Eisenhower, when he was a candidate in 1952, promised the restoration of two deliveries a day?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I cannot say "yes" or "no"; but I will take the Senator's word for it.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Let me say that if the Senator will examine some of the speeches made by candidate Eisenhower he will find that that promise was made. The point I am trying to make is that basically policy decisions with reference to the quantity and quality of service rest with two bodies, first, with the Congress of the United States, which determines the basic policy, and, secondly, with the top management officials of the Post Office Department who execute the policy established by the Congress. Is that correct?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. That is correct.

Mr. HUMPHREY. It is Congress which basically determines what the rates will be, or, at least, should determine what the rates will be, and also the character and the quality of the service. Is that correct?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Yes; and I have a strong feeling with regard to rates. I feel that the determination of rates rests with Congress, and such a question of policy should not be transferred to the Post Office Department, any more than we should transfer to the Department of Agriculture the right to make determinations with reference to parity, and so forth.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the Senator from South Carolina. I merely wanted to develop that point, because there has been a great deal of loose talk about deficits and business practices in the Post Office Department. I concur in any move that is made for improving the service. I believe Postmaster General Summerfield has taken some steps toward improving it and that those steps will help. But I still want to make it quite clear that there are policy decisions involved which are required to be made by Congress, and Congress ought never to turn those policy decisions over to anyone else to make.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. For the information of the Senator from Minnesota, I will say that we can balance the budget in the Post Office Department if we want the Department to be operated on a purely business basis. But if we were to do that, we would have to cut out all the rural routes and most of the fourth-class post offices. The New York post office would continue to run, and it would continue to have a surplus. It is running now with a surplus of about $30 million a year. Therefore it can be seen that the strong post offices must help the weaker ones, or we will not have a post-office system in the United States.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further for a question?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Did I understand the Senator to say—and I should state that the Senator from South Carolina has had many years of service on the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service and is intimately acquainted with those matters—that the New York post office actually produces a surplus in revenue?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. That is my understanding.

Mr. HUMPHREY. A surplus over expenses?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Yes; of approximately $30 million a year.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Is it not correct to say that the people of that great metropolitan area, therefore, are entitled to good service?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Yes; they certainly are entitled to good service.

Mr. HUMPHREY. And to speedy service?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. And to speedy service.

Mr. HUMPHREY. In rain or shine?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. In rain or shine.

Mr. HUMPHREY. In summer or winter?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. In winter or summer; in sleet or snow.

Mr. HUMPHREY. And in sleet or snow?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. That is correct.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I just wanted to be sure about it.

## CALL OF THE CALENDAR

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded and that further proceedings under the call be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Under the order previously entered, the Senate will now proceed to the call of the calendar. The Secretary will state the first measure on the calendar.

## AUTHORIZED PERSONNEL STRENGTH OF THE ARMED FORCES

The bill (S. 1647) to amend the act of August 3, 1950, as amended, to continue in effect the provisions thereof relating to the authorized personnel strengths of the Armed Forces was announced as first in order.

## THE BRICKER AMENDMENT

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I desire to use 5 minutes on another subject.

### DO WE KNOW WHAT WE ARE DOING?

Recently a Senator, who must remain nameless, came to me on the floor and said that he felt that there was a considerable amount of confusion about the Bricker amendment and what it would do to the Constitution. He also said that he was not quite clear as to the implications of the George amendment. He had some questions as to the effect of the McCarran proposal, and he was not quite sure what the effect would be of the Saltonstall-Ferguson-Knowland amendment. I think he also mentioned the Kefauver amendment and the Case amendment.

Several Senators have remarked to me that they had proposals they thought might add to the confusion.

Mr. President, we now have before us no less than 12 different proposals to amend the Bricker amendment. I suppose we will get some more amendments.

None—not one of these proposals—has had the benefit of careful scrutiny. Most of these proposals have been drafted by one or two men. Most of them have been put before this body during the last few days. They have not been considered by the public.

Mr. President, if we accept any of these amendments, we will be buying a pig in a poke—an act not worthy of the United States Senate.

To buy a pig in a poke means to buy the animal when it is in a sack and cannot be seen or examined.

If we buy any of these amendments we will be buying a pig in a poke on a dark night.

Mr. President, a Constitution such as ours is not one which can be amended by changing one word here and another there. Every word is pregnant with meaning.

We cannot string words together on the floor of this Chamber and expect to come up with anything except something that we all ought to be afraid of.

We must not treat the Constitution like a string of Christmas-tree lights. One bad light bulb, and the whole string may go out.

The Constitution is not to be treated casually, capriciously, or cavalierly. It is an instrument that we revere and cherish. We must be on guard against doing it violence by ill-conceived or ill-considered amendment.

Most of the constitutions of the Western Hemisphere have been patterned upon the American Constitution. These constitutions have stood the Americas in good stead.

Mr. President, it is presumptuous for any Senator to believe that he individually or in consultation with a few of his colleagues can work out a magic formula to amend the Constitution.

The strength of a democracy is found in its people, in the exchange of ideas, in careful and thorough public debate. It is out of public discussion that we get ideas and strength for our Nation. We have had such discussion now for some months of the Bricker amendment.

The President of the United States has stated his unalterable opposition to that amendment in its present form. We have not had careful discussion and consideration of the multitudinous proposals that have blossomed forth here. We cannot on this floor give those proposals the careful study they need and deserve.

There is but one sensible course of action for this Senate at this time. We must reject all proposals that have not been subject to most careful scrutiny, just as we must reject the Bricker amendment which debate here has shown would surely endanger our constitutional system.

THE SENATE FLOOR IS NO PLACE TO DRAFT A CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT

Mr. President, I am appalled at the attempts being made on the floor of the United States Senate to rewrite the Constitution.

Mr. President, the Bricker amendment is dead. But in its place we are asked to support something—almost anything—that would give the people the feeling that the Senate is protecting them from the world in which we live.

Our Constitution has served us exceedingly well for 165 years. Under its provisions we have grown from an infant Nation in swaddling clothes to a great world power.

I very much deplore, therefore, this tendency to rewrite the Constitution on the floor of the United States Senate. We are shooting in the dark and we may make serious mistakes which our children and our grandchildren will live to regret.

Mr. President, it is just as unwise for us to tinker with the Constitution here on the Senate floor as it would be for me to try to repair my watch or to touch up a great portrait.

Our debate on this subject clearly shows, Mr. President, that we are wandering about in a legal no-man's land without a compass to guide us. The State Department has informed us that it should take from 6 to 8 months to make a careful study of the problems involved in the conclusion of executive agreements. Shall we here jump to conclusions regardless of the facts? Shall we put on our blinders and proceed to amend the Constitution without knowing what we are doing?

If we come out of this debate with a hodge-podge of allegedly constitutional language—and that is what it would be—we will forever rue the day.

If we string together on this floor, words which mean one thing to one Senator and something else to another, we will have words without meaning.

If we send meaningless words to the House of Representatives, what will that great body do? Mr. President, if we send a hodge-podge of words to the House we will be asking it to do the job we should do, but of which we have been incapable.

The other day the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] said he thinks we have come to this state "because in our desperation to escape the world that we can never escape, we are seeking some advice of magic that would enable us to accomplish that impossible end."

If we must continue to struggle with proposals to amend the treatymaking powers of the Constitution, let us go about it in a statesman-like way. We might return Senate Joint Resolution 1 to the Judiciary Committee, asking it to restudy the matter in the light of the debate on this floor. But, Mr. President, I think that would be a mistake.

It seems to me, Mr. President, that there are several courses of action open to us that would be realistic and statesman-like.

We might, for example, establish a special committee of this Senate, with membership drawn from the Judiciary Committee, the Committee on Foreign Relations, the Committee on Armed Services, and perhaps from other committees, to make a careful study of the matters we have discussed on this floor. Certainly it has been shown that the problems raised by amending the treatymaking power are broader than those contemplated by the Judiciary Committee.

Or, Mr. President, the President of the United States might take the initiative and create a commission of outstanding jurists and citizens to study this matter.

Of one thing I am certain.

I am certain that the Constitution is too fine an instrument for revision on the floor of this Senate amidst the emotional heat we have here generated.

I have little sympathy with most of the amendments that have been proposed to Senate Joint Resolution 1. But it would be unfair and unjudicious for me to reject them outright. They deserve study because they represent the efforts of honest, hard-working men to deal with what they conceive to be an important problem.

Mr. President, it is my hope and my prayer that we will be guided on this floor today by our heads, not our hearts.

The men who built the Constitution worked long and hard. They made an instrument that has been our foundation for greatness and world leadership.

We must not in a moment of history destroy that instrument.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wisconsin yield?

Mr. WILEY. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. May I correctly interpret the Senator's speech as his assurance that I can count upon his support of my motion to recommit the amendment to his committee for further study?

Mr. WILEY. The Senator can be sure that I shall not vote for the amendments as they are, and he can also be sure that if the whole matter is not killed I shall certainly vote to get rid of it in the way the Senator suggests.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, may I at this time serve notice on the Senate—I have taken it up with the majority leader—that it will be my plan when we take up the Bricker amendment again, and before we vote on the George amendment, to move that the entire matter be recommitted.

Mr. KNOWLAND. We shall be glad to meet that issue at that time.

## AUTHORIZED PERSONNEL STRENGTH OF THE ARMED FORCES

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, it is my understanding that the Senate has under consideration Calendar No. 857, Senate bill 1647.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, since S. 1647 was placed on the calendar, H. R. 2326, a similar bill, was passed by the House and is No. 888 on the calendar.

I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to consider the House bill, H. R. 2326. I shall then ask that the House bill be amended by striking, on line 7, the year "1958" and inserting in lieu thereof "1957." This change will conform to the language of S. 1647.

This bill, with the suggested amendment, extends for 3 years—from July 1, 1954, to July 1, 1957—the existing legislation suspending the ceilings on the authorized active duty strength of the Armed Forces. The several statutes which authorize an overall ceiling of 2,005,882 for the Armed Forces were suspended until July 31, 1954, by the act of August 3, 1950.

If Congress does not pass this bill, the Armed Forces on August 1 will have to reduce their overall strength to the 2,005,822 level. We all know that for the

foreseeable future the strength of the Armed Forces must be in excess of 2,005,882. The President in his budget message stated that as of June 30, 1954, the total military strength of the Armed Forces will number about 3.3 million men, and that as of June 30, 1955, will number slightly above 3 million.

The committee amended the bill by extending the suspension for only 3 years rather than 4 years, which the bill, as introduced, provided. The committee was of the opinion that 3 years was a sufficient period for defense planning purposes since, generally speaking, planning in the Defense Department is based on a 3-year cycle.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Massachusetts?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 2326) to amend the act of August 3, 1950, as amended, to continue in effect the provisions thereof relating to the authorized personnel strengths of the Armed Forces.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I offer the amendment to which I referred, striking out, on line 7, "1958" and inserting in lieu thereof "1957."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Massachusetts.

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read the third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senate bill 1647 be indefinitely postponed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

## BILLS PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 2772) to provide for the disposal of paid postal savings certificates was announced as next in order.

Mr. GORE. Over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, did the Senator from North Dakota object?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. No; the Senator from Tennessee objected.

The bill (H. R. 5379), to authorize the printing and mailing of periodical publications of certain societies and institutions at places other than places fixed as the offices of publication was announced as next in order.

Mr. GORE. Over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (H. R. 5959) to exempt certain commissioned officers retired for disabilities caused by instrumentalities of war from the limitation prescribed by law with respect to the combined rate of retired pay and of compensation as civilian employees of the Government which retired officers may receive, was announced as next in order.

Mr. GORE. Over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

## PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF SENATE REPORT NO. 848

The resolution (S. Res. 194) to print additional copies of Senate Report No. 848, 83d Congress, on Korean atrocities, was considered and agreed to, as follows:

*Resolved*, That the Committee on Government Operations be authorized to have printed for its use 50,000 copies of Senate Report No. 848, a report pursuant to Senate Resolution 40, 83d Congress, 1st session, relative to an investigation of Korean war atrocities.

## PRINTING OF TASK FORCE REPORTS OF COMMISSION ON JUDICIAL AND CONGRESSIONAL SALARIES

The Senate proceeded to consider the resolution (S. Res. 202) providing for the printing of the task force reports of the Commission on Judicial and Congressional Salaries which had been reported from the Committee on Rules and Administration with an amendment in line 4, after the word "that," to insert "two thousand," so as to make the resolution read:

*Resolved*, That the task force reports of the Commission on Judicial and Congressional Salaries, created pursuant to Public Law 220, 83d Congress, be printed together as a Senate document with illustrations, and that 2,000 additional copies shall be printed for the use of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary.

The amendment was agreed to.

The resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, this resolution has reference to the printing of reports.

## BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 49) to enable the people of Hawaii to form a constitution and State government and to be admitted into the Union on an equal footing with the original States was announced as next in order.

Mr. GORE. Over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

## INCREASE IN BORROWING POWER OF THE COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION—BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 2714) to increase the borrowing power of Commodity Credit Corporation was announced as next in order.

Mr. GORE. Over.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee withhold his objection?

Mr. GORE. Yes.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, it is my understanding that the conference report on Senate Joint Resolution 358 relating to a restoration of the impaired capital of the Commodity Credit Corporation, as approved by the Senate, will provide the Corporation sufficient money to operate until the 8th or 10th of March. This bill will have to be taken up and acted upon by that time, or else the Corporation will be out of money again. The Corporation is anticipating approximately $75 million of receipts between now and that time, and loans are being made at the rate of about $100 million a week. I am only making this statement now; I am not asking to have the bill taken up at this time.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Vermont yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. GORE. I wish the Senator to know that I personally favor the passage of the bill. I hope no one will misunderstand my objection. I am objecting by request of a Senator who was called away on official business and wanted to be present when the bill is considered.

Mr. AIKEN. I understand the reason why the Senator is asking that the bill go over. It is too important to be placed on the Unanimous-Consent Calendar, anyway. I only wanted to say that the Corporation will be out of money again in approximately 5 weeks.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Vermont yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. I should like to take this occasion to say that I hope the bill will not be passed on a call of the calendar of bills to which there are no objections. I hope it will be scheduled for consideration so that it can be discussed, at least, briefly. The sum of a billion and three quarters dollars is involved, and therefore, it is not a minor matter. I sincerely hope the majority leader will see fit to set this bill for consideration at an early date before a crisis arises in the corporation, at such an hour and at such a time that the issue may be fully discussed on the floor of the Senate. I have no intention or expectation of discussing the bill at length, and I am sure other Senators have not, because, as I recall, the committee unanimously reported it. It is a bill of such magnitude and relates so intimately to the whole question of the price-support structure that I think, by all means, it should have full discussion and be considered not upon the call of the calendar of bills to which there is no objection, but as a measure worthy of debate and explanation.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, reserving the right to object—and I shall not object—I wish to answer the suggestion propounded by the distinguished Senator from Florida.

This is a bill of the type which, because of the amount involved, I think should be taken up on motion rather than on the call of the Unanimous-Consent Calendar. I shall plan to schedule it at an early date. I hope that it may be taken up this week.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, the colloquy between the Senators prompts me to say that this is the second year I have served on the Calendar Committee. It is a disagreeable task in many respects. Members who are interested in the passage of proposed legislation often do not appreciate an objection being made, and yet we have heard two Senators say that measures of general importance should not be considered on the call of the Consent Calendar. The more I serve in this capacity the more convinced I am that they are correct, and that the calendar

procedure should be reserved for bills of particular and specific subject matter not general in nature.

I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On objection, the bill will be passed over.

### JUAN EZCURRA AND FRANCISCO EZCURRA

The bill (S. 54) for the relief of Juan Ezcurra and Francisco Ezcurra was announced as next in order.

Mr. GORE. Over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, because of the colloquy which just now ensued, I erroneously objected to Senate bill 54. I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my objection and that the bill be considered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the bill (S. 54) for the relief of Juan Ezcurra and Francisco Ezcurra was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Juan Ezcurra and Francisco Ezcurra shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act upon payment of the required visa fees. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such aliens as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct two numbers from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

### FAWN S. LOUIE

The bill (S. 60) for the relief of Fawn S. Louie was announced as next in order.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. MORSE. Was Calendar 888, H. R. 2326, passed?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Calendar 888, H. R. 2326, was substituted for Calendar 857, S. 1647, and was passed, whereupon the Senate bill was indefinitely postponed.

Is there objection to the present consideration of Calendar 892, S. 60?

There being no objection, the bill (S. 60) for the relief of Fawn S. Louie, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Fawn S. Louie shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act upon payment of the required visa fee.

### BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (H. R. 685) for the relief of Walter Carl Sander was announced as next in order.

Mr. GORE. Over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

### KATINA PANAGIOTI FIFFLIS AND THEODORE PANAGIOTOU FIFFLIS

The bill (H. R. 1129) for the relief of Katina Panagioti Fifflis and Theodore Panagiotou Fifflis was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

### MRS. HERMINE LAMB

The bill (H. R. 1496) for the relief of Mrs. Hermine Lamb was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

### MRS. CLEMTINE DE RYCK

The bill (H. R. 1516) for the relief of Mrs. Clemtine De Ryck was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

### SETSUKO MOTOHARA KIBLER, WIDOW OF ROBERT EUGENE KIBLER

The bill (H. R. 1674) for the relief of Setsuko Motohara Kibler, widow of Robert Eugene Kibler, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

### CLARENCE R. SEILER AND OTHER EMPLOYEES OF THE ALASKAN RAILROAD

The bill (H. R. 2021) for the relief of Clarence R. Seiler and other employees of the Alaskan Railroad was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

### SANTOS SANABRIA ALVAREZ

The bill (H. R. 2618) for the relief of Santos Sanabria Alvarez was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

### LEE SIG CHEU

The bill (H. R. 2633) for the relief of Lee Sig Cheu was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

### WILLIAM E. AITCHESON

The bill (H. R. 2813) for the relief of William E. Aitcheson was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

### TAMIKO NAGAE

The bill (H. R. 3027) for the relief of Tamiko Nagae was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

### MRS. URSULA EICHNER CLAWGES

The bill (H. R. 3228) for the relief of Mrs. Ursula Eichner Clawges was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

### JOHN JAMES T. BELL

The bill (H. R. 3280) for the relief of John James T. Bell was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

### EIKO TANAKA

The bill (H. R. 3390) for the relief of Eiko Tanaka was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

### RUFIN MANIKOWSKI

The bill (H. R. 3619) for the relief of Rufin Manikowski was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

### MRS. HELEN BONANNO (NEE KOUBEK)

The bill (H. R. 3728) for the relief of Mrs. Helen Bonanno (nee Koubek) was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

### MRS. ANNA HOLDER

The bill (H. R. 3733) for the relief of Mrs. Anna Holder was announced as next in order.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, though I have no particular objection except as to the amount provided in the bill, may we have an explanation of the bill? The amount is a little larger than amounts provided in other cases.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, this bill proposes to pay to Mrs. Anna Holder, of Brooklyn, N. Y., the sum of $10,000, in full settlement of her claim against the United States for the payment of the proceeds of national life insurance issued to the late Edward J. Burns. The claimant is a stepsister of the deceased, born Edward Dougherty. Edward Dougherty was taken in by the mother and father of the claimant in 1908 and from that time on lived continuously with the Burns family and was considered their child. During his school years he used the name of Edward Burns, although there was never a legal change of name nor an adoption.

He entered the Army at the age of 37 years and took out two national life insurance policies at $5,000 each. The mother of the claimant was the principal beneficiary in one and the claimant was the contingent beneficiary. On the other, the claimant was named by the deceased as the principal beneficiary. The mother of the claimant, who was the principal beneficiary in one of the policies, predeceased the insured on March 27, 1943. Edward Burns died on May 22, 1945. After his death, the claimant, Mrs. Holder, made a formal claim for the payment of the national service life insurance, but the Veterans' Administration determined that she did not come within the permitted class of beneficiaries.

It appears, however, that there never was any objection made to the naming

of these benficiaries by anyone in authority, and had the policies been issued under existing law, this claimant would have been eligible to have received the money. Furthermore, there is no one other than Mrs. Holder who may be eligible to take under any conception of the law.

The committee therefore feels that since the deceased kept his insurance in full force and effect, without objection from any authority, that it is only right and just that the beneficiary he designated be allowed to have the benefits of his insurance. It is therefore recommended that the bill, H. R. 3733, be considered favorably.

I might add that the committee went into the matter very thoroughly, and the report is unanimous on the part of the committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill (H. R. 3733) for the relief of Mrs. Anna Holder was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

## ANETA POPA

The bill (H. R. 4254) for the relief of Aneta Popa was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

## JOHN ABRAHAM AND ANN ABRAHAM

The bill (H. R. 4439) for the relief of John Abraham and Ann Abraham was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

## EDITH MARIA GORE

The bill (H. R. 4577) for the relief of Edith Maria Gore was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

## JOHN JEREMIAH BOTELHO

The bill (H. R. 4972) for the relief of John Jeremiah Botelho was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

## MAX KASSNER

The bill (H. R. 5195) for the relief of Max Kassner was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

## J. DON ALEXANDER

The bill (H. R. 5945) conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the District of Columbia to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of J. Don Alexander against the United States was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

## ADVANCE SEED CO., OF PHOENIX, ARIZ.

The bill (S. 364) for the relief of the Advance Seed Co., of Phoenix, Ariz., was announced as next in order.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the bill?

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, the proposed legislation, as amended, would award the sum of $4,906.22 to the Advance Seed Co., of Phoenix, Ariz., for reimbursement for the overassessment for customs duties in connection with the importation of cloverseed.

The collector of customs at Nogales, Ariz., under section 763 of the Federal Seed Act, assessed the shipments of cloverseed imported by the claimant at the rate of 2 cents per pound. However, prior to the entries involved, the rate on cloverseed had been modified to 1 cent per pound in accordance with the provisions of the act. The information as to this modification in rate had not been transmitted to the collector of customs, and consequently he used the old rate.

Under the statute, claimant had 60 days within which to file a protest. He was not advised of this by the collector until after his right to appeal had expired. The Treasury Department and the Department of Justice both recommend favorable consideration of this claim. The committee therefore unanimously recommends favorable consideration of S. 364, as proposed to be amended.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I introduced the bill after conferring with the Treasury Department, which clearly admitted an error in not transmitting the information to the collector at Nogales.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 364) for the relief of the Advance Seed Co., of Phoenix, Ariz., which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Advance Seed Co., of Phoenix, Ariz., the sum of $4,906.22. Such sum represents reimbursement for overassessment of duties in connection with the importation of clover seed (Melilotus indica) covered by consumption entries Nos. 4224, 21, 76, 108, 126, and 178, dated June 21, 1951, July 6, 1951, July 23, 1951, July 30, 1951, August 6, 1951, and September 4, 1951, respectively: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

## VILHJALMUR THORLAKSSON BJARNAR

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 931) for the relief of Vilhjalmur Thorlaksson Bjarnar which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment, in line 7, after the word "fee", to insert a colon and the following proviso: *"Provided*, That a suitable and proper bond or undertaking, approved by the Attorney General, be deposited as prescribed by section 213 of the said act", so as to make the bill read:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Vilhjalmur Thorlaksson Bjarnar shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee: *Provided*, That a suitable and proper bond or undertaking, approved by the Attorney General, be deposited as prescribed by section 213 of the said act.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

## JEAN JING PEO FENG

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 989) for the relief of Jean Peo Feng, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That, in the administration of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Jean Jing Peo Feng, the fiancee of I-Ming Feng, a lawful permanent resident of the United States, shall be eligible for a visa as a nonimmigrant temporary visitor for a period of 3 months: *Provided*, That the administrative authorities find that the said Jean Jing Peo Feng is coming to the United States with a bona fide intention of being married to the said I-Ming Feng and that she is found otherwise admissible under the immigration laws. In the event the marriage between the above-named persons does not occur within 3 months after the entry of the said Jean Jing Peo Feng, she shall be required to depart from the United States and upon failure to do so shall be deported in accordance with the provisions of sections 242 and 243 of the Immigration and Nationality Act. In the event that the marriage between the above persons shall occur within 3 months after the entry of the said Jean Jing Peo Feng, the Attorney General is authorized and directed to record the lawful admission for permanent residence of the said Jean Jing Peo Feng as of the date of the payment by her of the required visa fee.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

## UTAKO KANITZ

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1137) for the relief of Utako Kanitz which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Utako Kanitz shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee: *Provided*, That a suitable and proper bond or undertaking, approved by the Attorney General, be deposited as prescribed by section 213 of the said act.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

## ANDREW D. SUMNER

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1203) for the relief of Andrew D. Sumner which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That Andrew D. Sumner, of Brandy, Va. (Army service No. O-364738), be, and he is hereby relieved of all liability to refund to the United States any part of the moneys erroneously paid by the United States to his former wife, Mrs. Ila Frances Sumner, as class E allotments, for the period from July 1, 1942, to January 31, 1944, inclusive.

SEC. 2. That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the said Andrew D. Sumner the sum of $196.09, which represents a like amount refunded by him to the United States on account of the erroneous payments of class E allotments to the said Mrs. Ila Frances Sumner for the period from July 1, 1942, to January 31, 1944, inclusive: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

## FRANZ GERICH AND WILLY GERICH, HIS MINOR SON

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1231) for the relief of Franz Gerich and Willy Gerich, his minor son, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment, on page 1, line 5, after the word "of", to strike out "$250" and insert "$202.38", so as to make the bill read:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Franz Gerich, the sum of $202.38, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for hospital and medical expenses incurred by him; and to Willy Gerich, his minor son, the sum of $5,000, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for personal injuries, pain, and suffering sustained by him as the result of an accident which occurred on May 25, 1945, in the vicinity of Lauderbach, Czechoslovakia, when a United States Army tank collided with a vehicle in which Willy Gerich was riding: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

## CORNELIO AND LUCIA LEQUILLO

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 1160) for the relief of Cornelio and Lucia Lequillo which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment, in line 6, after the word "alien", to insert "minor."

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

## LO BIANCO LETIZIA MARIA GENOVEFFA

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1112) for the relief of Lo Bianco Letizia Maria Genoveffa which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment, in line 5, after the word "child", to strike out "Lo Bianco Letizia Maria Genoveffa" and insert "Letizia Maria Genoveffa Lo Bianco", so as to make the bill read:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That, for the purposes of sections 101 (a) (27) (A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor child, Letizia Maria Genoveffa Lo Bianco, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Giuseppe Loverde, a citizen of the United States.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of Letizia Maria Genoveffa Lo Bianco."

## BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 1184) to authorize relief of authorized certifying officers from exceptions taken to payments pertaining to terminate war agencies in liquidation by the Department of State was announced as next in order.

Mr. GORE. Over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

## EXCHANGE OF LANDS BY THE HAWAIIAN HOMES COMMISSION

The bill (H. R. 2839) to enable the Hawaiian Homes Commission of the Territory of Hawaii to exchange available lands as designated by the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act, 1920, for public lands was announced as next in order.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the bill?

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. President, the purpose of the bill is to authorize the Hawaiian Homes Commission in the Territory of Hawaii to make certain exchanges of lands in order to carry out its functions. The Commission is an agency created by the Federal Government for the purpose of providing homesites for native Hawaiians. I may say that the committee has been advised that the commission owns a large number of noncontiguous tracts of land scattered over a considerable area, and it is asking now for authority to exchange such noncontiguous tracts for other public land tracts, of equal value, so that the commission can consolidate its holdings and provide homes for the natives of Hawaii.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. BARRETT. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. If the bill is enacted can they make the exchanges without submitting the proposed specific trades for the approval of Congress?

Mr. BARRETT. I think the Secretary of the Interior and the Governor of the Territory must approve them.

Mr. MORSE. They will not come back to a committee of the Congress?

Mr. BARRETT. No; they will not.

Mr. MORSE. I ask that the bill go over.

Mr. MORSE subsequently said: Mr. President, the explanation I have received concerning Order No. 925, House bill 2885, sheds a different light on House bill 2839 than I had in mind when I first raised my objection, and causes me to ask the Senator from Wyoming a few questions.

Is it the Senator's statement that the Federal Government has in fact no property interest in any of the lands which are involved in House bill 2839?

Mr. BARRETT. That is correct.

Mr. MORSE. The only reason why the bill is now before the Senate at all, if I understand correctly, is that the Federal Government is functioning in somewhat of a trustee relationship.

Mr. BARRETT. That is correct; the Government is functioning as a trustee for the territory.

Mr. MORSE. It never had a property interest in the land as such?

Mr. BARRETT. That is correct.

Mr. MORSE. Then, Mr. President, I withdraw my objection to Calendar No. 924, H. R. 2839.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill (H. R. 2839) was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

## ISSUANCE OF RIGHT OF PURCHASE LEASE TO EDWARD C. SEARLE

The bill (H. R. 2885) authorizing and directing the commissioner of public lands of the Territory of Hawaii to issue a right of purchase lease to Edward C. Searle was announced as next in order.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the bill?

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. President, I should like to inform the Senate, and particularly my colleague, the Senator from Oregon, that the public lands of Hawaii are in an entirely different class from the public lands of this country. When Hawaii was annexed to the United States, there was a specific provision that all public lands in the Territory belonged to Hawaii, and that our Government would hold them in trust for Hawaii. The presumption was, and still is, that the lands should be transferred to the new State in the event it is admitted

to the Union. That is the decision of the committee, at least so far as the bill now before the Senate is concerned.

In this case, Mr. Searle applied for 485 acres. The lease was issued to him. After a long time it was determined by the Attorney General that he could have but one tract. The purpose of the bill is to permit Mr. Searle to have the 485 acres of land, and to pay the rental required under the law, in order to enable him to avoid a loss, because the lands were leased to him in the first instance, and he made a considerable investment on the presumption that he could get the lease.

No Federal funds at all are involved. The lands belong to the Territory of Hawaii. The Bureau of the Budget, the Department of the Interior, and the Governor of Hawaii, as well as everyone else concerned, approve the bill.

Mr. MORSE. The explanation of the Senator sheds more light on Order No. 924, House bill 2839, than I had in mind when I first raised my objection. I should like to ask the Senator a question. Is it the Senator's statement that the Federal Government has in fact no proprietary interest in any of the lands involved in House bill 2839?

Mr. BARRETT. That is correct.

Mr. MORSE. The only reason the bill has come before the Senate at all, if I understand the Senator correctly, is because the Federal Government is functioning in somewhat of a trustee relationship?

Mr. BARRETT. That is correct; it is functioning as a trustee for the Territory.

Mr. MORSE. And it has no property interest in the land as such?

Mr. BARRETT. That is correct.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the immediate consideration of H. R. 2885?

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wyoming yield for a question?

Mr. BARRETT. I am glad to yield.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, referring to House bill 2885, calendar No. 925, is it correct to say that the leasehold interest is subject to appraisal for a determination of the value?

Mr. BARRETT. That is correct.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Therefore there is a criterion of the value of the lease which is to be passed on before this transaction is consummated. Is that correct?

Mr. BARRETT. Yes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill (H. R. 2885) was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

## BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (H. R. 4030) to repeal section 4 of the act of March 2, 1934, creating the Model Housing Board of Puerto Rico, was announced as next in order.

Mr. GORE. Over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

## EXERCISE OF CERTAIN POWERS BY THE PRESIDENT IN RESPECT OF CERTAIN PROPERTY IN HAWAII CEDED TO THE UNITED STATES

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 2846) authorizing the President to exercise certain powers conferred upon him by the Hawaiian Organic Act in respect of certain property ceded to the United States by the Republic of Hawaii notwithstanding the acts of August 5, 1939, and June 16, 1949, or other acts of Congress, which had been reported from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs with amendments.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the bill?

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. President, the bill is in the same category with the two bills which were passed a moment ago. The purpose of the bill is to give the Territory of Hawaii the authority to use certain lands in Hawaii to fulfill an agreement under which the Territory is to construct a retaining wall and certain works in the harbor at Honolulu. While public lands are involved, the title to them in fact remains in the Territory of Hawaii; and the United States is the trustee for the Territory. It is entirely for a public purpose, and I see no objection to legislation of this type.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendments of the committee.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 1, line 3, after the word "of", it is proposed to strike out "August 5, 1939 (53 Stat. 1209, ch. 444), the Act of", and at the top of page 4, to strike out:

2. That land, now part of the Fort Armstrong Military Reservation, which was transferred by the Secretary of Labor to the control and jurisdiction of the Secretary of War (now Secretary of the Army) by letter dated December 16, 1939, pursuant to the Act of August 5, 1939 (53 Stat 1209, ch. 444). Area sixteen one hundredths acre.

The amendments were agreed to.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill authorizing the President to exercise certain powers conferred upon him by the Hawaiian Organic Act in respect of certain property ceded to the United States by the Republic of Hawaii, notwithstanding the act of June 16, 1949, or other acts of Congress."

Mr. MORSE. I simply desire to say for the record that I have raised no objection to these Hawaiian bills on the basis of the representation, which I am satisfied is correct, that the Federal Government has no vested interest whatsoever in the titles to the lands covered by the bills.

## MEANING OF THE WORD "COMMODITY" IN THE COMMODITY EXCHANGE ACT—BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 1386) to amend section 2 of the Commodity Exchange Act, as amended, relating to the meaning of the word "commodity," was announced as next in order.

Mr. GORE. Over.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator withhold his objection?

Mr. GORE. Certainly.

Mr. AIKEN. I was about to propose a one-word amendment. One word was inadvertently left out, either in typing or printing the bill. I am requesting the majority leader to fix a time later this week when the bill will be considered by the Senate. He is not present at this time, but I understand he plans to do so.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Tennessee renew his objection?

Mr. GORE. I do.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection being heard, the bill will be passed over.

## RETROCESSION OF JURISDICTION OF CERTAIN HIGHWAYS WITHIN WRIGHT-PATTERSON AIR FORCE BASE, OHIO

The bill (S. 2689) to retrocede to the State of Ohio concurrent jurisdiction over certain highways within Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, Ohio, was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, reserving the right to object—although I shall not object, let me say, for the purpose of the RECORD and for future reference, that the bill does not involve an exchange of real estate, but involves only the retroceding to the State of Ohio of current jurisdiction over certain State and county roads within the Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, in Ohio. At the last session, Public Laws 38 and 41 were enacted, and they provided similar legislation with respect to Fort Belvoir and Fort Sill.

An investigation of the facts in this case will show that of course there will be joint use by the public generally, including joint use by the Federal Government, in connection with the functions of the forts, camps, and military reservations involved.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill (S. 2689) was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

*Be it enacted etc.*, That there is hereby granted to the State of Ohio a retrocession of jurisdiction over the portions of highways described below within the Wright-Patterson Air Force Base to the extent that all laws of the State and all laws of the United States shall be applicable thereon and the United States and the State shall exercise concurrent jurisdiction thereover:

(A) State Route Numbered 4, beginning at Huberville, approximately three thousand feet northeast of the intersection of Harshmanville Road with State Route Numbered 4, thence northeast to the Greene County and

Montgomery County line, the above section of road being in Montgomery County, Ohio;

(B) All that part of State Route Numbered 4 lying between the Greene County and Montgomery County line and the Cleveland, Cincinnati, Chicago, and St. Louis Railroad underpass and being within the Wright-Patterson Air Force Base reservation boundaries, the above section of road being in Greene County, Ohio;

(C) Beginning at the point where State Route Numbered 4 passes the extreme south corner of the original Wilbur Wright Field boundary, said point being approximately one thousand seven hundred feet northeast of Huffman Dam, thence northeasterly to the corporate limits of the village of Fairborn, Ohio, the above section of road being in Greene County, Ohio;

(D) State Route Numbered 235, beginning at a point where State Route Numbered 235 intersects and crosses an easterly boundary line of the Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, said point being approximately one thousand seven hundred feet north of the intersection of State Route Numbered 235 with State Route Numbered 4, thence westerly to the extreme west line of the reservation, excepting that part of the road lying between Haddix Road and the Osborn Road, the above section of road being in Greene County, Ohio;

(E) State Route Numbered 69, beginning at the intersection of State Route Numbered 69 and original State Route Numbered 235, thence southwesterly with the east one-half of the road to the extreme southwest corner of the reservation boundary, the above section of road being in Greene County, Ohio;

(F) Harshmanville Road, beginning at the intersection of Harshmanville Road with Yellow Springs Road in the village of Riverside, thence southerly with the east one-half of the road a distance of approximately one thousand four hundred feet, thence continuing southerly the full width of the road to Airway Road;

(G) Yellow Springs Road, beginning at the intersection of Yellow Springs Road with Harshmanville Road in the village of Riverside, thence easterly with the south one-half of the road to the Wright-Patterson Air Force Base reservation boundary;

(H) Airway Road, beginning at the intersection of Airway Road with Harshmanville Road, thence easterly with the north one-half of the road a distance of approximately two thousand feet, thence continuing easterly with the full width of the road to the Greene County and Montgomery County line;

(I) Spinning Road, beginning at the intersection of Spinning Road with the south right-of-way line of Airway Road, thence southerly with the west one-half of the road one thousand nine hundred and seventy-three feet to a south boundary line of the Wright-Patterson Air Force Base reservation;

(J) Glendean Avenue, beginning at the intersection of Glendean Avenue with the north right-of-way of the Baltimore and Ohio Railroad, thence northerly with the east one-half of Glendean Avenue, a distance of approximately one thousand seven hundred feet;

(K) Airway Road, beginning at the intersection of Airway Road with the Greene County and Montgomery County line, thence easterly to the Wright-Patterson Air Force Base reservation boundary, the point of ending being approximately four hundred and fifty feet east of Skyline Drive;

(L) National Road (Huffman), beginning at a corner in the Wright-Patterson Air Force Base reservation boundary, said corner being in the National Road and approximately two hundred feet north of its intersection with Airway Road, thence, with the west one-half of the road, northerly four thousand four hundred feet, thence continuing northerly with the full width of the road to Old Route Numbered 4;

(M) Zink Road (New Germany Road), beginning at the intersection of the New Germany Road with the south right-of-way line of Old Route Numbered 4, thence southerly with the east one-half of the road, a distance of eight hundred and ninety feet, also beginning in the New Germany Road at a corner in the reservation boundary, the beginning point being approximately one thousand four hundred feet southerly from the south right-of-way line of Old Route Numbered 4, thence continuing southerly with the westerly one-half of the road a distance of one thousand five hundred and eighty-seven feet;

(N) Old Route Numbered 4, beginning at the intersection of Old Route Numbered 4 with the southerly right-of-way of the Cleveland, Cincinnati, Chicago, and St. Louis Railroad, thence easterly the full width of the road to the part of the road right-of-way owned by the Commissioners of Greene County, Ohio;

(O) Sand Hill Road, beginning at the intersection of Sand Hill Road with an east boundary line of the Wright-Patterson Air Force Base reservation, the same being the west boundary line of the abandoned Cincinnati and Lake Erie Railroad, thence westerly to State Route Numbered 235;

(P) Haddix Road, beginning at the intersection of Haddix Road with State Route Numbered 235, thence northeasterly with the right one-half of the road to the Greene County and Clark County line;

(Q) Elizabeth Road (Johnson Street), beginning at the intersection of Elizabeth Road (in Old Osborn) with State Route Numbered 235, thence northwesterly to Haddix Road;

(R) Osborn Road, beginning at gate Numbered 260 at the Wright-Patterson Air Force Base reservation boundary, thence northerly with the west one-half of the road to State Route Numbered 235;

(S) Airway Road, beginning at the intersection of Airway Road with the southerly right-of-way of Old Route Numbered 4, thence southerly with the westerly one-half of the road to the extreme southeast corner of the Wright-Patterson Air Force Base-Area "D" reservation boundary;

(T) Old Route Numbered 4, all that part of Old Route Numbered 4 that may be within the boundaries of Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, Area "D". The location of the highways and the bounded areas are shown and identified by corresponding letter symbols on sheet numbered L of a drawing designated: Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, Basic Layout Plan, drawing numbered EWFE 150, dated December 2, 1952, on file in the Office, Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army. This Act is effective only as to those portions of the highways and areas indicated in this Act over which the United States has heretofore acquired exclusive jurisdiction and shall not affect portions of highways and areas, if any, over which exclusive or concurrent jurisdiction is now vested in the State of Ohio.

SEC. 2. The retrocession of jurisdiction provided for in this Act shall take effect upon the acceptance thereof by the General Assembly of the State of Ohio.

## TRANSFER OF CERTAIN LANDS TO TERRITORY OF HAWAII

The bill (H. R. 2842) to authorize the Secretary of the Army to transfer certain land and access rights to the Territory of Hawaii was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the bill?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, in the absence of the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HENDRICKSON], who is away on public business, let me say that this bill will authorize the Secretary of the Army to convey to the Territory of Hawaii title to two parcels of land totaling 9,087 square feet, and also the abutter's rights of vehicle access, in and to certain portions of the Fort DeRussy Military Reservation. The two parcels, which are located on the Fort DeRussy Military Reservation, constitute a narrow strip along the boundary of the military installation.

The Territory of Hawaii has, since 1950, held a perpetual easement on the two parcels described in the bill, and has already utilized the property for street-improvement purposes.

The purpose of the bill is to satisfy a section of the Hawaii laws which provides that all public highways will be owned by the Territory in fee simple. The conveyance to the Territory would have little practical effect on the utilization of the property, since the Territory has a perpetual easement on the parcels, and has been utilizing them for street-improvement purposes under existing authority.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Massachusetts yield for a question?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. Am I correct in my understanding that the reason for the request for transfer of the property is in order that an abutting wall may be built, to help hold back the sea; and therefore the wall will be of benefit to our military installations in that area?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. That is correct.

Mr. MORSE. I further understand that the cost of the abutting wall itself will be considerably in excess of the value of the 9,000 square feet which will be needed for location of the wall.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Our committee has no exact knowledge of the cost of the abutting wall, but we understand the statement the Senator from Oregon has just made to be correct.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I have made my own investigation in connection with the bill. I am advised that the improvements which will be placed on the land by the Territory of Hawaii will have a value far in excess of the value of the land involved, and that the improvements will take the form of an abutting wall which is very much needed to hold back the sea at this point, to the great benefit of the United States Government, as well as the Territory of Hawaii.

Therefore, I believe it is certain that the United States Government will obtain value received for the proposed transfer of the 9,000 square feet of land.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill (H. R. 2842) was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

## CONVEYANCE OF PORTION OF CAMP BUTNER MILITARY RESERVATION TO THE STATE OF NORTH CAROLINA

The bill (H. R. 5632) to provide for the conveyance of a portion of the Camp Butner Military Reservation, N. C., to the State of North Carolina, was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, let me point out that the mineral rights are not reserved to the United States, according to the provisions of the bill. I should like to have an explanation as to why the mineral rights should not be reserved to the United States.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I understand it is the position of the Army, in this case, it is not necessary to reserve the mineral rights to the United States. However, certainly the committee has no objection to such a reservation or to an amendment to that effect. So I shall be glad to submit an amendment, as follows:

Subject, however, to reservation to the United States of all mineral rights, including gas and oil, in the land authorized to be conveyed by this act.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Massachusetts yield to me?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I have a somewhat more detailed amendment which I should like to send to the desk and have read, and then I would ask the Senator from Massachusetts whether he would be willing to accept my amendment as a substitute for the amendment he has just suggested.

I also wish to make a comment on the bill, and also on calendar 933, Senate bill 489.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I am glad to have that done. In fact, I shall withdraw the amendment I have proposed, in favor of the amendment submitted by the Senator from Oregon, which has been carefully drawn, I understand.

Mr. MORSE. Then, Mr. President, I submit the amendment to which I have referred, and I send it to the desk and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment of the Senator from Oregon will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 2, line 4, after the word "range", it is proposed to strike out the period, insert a comma, and the words "subject, however, to reservation in the United States of all mineral rights, including gas and oil, in the land authorized to be conveyed by this act."

On page 2, line 9, after the word "purposes," it is proposed to strike out "for a period of 3 successive years."

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, in support of the amendment I have submitted, I wish to discuss not only House bill 5632, Calendar 931, but also Senate bill 489, Calendar 933. I mention the two bills jointly, since both of them convey land to States, for National Guard purposes, with the right of reversion to the Federal Government if the land ceases to be so used, together with the right of the Federal Government to reoccupy the property in times of emergency.

There are, however, slight differences in the two bills. Senate bill 489, conveying 58 acres to Connecticut, contains a reservation of mineral rights in the Federal Government; whereas House bill 5632, conveying property to North Carolina, does not retain the reservation. The Army advised that they did not insist on the amendment in the House, since there was no reason to believe there were any mineral rights on the property, but they had no basic objection to the inclusion of such an amendment.

As the Senator from Massachusetts has pointed out, the Senate committee did not press the point, since the bill had already passed the House. However, I believe we should follow a uniform practice in these matters. Although there probably is no mineral resource value in the North Carolina land, one might still ask the innocent question, "Who knows for sure?"

Another difference is that Senate bill 489 provides that title shall revert "immediately" if the property ceases to be used for military purposes, whereas House bill 5632, which has been reached at this point in the calendar call, would, if amended in the way I have proposed, provide that if the property is not used for a period of 3 successive years, title will revert.

Mr. President, it seems to me the language of both bills should be identical in this respect. I believe that the differences probably can be explained or accounted for by the fact that the bills were drawn at different sources.

My amendment will simply make the bills uniform in this respect, and therefore I believe the amendment to be a proper one.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, the committee has no objection to either of the two amendments submitted by the Senator from Oregon, and I am glad to withdraw the amendment I have suggested, in order that both the amendments may be considered as one, as the Senator from Oregon has suggested.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 5632) to provide for the conveyance of a portion of the Camp Butner Military Reservation, N. C., to the State of North Carolina.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment submitted by the Senator from Oregon.

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time, and passed.

## GRANTING OF LICENSE TO LEAHI HOSPITAL TO USE OF CERTAIN UNITED STATES PROPERTY IN HONOLULU, T. H.

The bill (H. R. 6025) to authorize the Secretary of the Army to grant a license to the Leahi Hospital, a nonprofit institution, to use certain United States property in the city and county of Honolulu, T. H., was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I simply wish to say that I should like to have the bill go over for one calendar call, until I may have an opportunity to discuss the bill with its sponsor. I think that discussion may clarify any doubt I have regarding the bill.

It is my present understanding that the bill would authorize the Army to grant a 10-year lease, which the Army could revoke at will, to the Leahi Hospital, a charitable institution, providing for the use of about 4.4 acres to be used as a parking lot. The land is situated on the edge of the Fort Ruger Reservation. I understand the hospital is a public hospital, and a nonmilitary one. I further understand that the annual rental of the property is probably $2,356.

Again we are confronted with the problem of whether this is a de minimis matter. I do not think it is, but I have some questions which I should like to ask in conference in regard to the title to this land, and what the Federal interest really is. If it is simply a cold proposition of taking Federal property and turning it over to a charitable institution for parking-lot purposes, with commercial value, for $2,356 a year, of course, I would insist that 50 percent of the appraised fair market value be paid for the property.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I have concluded.

Mr. GORE. I suggest to the Senator that he note also that the report does not make it plain that any rental is to be charged. There is no reference to rental value in the bill, and the report does not make it clear at all.

Mr. MORSE. I assumed that rental was not to be charged. That is one of the reasons why I wish to talk with the sponsor. If rental is to be charged, then there is the question as to whether or not the rental is fair.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, if the Senator will withhold his objection for a moment, I should like to read into the RECORD at this point a brief explanation. I have no objection to the bill going over for one call of the calendar, if that is the desire of the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. I understand that technically what I should ask is unanimous consent that the bill go over until the next call of the calendar. That automatically would place it on the next call of the calendar. I should like to have it understood that that is my request.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I should like to make a brief statement relative to the

understanding of the committee with regard to this bill.

Mr. President, this bill would authorize the Secretary of the Army to grant a lease to the Leahi Hospital, a charitable institution, on a parcel of property totaling approximately 4.4 acres. The lease, which would be given for no consideration, would be for a term of 10 years, and revocable at will by the Department of the Army. The purpose of the lease would be to provide a parking lot for the Leahi Hospital.

The parcel described in the bill is located on the northernmost corner of Fort Ruger, Honolulu, and is an integral part of this installation, which comprises approximately 680 acres.

The Army is not presently utilizing this acreage, but has a requirement for this property in the event of mobilization. The Army does not object to this bill since under the revocable license arrangement the property could be occupied on short notice. For several reasons the bill does not provide that the hospital will pay a fair rental value for leasing the property; first, the revocable nature of the lease makes any occupancy of the property of an indefinite tenure; second, the hospital proposes to spend about $12,000 paving the acreage, in order to make it useful as a parking lot; and third, the fact that the hospital, although supported mainly out of Territorial funds, is a private charitable institution whose primary purpose is to treat patients with tuberculosis.

I may add that the reasons which influenced the committee were the reasons stated in this memorandum, namely, that while this property has a rental value, as stated by the Army, of approximately $2,300 a year, it was felt that the fact that the lease could be revoked at will, the fact that the hospital proposes to spend $12,000 to pave the acreage, and the fact that the hospital is a private charitable institution, whose primary object is to treat patients for tuberculosis, were proper reasons for making this lease for no consideration.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, before making my request I should like to talk with the chairman of the Armed Services Committee between now and the time of the next calendar call. The figure which was given to me for paving the parking lot was $20,000, and not $12,000, which gives me some concern, because if we encourage or induce this charitable institution to go ahead and spend that amount of money and then reserve the right to take the property at a moment's notice, it seems to me that in fairness and equity we should make some provision for compensation for the loss of the paving cost. At least that is one of the factors which I should like to look into.

As to the out-and-out principle which is concerned here, of making available Federal property for charitable purposes, I am greatly moved by the heart to do so, but I do not know where we are to stop if we adopt that principle. I suppose there is a great deal of Federal property which might be made available to charitable institutions for hospital sites and other purposes. So, in order to make doubly sure that we are staying within a rule which has some checks attached to it, I ask permission to study the bill further. I therefore ask unanimous consent that it go over until the next call of the calendar.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

## CONVEYANCE OF CERTAIN LAND IN WINDSOR LOCKS, CONN., TO STATE OF CONNECTICUT

The bill (S. 489) to direct the Secretary of the Army to convey certain land located in Windsor Locks, Conn., to the State of Connecticut was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Armed Services with amendments, on page 4, line 22, after the word "of", to strike out "National", and on page 5, line 7, after the name "Connecticut" to strike out "in substantially as good condition as it was at the date of entry", so as to make the bill read:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the Secretary of the Army is authorized and directed to convey by quitclaim deed, without consideration, to the State of Connecticut all right, title, and interest of the United States, except as retained in this act, in and to the following described land in Windsor Locks, Conn., together with all buildings, improvements thereon, and all appurtenances and utilities belonging or appertaining thereto, such land including approximately fifty-eight and six hundred eighty-five one-thousandths acres and formerly designated as the Post Engineer Area of Bradley Field, as shown on maps on file with the Office of the Chief of Engineers:

PARCEL 1

Beginning at the intersection of the eastern right-of-way line of Connecticut Route Numbered 75 and the northern right-of-way line of the spur track of the New York, New Haven and Hartford Railroad; thence north along the east line of Connecticut Route Numbered 75, north one degree forty-six minutes thirty seconds west, a distance of sixty feet more or less; thence north fifty-three degrees ten minutes east, a distance of five hundred and eighty-eight feet more or less; thence north seventy-two degrees fifteen minutes east, a distance of four hundred seventy-three feet more or less; thence north seventy-eight degrees fifteen minutes east, a distance of three hundred and forty feet more or less; thence south sixty-six degrees twenty-five minutes east, a distance of two hundred and sixty-two feet more or less; thence south seventeen degrees forty-five minutes east, a distance of seventy-seven feet more or less to the northerly boundary of the fifty-foot right-of-way of the spur track of the New York, New Haven and Hartford Railroad; thence along the northern boundary of such railroad spur, south seventy-two degrees fifteen minutes west, a distance of one thousand five hundred and eighty-five feet more or less, to the point of beginning.

PARCEL 2

Beginning at the intersection of the eastern right-of-way line of Connecticut Route Numbered 75 and the southern right-of-way line of the spur track of the New York, New Haven and Hartford Railroad; thence easterly along the southerly right-of-way line of such spur track, north seventy-two degrees fifteen minutes east, a distance of two thousand six hundred and thirty-five feet more or less; thence south seventy-one degrees thirteen minutes east, a distance of one hundred eighty-three and five-tenths feet more or less; thence south eighteen degrees nine minutes west, a distance of one thousand three hundred and ninety-five one-hundredths feet more or less; thence north eighty-three degrees thirty minutes west, a distance of seven hundred and seventy-nine feet more or less; thence south twenty degrees ten minutes west, a distance of five hundred seventy-six and twenty-four one-hundredths feet more or less, to the northerly line of highway Connecticut Route Numbered 76; thence westerly, along the northerly line of Connecticut Route Numbered 76, north eighty-three degrees thirty minutes west, a distance of seven hundred and thirty-six feet more or less; thence north twelve degrees no minutes east; a distance of seven hundred and fifteen feet more or less; thence north eighty-five degrees no minutes west, a distance of seven hundred and five feet more or less to the easterly line of highway Connecticut Route Numbered 75, thence north along the easterly line of Connecticut Route Numbered 75, north one degree forty-six minutes thirty seconds west, a distance of thirty feet more or less to the point of beginning.

SEC. 2. All mineral rights, including gas and oil, in the lands authorized to be conveyed by this act shall be reserved to the United States.

SEC. 3. The conveyance of the property authorized by this act shall be upon condition that such property shall be used primarily for training of the National Guard and for other military purposes, and that if the State of Connecticut shall cease to use the property so conveyed for the purposes intended, then title thereto shall immediately revert to the United States, and in addition, all improvements made by the State of Connecticut during its occupancy shall vest in the United States without payment of compensation therefor.

SEC. 4. The conveyance of the property authorized by this act shall be upon the further provision that whenever the Congress of the United States declares a state of war or other national emergency, or the President declares a state of emergency, and upon the determination by the Secretary of Defense that the property conveyed under this act is useful or necessary for military, air, or naval purposes, or in the interest of national defense, the United States shall have the right, without obligation to make payment of any kind, to reenter upon the property and use the same or any part thereof, including any and all improvements made thereon by the State of Connecticut, for the duration of such state of war or of such emergency. Upon the termination of such state of war or of such emergency plus 6 months such property shall revert to the State of Connecticut.

SEC. 5. In executing the deed of conveyance authorized by this act, the Secretary of the Army shall include specific provisions covering the reservations and conditions contained in sections 2, 3, and 4 of this act.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

## TO QUIET TITLE AND POSSESSION TO CERTAIN REAL PROPERTY IN THE STATE OF WASHINGTON

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1827) to quiet title and possession with respect to certain real property in the State of Washington, which had been reported from the Committee on Armed Services with an amendment

on page 1, after the enacting clause, to strike out:

That the United States hereby releases, remises, and quitclaims to the persons who are the successors in interest of the city of Seattle, Wash., and King County, Wash., with respect to the tracts of land hereinafter described all right, title, interest, claim, or demand of the United States in or to such tracts of land. Such tracts of land are described as follows:

And insert:

That the Secretary of the Army is authorized to disclaim any and all right, title, lien, or interest of the United States in and to certain property located in the city of Seattle, Wash., King County, Wash., hereafter described as follows:

So as to make the bill read:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That the Secretary of the Army is authorized to disclaim any and all right, title, lien, or interest of the United States in and to certain property located in the city of Seattle, Wash., King County, Wash., hereafter described as follows:

A portion of West Canal Street and Burns Avenue Northwest, described as follows: Beginning at the southeast corner of lot 16, block 3, Ross addition; thence on the south line of said lot south eighty-nine degrees thirty-eight minutes thirty-two seconds west seven and forty one-hundredths feet to the true place of beginning; thence south thirty-nine degrees thirty-one minutes west ninety feet to a point on the north line of the Lake Washington Canal; thence following the said north line to the most southerly corner of lot 8, block 1, Seattle tide lands; thence along the easterly and northeasterly lines of said lot 8 to an intersection with the southeasterly line of that portion of Burns Avenue Northwest as vacated by ordinance numbered 76354; thence following said southeasterly line northeasterly to an intersection with the northeasterly line of Burns Avenue Northwest; thence following the northeasterly line of Burns Avenue Northwest and West Canal Street southeasterly to the true place of beginning; Also,

A portion of West Canal Street (formerly Ewing Street), together with a portion of West Bowdoin Place, formerly West Fortieth Street: Beginning at the southeast corner of block 6, Ross addition to the city of Seattle; thence south thirty-nine degrees six minutes no seconds west one hundred thirty and eighteen one-hundredths feet to a point on the northerly line of the Lake Washington Canal right-of-way; thence on the said northerly line, northwesterly four hundred forty-eight and seventy-eight one-hundredths feet; thence north thirty-nine degrees thirty-one minutes east sixty-nine and sixty-six one-hundredths feet to a point on the north line of said block 6, Ross addition; thence on said north line north eighty-nine degrees thirty-eight minutes thirty-two seconds east thirty-one and seventy-three one-hundredths feet to a point on the northerly line of West Canal Street; thence on said line southeasterly three hundred seventy-five and twenty one-hundredths feet to a point on the south line of said block; thence on said line north eighty-nine degrees thirty-eight minutes thirty-two seconds east sixty-three and twelve one-hundredths feet to the place of beginning; also,

A portion of West Canal Street (formerly Ewing Street), together with a portion of Sixth Avenue Northwest: Beginning at the northwest corner of block 8, Ross addition to the city of Seattle; thence on the west line thereof south no degrees twenty-one minutes twenty-eight seconds east twenty-six and two one-hundredths feet to a point on the northerly line of West Canal Street; thence on said line southeasterly three hundred forty and fifty-one one-hundredths feet to a point on the south line of said block 8; thence south thirty-eight degrees sixteen minutes no seconds west ninety feet to a point on the northerly line of the Lake Washington Canal right-of-way; thence on said line northwesterly three hundred fifty-eight feet, more or less, to a point that bears south thirty-eight degrees fifty-six minutes no seconds west from the place of beginning; thence north thirty-eight degrees fifty-six minutes no seconds east to the place of beginning; Also,

A portion of West Canal Street (formerly Ewing Street): Beginning at the northwest corner of lot 4, block 9, Ross addition to the city of Seattle; thence on the north line of said block north eighty-nine degrees thirty-eight minutes thirty-two seconds east forty-five and twenty-two one-hundredths feet to a point on the northerly line of West Canal Street, as established by ordinance numbered 14267; thence on said line southeasterly two hundred seventy-eight and thirty-nine one-hundredths feet to a point on the east line of said block 9, which said point is south no degrees twenty-one minutes twenty-eight seconds east twenty-two and sixty-four one-hundredths feet from the northeast corner of lot 11 of said block; thence on the east line of said block and the same extended south no degrees twenty-one minutes twenty-eight seconds east one hundred and forty-eight feet, more or less, to a point on the northerly line of the Lake Washington Canal right-of-way; thence on said line northwesterly to a point that bears south thirty-eight degrees six minutes no seconds west from the place of beginning; thence north thirty-eight degrees six minutes no seconds east to the place of beginning.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, for the purpose of the RECORD for future reference, my understanding of this bill is that it would authorize the Secretary of the Army to grant a disclaimer on property adjacent to the Lake Washington Canal, Seattle.

This bill came about as the result of the question of whether under the State statute of Washington, the Federal Government acquired an interest in land next to the canal. The Washington Code provides that if a city abandons a street, the property shall belong to the abutting owners. A Washington lower court has held, however, that the statute applied only to those abutting owners who contributed to the dedication. The Federal Government did not so contribute. The title companies in Washington are apparently still not sure. The Army is of the opinion that it has no interest, and is willing to grant a disclaimer.

I have gone into the legal point involved. I am satisfied that the lawyers for the Department of the Army are correct. As a matter of law, we have no legal interest in this property, but in order to clear up any question as to the title, the bill is necessary. I make that statement for future reference, and raise no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended, so as to read: "A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Army to disclaim any interest of the United States in and to certain property located in the State of Washington."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That completes the call of this portion of the calendar.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, do I correctly understand that under the order heretofore entered the Senate is now to proceed to the beginning of the calendar for the consideration of measures to which there is no objection?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

## BILLS AND SENATE RESOLUTION PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 242) to provide for the establishment of a Veterans' Administration domiciliary facility at Fort Logan, Colo., was announced as next in order.

Mr. GORE. Over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 56) for the relief of Erich Anton Helfert was announced as next in order.

Mr. GORE. Over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 59) for the relief of Felix Kortschok was announced as next in order.

Mr. GORE. Over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 101) for the relief of Phed Vosniacos was announced as next in order.

Mr. GORE. Over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

The resolution (S. Res. 57) to amend rule XIII of the standing rules relative to motions to reconsider was announced as next in order.

Mr. GORE. Over.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be passed over.

## BILL PASSED OVER—NOTICE OF REQUEST FOR CONSIDERATION OF CERTAIN BILLS

The bill (S. 389) for the relief of Dr. Alexandre Demetrio Moruzi was announced as next in order.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, in connection with Calendar Nos. 48, 49, 58, and 90, being, respectively, Senate bill 56, Senate bill 59, Senate bill 101, and Senate bill 389, which have been on the calendar for some time, I give notice that I shall ask that they be considered by the Senate at the first opportunity. Although the majority leader is not present I hope he will be able to arrange for their consideration either tomorrow or the next day. They are measures which have been reported by the Committee on the Judiciary, and the members of the committee are very anxious to dispose of the bills. Therefore, I give notice now that I shall ask that the bills be called up at the very first opportunity, and I hope it will be tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of

Calendar No. 90, Senate bill 389, for the relief of Dr. Alexandre Demetrio Moruzi?

Mr. GORE. Over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard. The bill will go over.

## BILLS AND RESOLUTION PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 978) to amend the Interstate Commerce Act in order to expedite and facilitate the termination of railroad reorganization proceedings under section 77 of the Bankruptcy Act and to require the Interstate Commerce Commission to consider, in stock modification plans, the assents of controlled or controlling stockholders, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. GORE. Over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 1063) to authorize and request the President to promote certain naval officers, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. GORE. Over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 1663) to increase the salaries of Members of Congress, judges of the United States courts, and United States attorneys, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. GORE and Mr. MANSFIELD. Over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will go over.

The resolution (S. Res. 20) amending the cloture rule with respect to the number required for adoption of a cloture motion was announced as next in order.

Mr. MORSE and Mr. HOLLAND. Over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will go over.

The bill (S. 1857) to amend certain statutes providing expeditious judicial proceedings for the condemnation of lands for public purposes was announced as next in order.

Mr. GORE. Over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 1461) to amend the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, concerning requests of common carriers for increased transportation rates.

Mr. GORE. Over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

## AUTHORIZATION FOR POTOMAC ELECTRIC POWER CO. TO CONSTRUCT CERTAIN RAILROAD TRACKS—BILL PASSED TO NEXT CALL OF THE CALENDAR

The bill (S. 1691) to authorize Potomac Electric Power Co. to construct, maintain and operate in the District of Columbia and to cross Kenilworth Avenue NE., in said District, with certain railroad tracks and related facilities, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. GORE. Over.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee withhold his objection for a statement on behalf of the chairman of the Committee on the District of Columbia?

Mr. GORE. I withhold my objection.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE], who is necessarily absent, has sent me a message asking me in his behalf to ask unanimous consent that order No. 373, S. 1691, may be considered on the next call of the calendar.

Mr. HOLLAND. I have no objection to that course being followed if it is at the request of the chairman of the Committee on the District of Columbia. I did not understand the Senator's statement.

Mr. MORSE. I am sorry. I was talking to the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE].

Mr. HOLLAND. Is the request being made on behalf of the chairman of the Committee on the District of Columbia?

Mr. MORSE. Yes; I am making the request on behalf of the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE], the chairman of the Committee on the District of Columbia. The advice he has sent me is that he believes the possibilities are very strong that a satisfactory solution of the differences involved can be consummated by the time of the next call of the calendar. Therefore he asks unanimous consent that the bill be passed to the next call of the calendar.

Mr. HOLLAND. I have no objection. I have the same information with respect to the situation. I believe the differences have been adjusted and we are awaiting merely a working out of the wording. I join in the request that the bill be passed to the next call of the calendar.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

## BILLS PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 1396) to authorize the adoption of certain rules with respect to the broadcasting or telecasting of professional baseball exhibitions in interstate commerce, and for other purposes was announced as next in order.

Mr. GORE. Over.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 1806) to amend the Navy ration statute so as to provide for the serving of oleomargarine or margarine was announced as next in order.

Mr. GORE. Over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 848) to prescribe policy and procedure in connection with construction contracts made by executive agencies, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. GORE. Over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 2314) to prohibit transmission of certain gambling information in interstate commerce by communication facilities was announced as next in order.

Mr. GORE. Over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (H. R. 4557) to amend section 319 of the Communications Act of 1934, with respect to permits for construction of radio stations, was announced as next in order.

Mr. GORE. Over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (H. R. 4558) to amend section 309 (c) of the Communications Act of 1934, with respect to the time within which the Federal Communications Commission must act on protests filed thereunder, was announced as next in order.

Mr. GORE. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (H. R. 4559) to amend section 501 of the Communications Act of 1934, so that any offense punishable thereunder, except a second or subsequent offense, shall constitute a misdemeanor rather than a felony, was announced as next in order.

Mr. GORE. Over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 281) to amend sec. 1 (17) (a), sec. 13 (3) and sec. 13 (4) of the Interstate Commerce Act in order to extend to the Interstate Commerce Commission power to prescribe the discontinuance of certain railroad services in intrastate commerce when found to be unreasonably discriminatory against or to constitute an undue burden on interstate commerce was announced as next in order.

Mr. GORE. Over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (H. R. 1026) to amend the Public Health Service Act, with respect to the provisions of certain medical and dental treatment and hospitalization for certain officers and employees of the former Lighthouse Service and for dependents and widows of officers and employees of such Service, was announced as next in order.

Mr. GORE. Over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (H. R. 3704) to provide for the incorporation, regulation, merger, consolidation, and dissolution of certain business corporations in the District of Columbia was announced as next in order.

Mr. GORE. Over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (H. R. 2351) for the relief of Sam Rosenblat was announced as next in order.

Mr. GORE. Over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 2413) to provide an elected mayor, city council, school board, and nonvoting Delegate to the House of Representatives, for the District of Columbia,

and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. GORE. Over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 2457) to authorize the Administrator of General Services and the Postmaster General to enter into building purchase contracts; to extend the authority of the Postmaster General to lease space for post office purposes, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. GORE. Over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 2038) to amend the act approved July 8, 1937, authorizing cash relief for certain employees of the Canal Zone Government was announced as next in order.

Mr. GORE. Over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 2231) to amend the Trading With the Enemy Act relating to debt claims was announced as next in order.

Mr. GORE. Over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 1243) to amend the War Contractors' Relief Act with respect to the definition of a request for relief, to authorize consideration and settlement of certain claims of subcontractors, to provide reasonable compensation for the services of partners and proprietors, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. GORE. Over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

## AMENDMENT OF RENEGOTIATION ACT—BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (H. R. 6287) to extend and amend the Renegotiation Act of 1951 was announced as next in order.

Mr. FERGUSON. I submit some amendments to the bill which I propose to offer, and I ask that they be printed and lie on the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendments will be received, printed, and will lie on the table.

Mr. GORE and Mr. MANSFIELD asked that the bill go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

## BILLS PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 1688) to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, was announced as next in order.

Mr. GORE. Over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard; the bill will go over.

The bill (S. 796) to permit the charging of tolls on certain highways constructed with Federal aid was announced as next in order.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 666) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain land and right-of-way in the State of Wyoming, to the town of Jackson, Wyo., was announced as next in order.

Mr. GORE. Over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

## PROHIBITION OF TRANSPORTATION OF FIREWORKS—BILL RECOMMITTED

The bill (H. R. 116) to amend title 18, United States Code, so as to prohibit the transportation of fireworks into any State in which the sale or use of such fireworks is prohibited was announced as next in order.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, in connection with this bill, pursuant to a motion passed by the Committee on the Judiciary this morning, I ask unanimous consent of the Senate that H. R. 116, Calendar No. 784, which prohibits the transportation of fireworks into any State in which the sale or use of such fireworks is prohibited, be recommitted to the committee for further consideration.

The reason for this request is that since H. R. 116 was reported to the Senate on July 30, 1953, hearings have been held on companion legislation, S. 1722 and S. 2245, and it is desired to review the matter and submit a further report thereon.

I may add that the request is made also on behalf of the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY], who is the chairman of the subcommittee involved.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the bill will be recommitted to the Committee on the Judiciary.

## BILLS PASSED OVER

The bill (H. R. 395) to confer jurisdiction upon the United States Court of Claims with respect to claims against the United States of certain employees of the Bureau of Prisons was announced as next in order.

Mr. GORE. Over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 1918) to amend section 9 of the Merchant Ship Sales Act of 1946 was announced as next in order.

Mr. GORE. Over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (H. R. 5976) to amend section 1 of the Natural Gas Act was announced as next in order.

Mr. GORE. Over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (H. R. 6648) to amend section 205 of the Small Business Act of 1953 was announced as next in order.

Mr. GORE. Over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 2313) to amend the Commodity Exchange Act in order to include wool among the commodities regulated by such act, was announced as next in order.

Mr. GORE. Over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 1990) to strengthen the investigation and enforcement provisions of the Commodity Exchange Act, was announced as next in order.

Mr. GORE and Mr. MANSFIELD. Over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

## AMENDMENT OF AGRICULTURAL ACT OF 1949—BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 1381) to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949, was announced as next in order.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I call attention to Calendar No. 837, Senate bill 1381, to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949. The reason I call attention to the bill at this time is that all over the United States the Commodity Credit Corporation apparently has small lots of commodities, so small that it is difficult to get rid of them without going to considerable additional expense. This bill would authorize the Commodity Credit Corporation to sell such small lots at prevailing rates in the various communities—mostly in farm communities—and then to offset such sales to purchase at not to exceed the loan rate, similiar quantities of such commodities elsewhere.

I call attention to the bill at this time because I have asked the majority leader to set a time within the next few days for the consideration of the bill. It has previously been objected to.

As things now stand, the only way the Commodity Credit Corporation can get rid of these small lots is either to wait until they start to spoil or else consolidate several of them in one place so as to have a quantity sufficient to attract a buyer. Even then, the Commodity Credit Corporation is not sure of getting rid of them. I believe that this bill would save some money. The bill was not objected to in the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, or by anyone who appeared before the committee.

Mr. GORE. I ask that the bill go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

## JOINT RESOLUTION AND BILL PASSED OVER

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 12) to authorize and direct the International Joint Commission on United States-Canadian boundary waters to make a survey of the proposed Passamaquoddy-Utah power project and for other purposes was announced as next in order.

Mr. GORE. Over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution will be passed over.

The bill (H. R. 5861) to amend the act approved July 8, 1937, authorizing case relief for certain employees of the Canal Zone Government, was announced as next in order.

Mr. GORE. Over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

That concludes the call of the calendar.

## EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. KNOWLAND. In a moment I shall move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business. However, for the information of the Senate, it will be my purpose to ask that only nominations under new reports be taken up and that the Senate not proceed to the consideration of the nomination of Mr. Beeson at this time.

Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business, for action on nominations under the heading "New Reports."

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PAYNE in the chair. If there be no reports of committees the nominations under the heading "New Reports" will be stated.

## FOREIGN OPERATIONS ADMINISTRATION

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Glen A. Lloyd, to be Deputy to the Director.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from California if it is not a fact that all the nominations now being considered were reported unanimously by the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Mr. KNOWLAND. The Senator is correct; except with respect to the nomination in the Foreign Operations Administration, which was reported by the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. CLEMENTS. The respective committees approved the nominations unanimously?

Mr. KNOWLAND. So far as I know, that is correct.

## COUNCIL OF ECONOMIC ADVISERS

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Neil H. Jacoby to be a member.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Walter W. Stewart to be a member.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

## SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Wendell B. Barnes to be Administrator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of all nominations confirmed today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection the President will be notified forthwith of the nominations confirmed this day.

## LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of legislative business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

## INDOCHINA CRISIS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, we are now in the third week of debate on the Bricker amendment, a week during which the resolution will be discussed but not voted on. We will continue into another week and, perhaps, still another. I recognize that the question is one of great importance and I do not in any way mean to deprecate the Senate's concern in this matter. But I cannot believe that it is of such urgency that we ought to neglect other vital issues which are pressing in on the Nation. After all, the treatymaking power in its present form has served the United States for one-hundred-and sixty-odd years. I trust, therefore that the Senate will bear with me in a brief discussion of another vital issue.

I would not do so unless I felt that the matter which I am about to discuss requires the urgent attention of the Senate. Last September, I traveled several thousand miles in the three states of Indochina. The war that is going on there was then in a relatively quiet phase. The towns and cities appeared peaceful and there was a note of optimism, a hope that perhaps the French and the Associated States of Laos, Cambodia, and Vietnam were going to win out over the Communists and hold this vital territory in the camp of free nations.

Now the situation has suddenly changed. The news of the change is on the inside pages of the press but, in many respects, it overshadows in importance to the Nation the headlines which will soon be forgotten. Brief notes, a few paragraphs here and there, tell of the swiftly developing crisis in Indochina. If not closely observed, this crisis might easily resolve itself into a Communist victory or the entanglement of the United States in another Korean situation.

The Communist-led Viet Minh forces have opened up a new offensive into northern Laos and are moving rapidly in the direction of the royal capital of Luang Prabang. The Viet Minh command has thrown at least a division and possibly more into northern Laos and has 2 additional divisions on the Vietnam-Laos border. The seriousness of the situation is shown by the news blackout imposed on February 3 by the French high command on information from northern Laos.

Of grave concern is the effect of these victories of Ho Chi Minh's forces on Paris. The French mood parallels that of some Americans in the grim winter of 1950 when our forces were withdrawing from north Korea. Many wish to abandon Indochina. And if the French quit the struggle the gateway of South Asia is open to the onward march of Communist imperialism.

Deserting Vietnam troops have cost additional vital outposts in southern Vietnam as the Communist invaders of northern Laos sweep onward and Red forces harass positions elsewhere in Indochina. Approximately 40 military posts in Cochin-China have been seized by Communist-led rebels during the last 2 weeks. At least half fell through treason or desertion. Vietnamese troops have gone over to the Viet Minh, evidently without a struggle and of their own volition. This may indicate the success which Communist-leader Ho Chi Minh has had in personifying himself as a leader of anticolonial and antiwestern nationalism instead of what he actually is—the leader of the Communist forces against France and the Associated States.

In my report on Indochina to the Committee on Foreign Relations on October 27, 1953, I pointed out that one of the most important elements in a successful termination of hostilities lies in the mobilization of the local people against the Communists. At the same time I stated that a substantial part of the population, at present indifferent, would, if success is to be achieved, have to enter into active participation on the non-Communist side. Failure to utilize the power latent in nationalism serves merely to increase the cost to ourselves and to France of preventing the Communists from seizing Indochina. This has been emphasized by the statement of President Eisenhower at a news conference on Wednesday, February 3, in which he stated that—

> Everyone knows that the heart and soul of the population usually becomes the biggest factor of success or failure in a situation such as Indochina.

The President further observed that if Vietnamese wanted to be free; if they believed that through this kind of war they will be free, there probably will be a success in that area.

The only way to insure success in the struggle against communism in Indochina is for the people of the Associated States to put their shoulders to the wheel. They must stop the squabbling which has been going on between the numerous religious and political groups in the area and recognize the fact that whether or not they will achieve the independence promised them by the French is a matter of their own choosing and in large part their own responsibility.

The situation has already deteriorated during the past few weeks, so much so that the French Government has asked the American Government to send additional American technicians and planes to the Indochina theater. While considering and acceding to these requests we should look at the military situation in Indochina.

The French have in excess of 400,000 troops of various kinds in this theater of war. They are led by extremely capable officers in the persons of Generals Navarre, Bodet, and Cogny. The French have also put one of their ablest diplomatic officials, Maurice de Jean, into the office of High Commissioner for the Associated States. The Communist forces, led by Ho Chi Minh, are estimated to number approximately 300,000 men.

In addition to the numerical superiority of the French and the Associated States, these forces have in general sufficient military supplies, with which to

carry on the war. I was told that repeatedly by both American and French officials during my study mission to Vietnam, Laos, and Cambodia, and recent information substantiates this fact.

The only items which are cited by French authorities in the area as being in short supply are helicopters and small naval craft for use in the delta areas. These shortages are being filled by additional shipments from the United States. A request of 25 C–47 transports was sent to Indochina in December of last year. The French have been receiving a steady flow of American aid, and in January the 400th ship carrying American assistance to Indochina arrived at Haiphong, an additional 50 shipments since August 1953. These shipments have included ammunition, transport and combat vehicles, military aircraft, navy vessels, communication equipment, small arms and automatic weapons, artillery, ammunition, hospital supplies, engineering and other technical equipment.

In my report to the Foreign Relations Committee I stated:

> Without a vast increase in striking power the Viet Minh will not be defeated. This increase, primarily a question of manpower, cannot come from France, already hard-pressed to meet commitments elsewhere. It certainly cannot come from this country. It can come only from the three Indochinese States.
>
> And it is right that it should come from them. Their hope for freedom and national existence is at stake. If they have the will to sustain themselves as independent nations, the French have pledged themselves to continue to support them until the Communists are defeated. As for the material needed to insure the resistance, we have not stinted in our assistance in the past, and we are not likely to do so in the future.

And the state which can make the greatest contribution by far, if it will forget its internal squabbling and shoulder the responsibilities it must if it is to become and remain independent, is the State of Vietnam. The Laotians had in October, 1953, 1 battalion, today they have 13. The Cambodians had approximately 10 battalions. The Vietnamese had something like 80 battalions in being and with plans calling for a force within a few years on the order of 200 battalions. It was the hope of the French command that as an area became pacified it could be turned over, militarily and administratively to the Vietnamese troops and the Vietnam Government. Some degree of success has been achieved in this policy but one wonders how long it will take if desertions like those which occurred in south Vietnam continue. The pacification of hostile areas in Cambodia and Laos has not been—and is not yet—a serious problem because the Viet Minh forces have been operating largely in Vietnam.

It is my understanding that President Eisenhower has appointed a committee to report to the National Security Council on the problem of Indochina. It is my further understanding that the President has authorized an additional shipment of B–26 bombers for the Indochina theater. According to press reports France has asked for 400 United States technicians to help service these and other planes and to train French and Vietnamese technicians. Over the weekend the press has carried stories to the effect that 200 Air Force ground technicians have been sent to Indochina. I might say that on the basis of my knowledge of the situation in Indochina the question of maintenance of aircraft by American personnel has been one of the projects of the military advisory assistance group over the past several months. This addition, therefore, is a logical extension of a practice already underway.

The situation in Indochina is ever-increasingly a world problem and answers must be found for the questions arising out of this southeastern Asia crisis. Before we commit ourselves more deeply in this area, the Senate and the American people are entitled to know these answers.

If we are about to be drawn more deeply into the military situation on the Asia mainland, as some persons seem to fear and as some press reports hint at, has the administration undertaken at this point to replace our conventional forces and place reliance on atomic weapons? One need not be a military strategist to know that the kinds of wars being fought in Asia are largely rifle wars, not atomic wars.

Does the sending of technicians to Indochina mean that additional American military personnel will be sent to that area?

Does it mean that if the French and the Associated States forces become harder pressed we will send in naval and air support?

Does it mean that if the situation warrants it, American combat troops will be sent to Indochina?

Does it mean that action has been taken or will be taken without notifying the proper committees of Congress as to just what kind of policy we intend to pursue in that area?

We cannot afford to permit the situation in Indochina to drift any longer. A few months ago I said on my return from that area that the issue there could be met successfully by a three-pronged effort of the Indochinese, the French, and the United States. I reported then that each had a part to play: Ours, to supply the essential equipment and material—which we have; the Associated States, primarily the Vietnamese and Cambodians, to develop the will to freedom among the people and the determination to fight for it—which is open to serious question; the French, to assist in the achievement of that freedom by a combined military and political effort in keeping with their finest traditions—which they have done up to this time.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I am delighted to yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I have been interested in the remarks of the Senator from Montana. I know he was in that area of the world, because we met each other in the Far East. He was going in one direction, and I was on my way in the other direction.

I wish to ask the Senator if he does not believe it is highly important that the French in Indochina be sent trained mechanics. There are native mechanics who have been trained over the years adequately to service ground vehicles, but as to some of the planes which are being sent to Indochina, the natives have not yet been adequately trained to take care of American equipment. Does not the Senator from Montana think that in the absence of an adequate training program, whereby replacements could be furnished for the mechanics who are being sent there, at least half the equipment, perhaps a great deal more, might be on the dead line, and none of it serviceable?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I may say to the distinguished majority leader that I am in accord with his views. I fully approve the sending of additional B–26 bombers. I am glad that 25 C–47's were sent last December. I see nothing wrong in sending 200 technicians to assist the 125 technicians who have been there, working under the military assistance advisory group, caring for the planes of different types, while at the same time teaching the French and Vietnamese technicians. I think that is good, sound policy. Up to that point, I am in full accord with what the administration has done.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I may say to the distinguished Senator from Montana that I think the action does not indicate, either directly or indirectly, any desire or intention on the part of the Government of the United States to send any ground forces to that area of the world. To the contrary, I think that supplying planes and seeing to it that the planes can be kept flying, instead of being kept on the dead line, will do more than anything else to insure that no demands for ground forces will be made upon us; and if they were, I do not believe the United States Government would, in any event, send ground forces to that area.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The words of the distinguished majority leader are, of course, very reassuring. I know how busy the distinguished Senator from California is, but if he had time to read the article by Constantine Brown in the Washington Star of last Saturday, he may recall that Mr. Brown indicated that there had been rumors to the effect that the two divisions being withdrawn from Korea might find their way to Indochina. One of them is the California division.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I think I can give categorical assurance to the junior Senator from Montana that there is no intention to send those two divisions, or any other two divisions, of land forces to Indochina.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I may say to the distinguished majority leader that his statement is reassuring enough for me and, I am sure, for the Senate and for the American people.

The majority leader mentioned the fact that he had spent some time in Indochina. I know he did, and I know he worked hard, and really got to know the problem in that area better than I did.

The Senator from California realizes, of course, that so far as leadership in the struggle of the Viet Minh against the

French and the Associated States is concerned, Ho Chi Minh is playing a very cagey game. He is not picturing himself as a Communist, but he is trying to carry out the idea, which he has done for some years, of being the leader against colonialism and of fostering a policy of anti-westernism.

Because of that it has been quite difficult, it appears to me, to get sufficient support on the nationalist side in Vietnam to overcome the picture which Ho Chi Minh has been able to create in the minds of a great many people in that region.

I had hoped that by this time we might have heard that Vietnam had been able to develop a leader of comparable stature, but so far it appears there are too many leaders in Vietnam who are not of sufficient stature to act as a counterpoise to Ho Chi Minh.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I may say to the distinguished Senator from Montana that I think everyone recognizes the importance of not allowing Indochina to pass into Communist hands, because to do so would, of course, place Communist forces up against the borders of Thailand, Burma, and Malaya, and such forces would then be just one jump away from India and Pakistan. The loss of all Indochina to the Communists, of whatever nationality, would, I think, be an unfortunate development in that area of the world, to say the least. I think, however, that up to the moment there has been no indication of any major Chinese invasion of Indochina.

Undoubtedly, the forces of Ho Chi Minh are being supplied and re-equipped, and perhaps are being trained, on the Yunan side of the Chinese-Indochina frontier. But I believe that, so far as we know, no substantial volunteer forces have shown up, such as have shown up in North Korea.

I believe this Government has made it perfectly clear to the Chinese Communists that we could not be unconcerned if there were any such invasion from across the Chinese frontier. I do not believe that either the United States or the rest of the free world could be unconcerned about such an event.

I wish to say also to the distinguished Senator from Montana that I fully agree with him that up to the moment, at least, the French have not been able to get the same wholehearted support for the war effort on the part of the Vietnamese that the Republic of Korea had on the part of the people of Korea in resisting Communist aggression.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Senator from California is correct.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I believe the Senator from Montana has quite correctly put his finger on the point when he says that Ho Chi Minh, from a propaganda point of view, has had some advantage, because he has posed as the leader in freeing that area from colonialism, whereas Korea, of course, had been an independent country which was attacked from the outside.

Actually, I do not believe there are many Vietnamese who would be happy if the French announced overnight that they were going to withdraw from Indochina, because I think that actually they know, as well as the Communists know, and as we must know, that the Vietnamese, in their present state of training and with present equipment, could not successfully resist the well-trained forces of Ho Chi Minh.

It has seemed to me, however, that it would be highly advantageous if the French were able to go beyond the point which they reached last July. I think the French made great progress in pointing out that they want Vietnam, Laos, and Cambodia to be free and independent states. But difficulty arose because the French wanted them to remain inside the French union and not have the choice as to whether or not they should so remain.

Personally, I think that if the French were in a position to give assurances to the people of Vietnam, Laos, and Cambodia that, as of a certain day in the future those people would have their independence we would see a remarkable change in that area of the world. Such a date might be 5 or 10 years in the future. The United States had a similar arrangement with the Philippines under the so-called Tydings Act and other legislation passed by Congress.

I have been told by responsible people who have been connected with the Philippine Government and by persons who had been in business in the Philippines that there was a great deal of agitation in the Philippines prior to the passage of the basic act by the American Congress. In practically every election the issue was the desire of the Filipinos to gain their independence, and some contended that perhaps the Americans had no intention of ever giving them their independence.

However, once Congress passed the basic act, which provided that on a certain date in the future the Philippines were to have complete independence, the picture in the Philippines changed overnight, and everyone went to work and wanted to be properly trained to assist the new Government in taking over.

It seems to me that there would be a great many advantages if the people of Vietnam, Laos, and Cambodia had the same kind of association with France which India, Canada, Pakistan, Australia, and New Zealand have with Great Britain in the British Commonwealth. Each one of those nations, if it so desires, has the right not to be a part of the British Commonwealth. If that kind of assurance could be given to the people of Vietnam, Laos, and Cambodia, very likely, in their own economic and defense interests, in the interest of their cultural ties, and for other reasons, they might elect to belong to what might be called a French Commonwealth. But until they have the assurance that such a choice will be theirs, I think it would be very difficult to get the support of the rank and file of the people in the same manner the Government of Korea had the support of the rank and file of their people in resisting Communist aggression from the north.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I may say to the distinguished majority leader that there is a great deal of merit in what he says. I should like to see something done along the line he suggests, but I believe the Senator stretches the termination period too far ahead. It is my belief that, so far as granting independence to Associated States in the French Union is concerned, the French would be willing to postpone the date to any the people of Vietnam, Laos, and Cambodia would desire.

Of course, the French would like to remain and see the new states get on their feet economically. I think likewise the new states would need French help. When we consider the difficulties which the French have had and the lack of support in the villages and at the grassroots level, one can appreciate such a desire. Despite the agitation for a negotiated peace, I hope there will not be a negotiated peace such as the French hope for. I am becoming concerned about the 16th parallel, because it brings up thoughts of the 38th parallel. I should like to see a clear-cut victory, and then the states given complete independence, so that they would not lose their independence as soon as they had achieved it, under such circumstances as the Koreans did.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield to the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Unless we keep in mind some period of time, it is a little difficult for the people of France, and for the French Government itself, to carry the very heavy burdens which they have been bearing. There should be some time for adjustment such as the period we had in our relations with the Philippines. I do not think it necessary to fix on a precise number of years; but in view of the heavy burdens which the French have borne and the contributions they have made in that area of the world, I do believe there could be some adjustment, and that the people of Vietnam, Laos, and Cambodia should be able to feel that on a day certain, which day could be determined upon between them in the future, they would have their complete independence, just as the Philippine Republic gained its complete independence.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Perhaps that is the eventual answer. Certainly it is an alternative worth study by both the French on one side and the people of the Associated States on the other.

Mr. KNOWLAND. The discussions which have been going on for a negotiated settlement would probably end up in Indochina being Communist, because Ho Chi Minh and the Communists will do only what Communists have done the world over. They will enter a government only for the purpose of destroying it. If they can once get a so-called coalition government, which is one of the things they have been talking about and aiming for, it will have the same tragic results coalition governments had in Poland, Czechoslovakia, and elsewhere in the world where they have been tried. It would not be to the advantage of the people of Vietnam, Laos, or Cambodia, or of the French, or of the free world, or of the rest of the people of Asia, to have that kind of settlement, which could only result in the ultimate annexation by the Communists of Indochina.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Senator is correct, and I desire to thank him for his sage words and the statements which he has made this afternoon.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Montana yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I am delighted to yield to the Senator from Massachusetts?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The Senator asked some questions a few minutes ago about 200 men. I have listened with a great deal of interest to what the majority leader and the Senator from Montana have said. I agree with practically everything that has been stated by them. I should like to go back a little and try to answer some of the Senator's questions, because I was as disturbed as he was when I read that 200 uniformed mechanics of our Air Force were to be sent to Indochina.

As a result of inquiries, the Committee on Armed Services had information given to it last Friday by Admiral Radford, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. I think I can assure the Senator from Montana that at present there is certainly no intention of sending members of our Armed Forces into Indochina except for two purposes. One is to help train the technical and military assistants of MAAG; and that number of men is a good deal smaller than it has been at some other times. The second group comprise the so-called technicians who maintain our airplanes. The B–26 is an airplane about which the Indochinese have no knowledge. French mechanics and Indochinese are being trained to maintain those planes. But for certain purposes, more planes than originally contemplated were sent to Indochina. Consequently, if the planes were not to fall apart—and, of course, the Senator from Montana agrees that they should not be permitted to fall apart—we had to send additional personnel there. The French requested 400. We have sent 200.

This afternoon, in response to an inquiry of mine, I have received, over the telephone, assurances from the Secretary of Defense that the 200 mechanics will be out of Indochina by June 12. If the French and Indochinese are not capable by that time of maintaining the planes, then perhaps some civilian volunteers will be sent to do it. But we hope that will not be necessary.

However, I know I can assure the Senator from Montana that it is the intention of the Department of Defense, and their firm determination, to have those 200 trained mechanics out of Indochina by June 12.

Between now and then, those men are to be in places far removed from any combat area, and are to be there solely for the purpose of maintaining the planes which are sent there, work on which cannot now be done by local mechanics. Thus we shall have in Indochina a training force.

I do not think there is any objection to sending the training group, because in that way our material and equipment will be made of value.

In the second place, the special technicians, who are to be kept in places far removed from any combat area or combat zone, are to be out of Indochina—on the assurance to me, this afternoon, of the Secretary of Defense—by June 12 of this year.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished chairman of the Armed Services Committee. I know that with the weight of his word behind it, his statement will receive due consideration.

Of course he understands that I am not opposed to the sending of the Flying Boxcars, the B–26 bombers, and the technicians; I think it must be done. In my opinion, the French will not lose the war in Indochina, although, of course, the operations there are scattered, and matters cannot be clarified until conditions have settled a little.

However, I appreciate the explanation which has been given. In that connection let me say, to use a phrase used several years ago by the majority leader, that in Indochina and elsewhere the Democrats at this time, I hope, will be "in" on the "take-off," as well as on the "crash landing"—although of course we hope there will not be a "crash landing."

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Montana yield to me?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Let me say that I am sure the Senator from Montana is fully informed of the fact that both last year and this year the President of the United States has consulted with the members of both parties on the general, worldwide situation. Last year there were numerous meetings of the leadership of both the Democrats and Republicans of the House and the Senate, in going over the very delicate developments at that time in Korea. I am sure the President has made it very clear that in the field of foreign affairs and in the field of defense, he believes that both parties should be fully consulted in advance, and not merely notified after an event has occurred.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I am delighted to hear that. I hope that spirit of cooperation in both fields will continue and will grow, and that both parties will receive full consideration in connection with the discussion and study of any new policy which may be advanced and which may affect those fields.

Insofar as the area of foreign affairs is concerned, I certainly hope politics will be kept to a minimum, and an effort will be made to present a united front to the rest of the world.

Mr. President, I now yield the floor.

## RECESS

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, if there is no further business, and if there are no other remarks to be made at this time by Members of the Senate, I now move that the Senate stand in recess until tomorrow, at 12 o'clock noon.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 14 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Tuesday, February 9, 1954, at 12 o'clock meridian.

## NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate February 8, 1954:

UNITED STATES MARSHAL

Billy Elza Carlisle, of Georgia, to be United States marshal for the middle district of Georgia, vice Edward B. Doyle, retired.

IN THE AIR FORCE

The following officers for appointment to the positions indicated under the provisions of sections 504 and 515, Officer Personnel Act of 1947:

Gen. Otto Paul Weyland, 63A (major general, Regular Air Force), United States Air Force, to be commander, Tactical Air Command, with rank of general, and to be general in the United States Air Force.

Lt. Gen. Earle Everard Partridge, 33A (major general, Regular Air Force), United States Air Force, to be commander, Far East Air Forces, with rank of general, and to be general in the United States Air Force.

Lt. Gen. Orval Ray Cook, 36A (major general, Regular Air Force), United States Air Force, to be deputy commander in chief, United States European Command, with rank of general, and to be general in the United States Air Force.

Lt. Gen. Edwin William Rawlings, 95A (major general, Regular Air Force), United States Air Force, to be commander, Air Materiel Command, with rank of general, and to be general in the United States Air Force.

Lt. Gen. Bryant LeMaire Boatner, 362A (major general, Regular Air Force), United States Air Force, to be Deputy Chief of Staff, Materiel, United States Air Force, with rank of lieutenant general, and to be lieutenant general in the United States Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Truman Hempel Landon, 93A (major general, Regular Air Force), United States Air Force, to be the Inspector General, United States Air Force, with rank of lieutenant general, and to be lieutenant general in the United States Air Force.

## CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate February 8, 1954:

FOREIGN OPERATIONS ADMINISTRATION

Glen A. Lloyd, of Illinois, to be Deputy to the Director, Foreign Operations Administration.

COUNCIL OF ECONOMIC ADVISERS

The following-named persons to be members of the Council of Economic Advisers:

Neil H. Jacoby, of California.

Walter W. Stewart, of New Jersey.

SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION

Wendell B. Barnes, of Oklahoma, to be Administrator of the Small Business Administration.

# HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, FEBRUARY 8, 1954

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou God of majesty and mercy, grant that nothing during this day may undermine or eclipse our faith in Thy greatness and goodness, Thy presence and power.

May our sense of Thy divine sovereignty and sympathy transcend and supplant those feelings of anxiety and doubt which so often consume our strength and mar our peace.

Deliver us from all thought and tendencies which are alien to the mind and spirit of our blessed Lord as we seek to solve the problems of international relationships.

Show us how we may strengthen the ties of brotherhood and bring the members of the human family into a closer fellowship.

Hear us in Christ's name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, February 4, 1954, was read and approved.

## COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN submitted a conference report and statement on the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 358) to discharge indebtedness of the Commodity Credit Corporation.

## PERSONAL ANNOUNCEMENT

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I regret that my absence on Thursday last to attend a funeral prevented my voting on the bill authorizing help to control the level of Lake Michigan.

## COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, as I understand it the conference report that has just been filed has to do with the replenishing of the depleted capital of the Commodity Credit Corporation. In this instance the papers have been held on the other side. My information is that the Senate expects to act on the conference report first thing tomorrow, in which event we would expect to act on it immediately after that time.

## LEGISLATION TO ESTABLISH VETERANS' DAY AS A NATIONAL HOLIDAY

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I have this day introduced a bill in the House of Representatives to change the name of Armistice Day to Veterans' Day.

Armistice Day was declared a legal public holiday by the Congress in 1938, to be observed on the 11th day of November of each year. The date, November 11, was, of course, chosen to commemorate the close of World War I. The holiday was dedicated to the cause of world peace, and to the veterans of that First World War.

Since 1938, the United States has been involved in two great military efforts, and each has added millions of veterans.

This legislation does not establish a new legal holiday. Rather, it expands an existing holiday in order that a grateful Nation may pay proper homage to all its veterans who have contributed so much to the cause of world peace and the preservation of our way of life. It is altogether fitting that the United States should honor its veterans on a day when they themselves pause to pay tribute to their comrades who gave their lives on foreign soil.

It is my hope that the observance of Veterans' Day will become universal in the United States to the end that the great sacrifices of the American veteran shall not be forgotten.

## PERSONAL ANNOUNCEMENT

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I want to explain to the House my absence on Thursday, February 4, and to explain that my vote on the authorization to help control the level of Lake Michigan, that is, on rollcall votes No. 10 and No. 11 would have been "yes" in both cases. I was absent in New York testifying before Governor Dewey's special legislative committee on integrity and ethical standards in government at the Governor's request.

## COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Speaker, the 1953 annual report of the House Committee on Un-American Activities has been printed and released to the public. As a result of the report of the most active year in the committee's history, demands from all corners of the United States are coming in for additional copies of the report. It is the finest and most objective report that has ever been issued.

This morning I have thrown in the hopper a request for the printing of additional copies of this report as a House document. I am certain that the additional copies, which I understand will be approximately 4,000, will fail to meet the requests already pouring in; however, the committee will distribute them as long as they last to the persons who request them.

The committee, however, following its usual policy, will fill requests from Members of Congress. I expect in the near future to introduce a resolution asking for the printing of this report in such numbers as will meet the requests of the general public.

## WHAT'S IN A NAME?

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Speaker, I have today written to Mr. Wilson, Secretary of the Department of Defense, asking if it is not possible to change the name of the officials in the Navy who are called petty officers. I assume this word "petty" has been bequeathed to our Navy because of British tradition. I am certainly not an Anglophobe, but I think we can find great improvement on this name.

When we read in the dictionary we note that the word "petty" is defined as "Small in nature, trifling, mean or ungenerous, inferior," and so forth. I am sure these names have no part in the magnificent work that the petty officers in our Navy perform. The title of petty officer roughly corresponds in rank to an Army noncommissioned officer, and I am especially thinking in terms of the sergeant in the Army. All of us who have had the high honor of serving in the Army realize that the sergeant is the backbone of the Army. His title is one that is borne proudly and he has to make no apology for the name. I have talked with petty officers in the Navy and they do not like the name "petty." Why not change the name to enlisted officer and correct this problem that may seem small, and yet one that, if solved, would improve the already high morale in our great Navy.

I am delighted to speak this word for the petty officers in the Navy and for their wives and loved ones. Surely we can think of a better word than "petty" to give to the backbone of the Navy.

## NEW HAVEN RAILROAD

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Speaker, I am calling today for immediate congressional action to prevent seizure of the New Haven Railroad by a group of profit-hungry individuals. I shall seek legislation, if necessary, to keep control of a railroad which is a New England public utility and a strategic element in our national defense from being run and plundered by citizens of a foreign country.

I intend to seek bipartisan support of the entire New England congressional delegation for a prompt investigation by the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. The Canadian interests, working through a Mr. Patrick B. McGinnis, a New York financial venturer whose mismanagement of the Norfolk & Southern Railroad is already the subject of ICC inquiries, intends to seize control of the New Haven Railroad at the annual meeting of the stockholders on April 14, 1954.

It will be a disastrous day in New England when the New Haven Railroad is operated by absentee investors in Hamilton, Ontario. The only possible interest these men and their financial agent have in New England is to see how much money they can take out of our State and the public be damned. The present management of the New Haven Railroad, under Mr. Frederick C. Dumaine, Jr., has been repeatedly hailed in the press of New England and New York for constantly improving equipment and service. Massachusetts in particular remembers only too well the situation which existed just a few years ago when the New Haven Railroad planned to abandon some 88 stations, close down its Old Colony Line, and leave thousands of commuters with no convenient means of transportation. There were predictions at the time that grass would grow on the Old Colony tracks. The present management, in a move which astounded even the most optimistic New England boosters, not only saved the Old Colony but turned it into a healthy, well-equipped line through the installation of new rail, new roadbeds, rebuilt and refurnished installations of all sorts, and a complete new single system offering a better service than it ever had in its history. Besides reducing overhead costs and opening new and enormous sources of revenue such as the great wholesale market terminal in Boston and warehouse in New York, the New Haven's management has been building the recent bankrupt company into one of the strongest and healthiest businesses in northeastern United States.

But most important, the present management has recognized that the sound long-range interests of New Haven stockholders are inseparable from those of the general public. It has resulted in an inspiring demonstration of public responsibility and service.

Now, Mr. McGinnis, who has been hostile to the present management ever since it refused his demand that he be hired as some kind of a consultant at an enormous salary, is attempting to spearhead a drive by a few big stockholders who are hungry for a fast dollar.

I have absolutely no interest in the New Haven Railroad except as a Congressman representing my district in Massachusetts and as a resident of New England and as an American keenly interested in the defense of this Nation. In these capacities, I am deeply disturbed and even alarmed by the plans made public by Mr. McGinnis in the press during the last few days. If a small group of alien profiteers is allowed to run the New Haven Railroad, I have not the slightest doubt they will do exactly what Mr. McGinnis said they intend to do—make profits. Since this group obviously is not satisfied with the present sound and reasonable improvement of their investment, it must follow that they desire a much faster rate, and this is possible only at the expense of equipment, service, and the public.

This, understandably, does not disturb anyone in Hamilton, Ontario. However, the people of New England cannot and will not allow their principal transportation utility to degenerate, once again, to the status of a milk cow serving a few men with insatiable appetites.

The Canadian profiteers must be made to realize that the New Haven Railroad belongs, first and foremost, to the people of New England and they will not stand by while this utility is picked to the bone for the profit of the few at the expense of the many.

It must be remembered also that a modern, efficient, and well-run New Haven Railroad is an integral link in the Nation's defense pattern. It is every bit as important in this respect as bombers, radar installations, and munitions. As a matter of principle and plain commonsense we simply cannot allow a public utility of such strategic importance to be run by citizens of a foreign country, friendly or otherwise, any more than we can allow it to become a financial plaything for greedy profiteers.

---

## NATIONAL DAIRY PRODUCERS CONFERENCE BACKS PARITY LEVEL SUPPORTS

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include certain material.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, more than 1,000 dairy farmers from every type of dairy producing area, and from 25 States, met 2 days recently in Madison, Wis., the capital city of my home State. The butter brokers, the large milk trusts, and dairy-processing companies were not represented at the meeting, just the grassroots farm people who work every day milking cows and the representatives of their own cooperative creameries, cheese factories, and marketing associations. The farmers who attended were both Democrats and Republicans; many said they were independent voters. Members of all the major farmer organizations took part in the conference.

These dairy farmers held a working conference to discuss among themselves their production and income problems. They called in many of the Nation's top dairy and economics experts from the land-grant colleges and universities.

After learning everything they could from these specialists, the 1,000 dairy farmers went to work to develop a united program of action that would develop commonsense and practical solutions to the problems of dairy farming in this country. The program they adopted is a fine statesmanlike document. I am impressed by the wide scope and hardheaded realism of the recommendations they made. I commend this statement to the Members of the Congress for our careful consideration. The conference manifestly realized the importance to farmers of general economic policies as well as specific farm programs.

I am gratified that the conference recommended enactment of 100 percent of parity mandatory price supports for dairy products such as is provided in H. R. 7166, which I have introduced. I include with my remarks, the recommendations of the National Dairy Producers Conference to the President of the United States, to the Secretary of Agriculture, and the Members of Congress:

ACTION PROGRAM STATEMENT ADOPTED BY NATIONAL DAIRY PRODUCERS CONFERENCE, MADISON, WIS., JANUARY 22–23, 1954

A continuing increased production of milk and the food products manufactured from it must be maintained each year if the increasing population of the United States is to have a nutritionally adequate diet. Dairy farmers are willing and capable of producing a continuing abundance of milk and its products at reasonable prices for American consumers; provided educational research and other services, and income from production and sale of milk and butterfat, are sufficient to enable them to stay in business and earn farm family incomes equivalent to those earned by other segments of the population.

We dairy farmers assembled at the National Dairy Producers Conference at Madison, Wis., on January 22 and 23, 1954, do hereby adopt the following program statement:

1. We urge enactment by Congress of an amendment to the Agricultural Act of 1949 that will direct the Secretary of Agriculture to support the prices of milk, butterfat, and its products at 100 percent of parity and that will authorize the Secretary to utilize parity production payments to farmers, in combination with other approved methods of support.

2. We urge the Secretary of Agriculture to announce now his official and definite decision to extend the present dairy price support program at a minimum of 90 percent of parity.

3. We urge the United States Department of Agriculture to revise the procedures currently utilized in the administration of the dairy price support progam so that the announced level of supports will be actually reflected to dairy farmers in all sections of the country rather than the less than 85 percent supports now received in many areas.

4. We urge that a parity formula be adopted such that the calculated parity price for milk producers in different areas will reflect an economic balance with the rest of the economy.

5. We are opposed to enactment of sliding scale, variable, or flexible price support levels for any farm commodity. We urge all dairy farmers to join forces with farmers who produce other commodities in the interest of enactment of a sound, fully adequate price support program.

6. We favor the enactment of an expanded Agricultural Conservation Practices program with sufficient funds to make payments to wheat, corn, cotton, and other producers who put their diverted acres into soil-building annual crops, developing a national soil fertility security reserve rather than using such land for commercial production.

7. We recognize that American consumers cannot maintain and increase their purchases of milk and its products unless they have adequate incomes. Therefore, we urge adoption by business, industry, and Government of economic policies that will promote and encourage national economic expansion at a rate sufficient to maintain prosperous full employment with increased productivity per man, and increased consumption at a rate sufficient to balance expanding production.

8. We urge adoption of special means and programs to enable low-income consumers and relief recipients to increase their purchases of milk and its products through regular channels of trade up to a desirable nutritional standard. Additionally, we urge increased use of milk and its products by the United States Armed Forces, in public welfare institutions, and in the school lunch program.

9. We urge the establishment of a security stockpile of milk products under provisions of the Critical and Strategic Materials Stockpile Act, such commodities to be purchased in the market, or from Commodity Credit Corporation, at prices provided for disposition of Government-held commodities in section 403 of the Agricultural Act of 1949, including provisions for adequate civil defense needs.

10. We urge the adoption of import and export policies under negotiated international agreements, so that imports of milk and its products will not reduce returns to American dairy farmers below 100 percent of the parity price, and that export markets for United States milk products will be expanded. To the extent that our Government believes that it is in the national interest to promote two-way trade by accepting imports of agricultural commodities that compete with commodities produced on American farms, farmers should not be required to bear the cost; rather this cost should be borne by the entire Nation.

11. Other suggestions recommended for increasing the consumption of milk and its products are:

A. A strengthened educational program to inform consumers of the dietary merits of dairy products, to be carried on through producer and industry-financed advertising programs, educational courses in the public schools, improved grading procedures to make high quality more readily recognizable by consumers, and legal protection against false or misleading labeling or advertising of competitive and imitation products.

B. Inasmuch as it is clearly demonstrated that increasing the purchasing power of lower-income families results in their increased consumption of dairy products, while equal increases in incomes of higher-income groups do not, we recommend: That any tax reduction made by Federal or State governments should be tailored to benefit low-income families, preferably by raising the personal exemption; that the legal minimum wage should be raised and extended to additional workers, including agricultural workers; that benefits should be increased, and coverage extended to additional workers, including agricultural workers, of unemployment insurance and workmen's disability programs; that social-security benefits be increased and extended to additional workers, including agricultural workers and family-farm operators.

C. Intensified research on marketing and transportation procedures to develop more attractive and appealing products, lower-cost distribution methods, and more effective sales programs to move a greater volume of dairy products at fair prices.

D. Encouragement of action by consumers to achieve more efficient and lower-cost distribution of dairy products at prices fair both to farmers and to consumers through the development of consumer cooperatives able to join with producer cooperatives in establishing a nonprofit yardstick for the handling of milk and its products all the way from the producer to the consumer.

E. A broad public appeal to industry, business, and trade unions, to raise wages out of profits without increasing prices, so as to keep purchasing power rising fast enough to balance increasing productivity per man.

12. We urge adoption of Federal legislation to authorize accelerated depreciation for tax purposes and a capital credit program to enable dairy producers' cooperatives and other privately owned dairy processing plants to replace obsolescent plant facilities with modern flexible multiple-purpose dairy plants.

13. We urge enactment by Congress of a loan and service agency and program similar to the cooperative rural electrification program of REA, to assist in the establishment of a nationwide system of dairy marketing and processing cooperatives.

14. We urge dairy farmers to explore the possibilities of setting up national or regional dairy marketing organizations.

15. We urge increased appropriations for research in dairy merchandising.

16. We urge the Congress to increase appropriations for the school lunch program in order to increase the use of dairy products, and we recommend that purchases be made from local sources to insure better quality.

17. We urge that milk marketing orders be continued, and since milk distribution is now regional instead of local, that Federal orders should be reexamined for their effect on the transfer of milk from one local market to another, and their effect on the locations of production.

18. We urge that costs of distributing dairy products be investigated and appropriate legislation be enacted to insure producers of receiving a fair share of the consumers' dollar.

19. We recommend the establishment of a national grading system for butter and cheese, and that such products be grade labeled in terms understandable to consumers.

20. We ask Congress to enact legislation directing the Armed Forces to use butter and milk products; that farmers and processors make every possible effort to see that such butter and other products are of high quality; and we urge that the Armed Forces use sufficient care in transportation and handling of such products that their high quality is preserved up to the point of consumption.

21. To facilitate product-quality improvement, we recommend (a) better coordination of State standards of sanitation and quality inspection across State lines, and that the United States Department of Agriculture engage in activities to bring about this coordination; (b) that the Federal Government assume a greater responsibility in setting standards and promoting the eradication of Bang's disease and tuberculosis; (c) that the Federal appropriation required to support the $25 and $50 indemnity be restored; and (d) that the grade of milk be determined on the basis of flavor, sediment, and bacterial count in addition to the physical surroundings.

22. We recommend appropriation of greater funds for public and private, including cooperatives, research and educational activities designed to discover and encourage the adoption of improved dairy farm management techniques that will reduce the costs of milk production and improve the quality of milk when it leaves the farm. We urge every dairy farmer to avail himself fully of every such service and to adopt such of the improved practices as are adapted to his farm and within his financial resources.

23. In connection with use of parity production payments as a method of supporting the returns from the sale of milk, butterfat, and other perishables, we favor placing a maximum limitation upon the amount of such payments that can be earned by an individual farmer in a single year at the following level:

An individual farmer would be authorized to earn a production payment only upon each unit of the commodity he produces and sells up to a volume of sales such that the total received from sales plus payments would be not more than $25,000 for farms with average farm-cost-gross income ratios, or its net income equivalent for types of farms where the ratio of farm costs to farm gross income is greater than under average farm conditions.

24. We wish to express our appreciation to the National Farmers Union for sponsoring this conference which has given dairy farmers from all over the Nation an opportunity to meet together, discuss mutual problems, and to develop this statement of a practical and commonsense program of action in order to approach a solution for these problems.

25. We express our appreciation to the Governor of Wisconsin and to the officials and citizens of Wisconsin and Madison for the fine hospitality they have shown us.

26. We express our appreciation to the University of Wisconsin, University of Nebraska, and North Dakota State College whose cooperation in supplying information and the services of technical specialists has contributed to the success of this conference.

27. We express our appreciation for the fine services of the press and radio representatives who have covered this conference.

28. We direct that copies of this statement be forwarded to all Members of Congress, to the President of the United States, and to the Secretary of Agriculture.

---

## "MY RESPONSIBILITIES UNDER THE BILL OF RIGHTS"

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, the National Association of Real Estate Boards last year conducted a nationwide essay contest on the subject, My Responsibilities Under the Bill of Rights. Some 20,000 high-school students from every section of our country submitted essays on this subject. The judges who selected the prize-winning essay from the 80 local winners were Senator John W. Bricker, of Ohio; Representative Ralph W. Gwinn, of New York; and United States District Judge Edward M. Curran, of Washington, D. C.

The winner of the first prize was Miss Helena M. Carter, of Atlanta, Ga., a senior in Christ the King High School.

The National Association of Real Estate Boards held its annual banquet dinner in Washington last Wednesday night. Many of you attended this dinner and heard Miss Carter read her essay which won for her the first prize in the contest, that prize being a 5-day visit to the Nation's Capital, with all expenses paid for Miss Carter and her chaperone.

Many of you who are here today have asked me to express to Miss Carter your appreciation for her splendid document. It was one of the finest articles on the Bill of Rights ever to come to my attention. It is heartening and inspiring to

know that our young people are concerning themselves so earnestly with the fundamental principles upon which our Government is founded, and that they can think with such clarity and come to such logical and sound conclusions as those expressed in this essay.

I think this essay deserves wide distribution. I believe that every person who reads it will benefit by it, and I insert it here in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as a part of my remarks:

MY RESPONSIBILITIES UNDER THE BILL OF RIGHTS

"The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution * * * are reserved to the States * * * or to the people."

These lines of the 10th amendment to our Constitution epitomize the spirit of American life. Into these lines has been transcribed all of our American heritage, our freedoms, and our rights, and consequently our corresponding duties.

Our responsibilities under the Bill of Rights are many. Into our hands, the hands of the people, have been placed the most precious gifts our Founding Fathers could give—gifts which we must protect, cherish, and in turn, transmit to our children.

I, a student, share equally in these responsibilities and obligations. I must realize that a nation's wealth is not found in its stores of gold or silver, but in its people who are willing to make sacrifices for its welfare. I must realize that our Government under the Bill of Rights, government "of the people, by the people, and for the people," is not a luxury on which some men may grow indolent and selfish, but an instrument which demands and requires all of the participation, services, and energies of the people whom it benefits.

If I begin to take our Government for granted, if I begin to regard its privileges as something it owes to me, then I shall someday awaken to the fact that, because of me and others like me, my Nation has been consumed by the lethargy of its own people.

I must realize that our Government, under the Bill of Rights, offers a sterner challenge than any other government in the world. It scoffs at the ideas of totalitarianism and only asks the generosity, the loyalty, and the cooperation of its people.

It is not possible for men to be impressed or disciplined into devotion to the rights and privileges which self-government offers them. Instead, they must be alerted from youth, the youth of which I, as a student, am a part, to respect and cherish the ideals which democracy upholds. They must be made aware of the great privileges which our Government, under the Bill of Rights, grants them, and must be taught to safeguard these privileges.

It is a sample of gross immorality for me to claim freedom to vote, if I am not ready to allow my fellow Americans that privilege. It is ungodly for me to claim religious freedom, if I am unwilling to tolerate beliefs which differ from mine. It is deceitful to declare freedom of the press, if I intend to deny that freedom to others, and it is hypocrisy for me to declare freedom of opinion, if I will not grant equal freedom to those who oppose me.

Today we are faced with the problem of rectitude of the individual versus rectitude of the State. It is a contest which may, understandably, last until the end of our lives. Basically, the odds are with me, as a responsible member of American society. A democracy such as the one which our Government offers cannot be defeated in this contest; it can only lose by default. It can only lose, if, through indifference, I neglect my personal responsibilities for its safety and growth.

## TRICKLE, TRICKLE LITTLE TAX RELIEF

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, if you do not have a son or daughter in college; if you do not have a foster child; if you are not a widow or widower with a son or daughter under 10 years of age, who works and also hires a baby sitter; if you are not living on a pension; if you are not so unfortunate as to spend more than 3 percent of your adjusted gross income for medical expenses; if you are not a shareholder in a corporation, the action so far approved by the Ways and Means Committee of the House will not give you 1 cent of relief from taxation in its so-called technical revision of the revenue laws.

In other words, practically all the wage earners and small merchants are being completely ignored.

## PUBLIC-WORKS PROGRAM

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, today the distinguished Member of the other body, the Honorable PAUL DOUGLAS, of Illinois, and I introduced companion bills to provide for more effective planning, coordination, and programing of public works.

We are dissatisfied with the Eisenhower administration's slowness of action in developing an adequate reservoir of public-works projects for use in the event the present economic situation worsens. However, we feel our bill represents a necessary step in the public-works field regardless of whether the present recession deepens or full employment quickly returns.

The Douglas-Bolling bill, entitled the "Public Facilities Act of 1954," first, enables Congress to carry out its responsibilities to the people by planning ahead and preparing programs to assure continued economic stability and growth; second, provides machinery for the advanced planning of public-works programs which would be available immediately for implementation; third, centralizes responsibility for such planning and action in the President and authorizes the establishment of a special office for his assistance; fourth, stimulates Federal public works and community development through cooperation of the Federal, State, and local governments. Today, no such unified approach or integrated public-works program exists; advanced planning is not conducted on a comprehensive basis nor is responsibility for such leadership centralized in any agency.

The bill establishes a Public Facilities Administrator, appointed by the President with the advice and consent of the Senate. He is to be aided by an advisory committee consisting of representatives of Federal agencies concerned with public works and with assisting State and local government programs.

The Douglas-Bolling bill directs the President, with the assistance of the Administrator, to devise programs for submission to the Congress to aid in the construction of needed public facilities by the Federal, State, and local governments and authorities set up under the jurisdiction of State and local governments. The President is authorized, after determining that such need exists, to accelerate Federal public-works programs. The President is directed to include in his Annual Economic Report to the Congress: First, specific information on the reservoir of public facilities needed and planned by all levels of government; second, the policy of the Federal Government with regards thereto; third, recommendations for legislation to implement that policy.

## PROPHETS OF GLOOM

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, those of us who bring to the attention of the administration figures on unemployment in our respective areas are termed prophets of gloom.

It seems to me rather remarkable that for bringing these subjects to their attention we are chastised for certain things that are true. Those here who do not want to take the responsibility and do not want to take cognizance of the fact I believe are the prophets of doom to themselves, because, as all of us know, back in the thirties when there was mass unemployment there were a hundred thousand Communists in this country; today, 20 years after, there are less than 20,000.

We had better start doing something now.

These are the most up-to-date facts about unemployment in the Detroit area:

Chrysler Corp.—excluding the automotive body division, formerly Briggs—has reduced employment more than 40,000 from a total of 138,000 in April 1953.

At the present time more than 28,000 seniority workers—exclusive of those in the automotive body division—are among those laid off by Chrysler Corp., the hardest hit plants being Dodge and Plymouth.

At the Dodge plant, where production has been cut from the 1953 peak of 1,630 cars a day to 550 per day, 13,200 seniority workers are laid off. Moreover, at times they are given only 4 days' work a week, as was the case last week.

At Plymouth, where cars were being assembled at the rate of 2,160 per day during the peak period of July 1953, production was cut starting last January 25 to 760 cars per day. This cutback resulted in the layoff of approximately 5,000 seniority workers.

The recent cutbacks in Plymouth production have resulted in the layoff of 10,000 workers in the Chrysler automotive body division—formerly Briggs.

Among the so-called independent producers, Hudson employment has been cut from more than 15,000 to 7,500.

Packard employment has fallen from 17,900 to 10,000.

Studebaker employment has been reduced from 20,000 to 13,500 and the work schedule has been cut to 4 days a week.

On January 9, 1954, the Michigan Employment Security Commission reported that 107,000 workers, more than 7 percent of the work force, were unemployed in the Detroit area and 167,000 unemployed in the State of Michigan. The commission then projected a further decline in employment. This projection is being borne out.

On February 5, 1954, the Detroit Free Press reported that 3,800 workers at the Packard plant face a 1-week layoff.

The Free Press also reported that Chevrolet workers, of whom there are 9,000 in Detroit, have had their work cut to 4 days for the second consecutive week and that Chevrolet officials indicate that the 4-day week may continue temporarily.

At the Great Lakes Steel Plant, in addition to 1,800 workers laid off 2 weeks ago, it is expected that another 2,000 or more will be laid off this week or in the near future. Those working now I understand are on a 3-day-a-week schedule.

The service-connected employment has been cut throughout the city. There were some 500 brewery employees released. This is typical of other fields of employment.

Attached hereto is a recent telegram sent to Leonard W. Hall by UAW-CIO President Walter Reuther:

I note from the newspapers that you are still engaged in your name-calling campaign. It is my unpleasant duty to inform you that I have been unable to find a single laid-off worker who has been put back to work by your epithets. In fact, since you initiated your name-calling campaign, there have been further layoffs in Detroit and other industrial centers. I suggest that instead of playing politics with unemployment, you could use your influence as national chairman of your party to persuade the Republicans in the various State legislatures to proceed without delay to implement President Eisenhower's recommendations to increase unemployment compensation benefits and duration. While this alone will not eliminate unemployment, it will at least provide some immediate relief for the hardship and distress now facing the families of the more than 2 million workers now drawing miserably inadequate benefits, and to the businesses dependent on their patronage.

At the same time, you can urge the leadership of your party in the executive and legislative branches of the Government to get to work to dispel the gloom to which you refer by taking vigorous action to restore full employment. We have enough faith in the basic soundness of the American economy to believe that full employment can be restored. All that is required is the will to do it on the part of those who have the responsibility for doing it. Name-calling will not do it. Neither will optimistic incantations prove any more effective now than "prosperity is just around the corner" during the 1930's. It is not enough to be long on confidence so long as millions of American families are short on purchasing power.

Your party, which has the responsibility for administering the economic as well as the political affairs of the Nation, cannot deal with the problems of the American people by brushing them under the rug. Nor can it conceal those problems by covering with bushel-loads of abuse those who refuse to join you in denying that any problem exists.

Unemployment must not be made a political football by either party. The way to keep unemployment out of politics is to put the unemployed back to work. We suggest you direct your activities toward that end.

## THE NATIONAL ECONOMY

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, on February 2 when Secretary of the Treasury Humphrey appeared before the Joint Committee on the Economic Report the newspapers quoted him as saying that if consumers keep buying at the rate they are now, the present slow decline in the economy will level off and we will be on our way again.

On February 3 the Anaconda Copper Mining Co. announced the closing of two of its mines in Butte, Mont. Also announced was the curtailing of output of copper from the Butte mines by about 10 percent and a reduction of workweek from 6 days to 5 in the mines and at the smelters in Anaconda and Great Falls.

Secretary Humphrey's statement, so closely followed by the action in Butte, prompted one of the Butte miners to wire me as follows:

FEBRUARY 5, 1954.

Hon. LEE METCALF,
*House Office Building,*
*Washington, D. C.:*

Secretary Humphrey says keep buying. Butte miners cut from 6 to 5-day week. Means loss of $100 per month to every miner affected. Ask Secretary Humphrey how miners can continue buying at present rate with this reduced income.

KENNETH F. SHEEHAN.

This is the real question of the week.

## CONFIDENCE IN MR. DULLES AT BERLIN CONFERENCE

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, when the Secretary of State appeared before our Baltic committee last November in Washington he stated among other things that if we go to the conference table we go there not to sacrifice principles but to make our principles prevail. I think the history of the Berlin conference thus far indicates that we are taking a real leadership at that conference. We are not sacrificing or negotiating principles but we are there commencing to make our principles prevail.

Along this line I should like to point out to the House the effect of our strong position with regard to free elections in Germany. We are with regard to free elections in Germany standing on principle and we see an unmistakable response among the East German people on the other side of the Iron Curtain, in the yearning of men for freedom. We see those people rallying to the principle of freedom when it is expressed. With that firm leadership that is being shown by Mr. Dulles, particularly with respect to faith in human freedom, we are also gaining firmer support from France and England.

Sometimes it is difficult to take a firm stand on belief in the right when the currents of indecision and neutrality are running strong against us. But Mr. Dulles is proving that he acts from moral courage and gains the strength to take his stand against the Communist semantics of deceit and fear from a deep faith in human freedom. All men of good will on both sides of the Iron Curtain will respond to this deep faith.

## LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. CLARDY (at the request of Mr. VELDE), from Monday to Thursday, on account of official business with the Un-American Activities Committee.

## NORTH PACIFIC FISHERIES TREATY A TRIBUTE TO MILLER FREEMAN

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Speaker, in keeping with the thought that we should send flowers to the living, I desire to pay tribute to a great citizen of the Pacific Northwest who resides in my congressional district.

Activation in Washington this month of the International North Pacific Fisheries Commission crowns the career of Miller Freeman, Seattle industrial publisher, and his half-century campaign for the conservation of the world's fishery resources through the means of international agreements applying scientific research and intelligent management to the end of "use without destruction."

The North Pacific Fisheries Treaty, under which the United States, Canada, and Japan are undertaking the development of that ocean's fisheries on the basis of sustained yield is the third such treaty which has come into effect in large degree through the vision, faith, and efforts of Miller Freeman. All have grown in

the pattern of the first, through which the United States and Canada in 1924 agreed to joint management of the Pacific halibut resource. Largely conceived and carried through negotiation to actuality by Mr. Freeman, the halibut treaty and the research and conservation achieved under it have stood for 30 years as the world's best example of achievement in the field of international fisheries conservation.

Some 20 years ago, the United States and Canada, again under the leadership and stimulus of this man, united their efforts to solve scientifically the perplexing riddle of the once fantastically abundant Sockeye salmon of the Fraser River. From virtual extinction, this run today is rebuilding into one of the rich natural resources of North America. What was virtually lost to men, now promises to yield food and wealth to Canadians and Americans forever, through this treaty which Miller Freeman shepherded into being.

With the end of war in the Pacific, Miller Freeman undertook to stimulate thinking throughout the Pacific States to the end that a means might be evolved to prevent destruction of the fishery resources of the North Pacific through reckless international competition. Out of his suggestions grew the Pacific Fisheries Conference, an exceedingly interesting agency in which all elements of the fisheries—unions and owners, workers and operators, crewmen and scientists—unite their efforts to solve fishery problems of common concern. From its inception early in 1946, Mr. Freeman has been the modest chairman of this conference, out of which has come the International North Pacific Fisheries Treaty.

This treaty raises a new concept of conservation. In it the three nations agree to pool their scientific research through the tripartite commission, studying the fisheries which they develop to the end that the crop can be harvested without impairing the future, and that the yield may be sustained at maximum levels. It goes even further in that the nations agree that: Where a fishery resource has been under development, is utilized to its full capacity, is under scientific study and management directed at its conservation, nations not previously engaged in the fishery should abstain from entering it.

Here is a breadth of common concept which has never appeared before in the field of international fisheries. It is a concept and an achievement which has grown out of the thinking and working of Miller Freeman for 50 years in the field of fishery conservation, in the sense which counts wise use as the very essence of conservation.

This man is a publisher, not a scientist, not a fisheries expert. He is the founder and builder of one of the leading industrial publishing houses of this country. His earliest memory is that of traveling through the mountains of Montana with a knock-down print shop carried in two covered wagons which served as well to bear and shelter the Freeman family.

His father was a Confederate soldier from Culpeper Court House, Va., who after the War Between the States chose the way of the West, where he published a unique newspaper—the Frontier Index—which moved with the frontier, west and west.

Miller Freeman was born in Ogden, Utah, 79 years ago. As I have said, his first memory recalls the journey as the wagons moved on to Butte. Then to Yakima, in my State of Washington.

As a very young man, Miller Freeman launched forth as an editor and publisher on his own on Puget Sound. In 1903 at Seattle he founded Pacific Fisherman, the first of his numerous industrial journals, most of them devoted to the natural resource industries. Some of them deal primarily with the Pacific region. Others, like Pulp and Paper, The Lumberman, Mining World, and The Log, are national in scope; and all are international in reputation and respect.

A naval captain in World War I, Mr. Freeman has served my State for many years in many ways—and particularly in enterprises which required forward vision, faith, courage, and energy abounding. America's first, and still only, great floating bridge would never have come into being if he had not fought through to fulfillment the enterprise which the engineers conceived, but could not of themselves achieve.

Miller Freeman has made his mark and served his country well in widely varied ways. In this new treaty, with its wider concepts, he serves all mankind; for the Pacific—whose productivity the treaty protects—is one of Earth's richest reserves, with resources that, wisely used, can furnish man with food and wealth forever.

## THE RELEASE OF BUTTER FOR IMMEDIATE PUBLIC CONSUMPTION

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, I understand that on tomorrow we will consider the question of the restoration of the capital of the Commodity Credit Corporation. I also heard our friend speak a moment ago of the desire for a fixed parity of 100 percent for dairy products, including butter.

Mr. Speaker, I understand that some of the butter producers are recommending to the Secretary of Agriculture that he call back into consumption some of the butter that is in store, amounting as of June 30, 1953, 231 million pounds. As I see it, the dairy farmers are facing as big a scandal in butter with irreparable damage to them as the potato farmers themselves realized in potatoes.

I urge upon them to support this return to consumption of some of the store of butter to bring the butter price down to a 60- or 70-cents-a-pound level. I feel that will restore consumption of butter which has fallen off 50 percent in the last 10 years. If the dairymen insist on seeking 100-percent parity, consumption of butter will decline still further and they will inevitably and finally incur the full wrath of all American consumers. No business group should do that with its eyes open.

## OLD ORDER AMISH MENNONITE PEOPLE

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I have today filed a petition presented to me from the Old Order Amish Mennonite people, who reside in and near my district. I am quoting below from the heading of the petition:

We, the undersigned (Old Order Amish Mennonite), are conscientiously opposed to take insurance of any form, as we provide for our poor and disabled through our churches. So we are praying and asking to be exempted from social security.

Following this heading, Mr. Speaker, there are 94 signatures.

TO OUR WORTHY STATE REPRESENTATIVE OF OHIO:

We, the undersigned (Old Order Amish Mennonite), are conscientiously opposed to take insurance of any form, as we provide for our poor and disabled through our churches. So we are praying and asking to be exempted from social security.

Susanna M. Troyer, Maryann J. Yoder, Esther H. Miller, Susie R. Swartzentruber, Sarah E. Troyer, Katie Lehman, Sadie Troyer, Lizzie Keim, Erma Miller, Saloma Miller, Susanna Yoder, Elizabeth Troyer, Mary Weaver, Emma Troyer, Elizabeth D. Troyer, Rebecca L. Troyer, Amanda M. Troyer, Lydia Ann E. Weaver, Bishop Henry J. Miller, Sol. L. Weaver, Levi M. Troyer, Levi Swartzentruber, Jonas L. Yoder, Melvin J. Yoder, Henry J. Yoder, Jonas E. Schlabach, Eli D. Yoder, Eli M. Keim, Eli M. Troyer, Raymond Swartzentruber, Joni A. Yoder, Benj D. Troyer, David M. Miller, John E. Yoder, Elmer D. Miller, Abe J. Weaver, Moses M. Troyer, Andrew M. Troyer, Ervin L. Weaver, Alfred J. Yoder, Eli E. Gingerich, John C. Yoder, Mose P. Troyer, Emanuel M. Troyer, Andrew J. Weaver, Emanuel E. Miller, Abe C. Yoder, Andrew D. Troyer, Aden Troyer, Melvin J. D. Yoder, Mrs. Martha Yoder, Ben J. P. Weaver, Dan J. Hershberger, Emanuel A. Miller, Ben J. E. Weaver, John P. Weaver, Abe M. Troyer, Joseph M. Keim, Mose P. Miller, Moses J. Keim, William J. Keim, Abner P. Miller, Nelson A. Troyer, Moses E. Miller, Ben Kauffman, Fredericksburg, Ohio, route 2; Isaac Miller, Apple Creek, Ohio, route 2; David K. Troyer, Andy E. Hershberger, Andy E. Gingerich, Amos D. Yoder, Andy G. Yoder, Mary E. Troyer, Anna B. Weaver, Clara J. Troyer, Laura J. Keim, Fanny E. Hershberger, Ella A. Weaver, Clara J. Nisley, Clara J. Keim, Mattie B. Kauffman, Lydia J. Weaver, Amanda E. Gingerich, Martha M. Keim, Elizabeth A. Hershberger, Mary S. Troyer, Mary J. Nisley, Susie M. Miller, Olen J. Schlabach, Ella Schlabach, Anna A. Weaver, Fredericksburg, Ohio, route 2; Bishop Jacob J. Stutzman (age 82 years); Preacher Elam Swartzentruber, Preacher Eli B. Yoder, Deacon John J. Stutzman, Millersburg, Ohio, route 4.

Our church consists of 46 members.

## DISMISSALS FOR SECURITY REASONS

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I am, today, introducing resolutions calling on the President, the Attorney General, and the Civil Service Commission for information with respect to Federal officers and employees who have been separated from the service for security reasons under Executive order during the past year.

The dismissal of some 2,200 Federal employees is a matter which has inspired wide public interest. It has caused hundreds of editorials to be written on the subject. People are looking for the facts. I am sure that the American people are mature enough to be told the truth. Congress is entitled to know, and I hope that all Members will join with me in requesting this information.

I have asked that we be told how many officers and employees have been dismissed in each category according to the specific ground or reason for their separation. How many, if any, were removed for acts of espionage, sabotage, or treason. How many, if any, were removed for present membership in the Communist Party. How many were notified in writing of charges against them. How many of these people are now employed by the Government. How many were separated under the Executive order, and how many resigned. Let us have the facts. We need not fear the truth. The people are entitled to the truth.

## EMPLOYEES' SALARY INCREASE BILLS

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, originally the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee had planned to schedule the beginning of hearings on employees' salary-increase bills today, Monday, February 8. However, because of the schedule of the House, it was decided by the committee to postpone the beginning of the hearings until Tuesday, February 16, 10 a. m.

The committee had planned to hear Members of Congress today and tomorrow. Because of the postponement of the hearings, we will set another time for hearing Members of Congress. On Tuesday, February 16, we will begin the hearings by testimony from the Postmaster General.

## SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan asked and was given permission to address the House for 15 minutes on Tuesday and Thursday next, following any special orders heretofore entered.

## IS HONEYMOON OVER?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, the very grievous wounds inflicted upon me by my own committee when they refused to let me go on with the investigation of racketeering and extortion, and then, in addition, the committee hid behind the so-called iron curtain of an executive session—I refused to have these individual votes made public—those wounds had only begun to heal when just this morning I was amazed, shocked, and really began to suffer in earnest when I learned that after last session—remember, last session, our colleagues on this side promised so often and so faithfully to go along with President Eisenhower—when here this morning, from the well of the House there, six Democrats got up—I kept count of them on my fingers of one hand and two on the other hand—six of them, I think it was, got up and criticized our President and told him what to do. They expressed their displeasure. Now, I wonder what caused that change of heart. Certainly they meant it last session? I am sure they did? And, he has not done anything since that was harmful to them. What is the matter with the gentleman? Please tell us what is politically biting you.

## CARDINAL MINDSZENTY AND RELIGIOUS PERSECUTION IN IRON CURTAIN COUNTRIES

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, in May of 1947 the Communists successfully overthrew the legally established government in Hungary. By the middle of 1948 practically all effective political opposition to Communist leadership was ruthlessly crushed. There followed the elimination of other forces which were the uncompromising enemies of atheistic communism.

In the foreground of such forces, and the most formidable one, was the church. Communist leaders of Hungary knew this well; they realized that it was more difficult to combat spiritual and ideological forces than physical ones, and were fully prepared for the occasion. They were firmly determined to subdue, to subjugate, to enslave and destroy all religious forces which were obstacles in the attainment of their goal—the establishment of a Communist dictatorship.

On September 26, 1949, the newly established Ministry of People's Enlightenment announced that "an organized struggle will begin on the ideological plane for the eradication of capitalism." This meant open warfare against the church and the clergy. In that struggle, the Communists were prepared to use police, prisons, guns, and gallows. Already some churchmen were in trouble, and now many others were forcibly banished from their parishes and thrown into prisons where they languished with great suffering.

Cardinal Mindszenty, the Roman Catholic primate of Hungary, protested vigorously against all these inhumanities. Of course, he also protested, with all possible energy, against the suppression of the religious press, against the outlawing of youth organizations, against the Communist design of seizing church schools, against the exclusive teaching of Marxist materialism in schools under government control, and against elimination of the Christian spirit from Hungarian culture.

In this struggle against the forces of darkness and destruction in a Communist-dominated country, the brave cardinal had the solid but, in the circumstances, ineffective support of all believers; he also had the moral support of churches in all free countries; neither of these, however, could assist him in standing against the physical forces of tyranny. On December 26, 1948, when 16 secret-service officers surrounded the cardinal's residence and arrested him, he was physically alone against that circle of brute force, well beyond the ready sympathetic human assistance.

From the time of his arrest until his trial in the following February, this prince of the church was subjected to a series of agonizing physical treatments—a type of torture inflicted upon innocent victims by their inhuman masters. It has been repeatedly and reliably reported that the cardinal was drugged in order to have him confess. His trial began on February 3, 1949, and the public prosecutor accused him of espionage, treason, and black marketing. In the course of the trial it was announced that the cardinal admitted the charges and confessed his guilt. Five days later, on February 8, he was found guilty of treason, of espionage, and of black-market activities, and was sentenced to life imprisonment.

Since that day the sad event is remembered by all believers in freedom of conscience. On this, the anniversary of the fifth year of his life imprisonment, we are all reminded of the sufferings of this prince of the church in some dark dungeon in Hungary. While he is thus rendered incapable of waging struggle against the forces of Communist dictatorship, his faithful followers are being persecuted, spied upon, arrested, imprisoned, exiled, and even shot by the hundreds, sometimes without a trial.

In Hungary, as well as in all countries where Communists have established their so-called people's democracies, there is no freedom of conscience. Religious leaders are not allowed to perform their duties. If these leaders show any unwillingness to take orders from the civil authorities they are arrested on some pretext, are accused of some anti-state activity, in a prearranged trial they are found guilty, and then sent to prison

or liquidated. Cardinal Stepinac's arrest and imprisonment in Yugoslavia in 1946 was the first of such celebrated cases, and Cardinal Wyszinski's arrest last September in Poland may not be the last of such arrests, but in all Iron Curtain countries the struggle for the suppression of the church, for the elimination of the clergy as a force against the spread of un-Christian Communist doctrine, for the destruction of hallowed and sacred institutions, is still raging. In this holy war churches in all these countries are involved in a life-and-death struggle against the dark forces of tyranny and evil. Let us pay our tribute to Cardinal Mindszenty on this day for his long and courageous fight against ungodly civil authorities. Let us also hope that the final victory in this struggle will be on the side of righteousness and freedom.

## UNTRUE STATEMENTS ABOUT THE DEMOCRATIC PARTY

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, this is not in reply to what the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] said but it is in reply to the general situation that we meet.

I said a while ago that the backs of some of us are getting pretty sore. We are being called on to cooperate, yet we have people high in the administration and people high in the Republican Party indicating that everybody connected with the Democratic Party is at least tinged with communism. Then the man who is closest to the President of the United States on last Saturday night indicated we were all sadists.

Of course, those statements are mean, they are untrue, they are dastardly. They should be stopped by somebody, and there is one man in the United States who can stop that kind of talk.

## CARDINAL MINDSZENTY

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BENTLEY] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, I am honored and privileged to have this opportunity to address my colleagues of the House today on this, the fifth, anniversary of the sentencing of Cardinal Mindszenty to life imprisonment by the Communists of Hungary. At this point I should like to read into the RECORD the text of a letter which was sent to all Members by the Hungarian National Council, 125 East 72d Street, New York 21, N. Y., under date of January 25, 1954:

HUNGARIAN NATIONAL COUNCIL,
*New York, N. Y., January 25, 1954.*

Hon. ALVIN M. BENTLEY,
*The House of Representatives,*
*Washington, D. C.*

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BENTLEY: The month of February marks the fifth anniversary of the trial of Joseph Cardinal Mindszenty, prince primate of Hungary, staged by the Communist regime of Hungary. News of the cardinal's arrest, on the second day of Christmas in 1948, was received with deep consternation by the entire free world. The world immediately realized that the Mindszenty case was not merely a concern of the Roman Catholic Church and the Hungarian Nation, but that it affected the entire free world and every thinking man and woman. The circumstances of the cardinal's arrest, the utterly false accusations brought against him, the mock trial, filled the free world with alarm.

America, the land of freedom, instinctively sensed that Mindszenty stood for the principles of human liberty on which this great country was founded. No one in the United States had any doubt that Mindszenty had done the right thing. He did so because he foresaw the real goal of the Bolsheviks: the destruction of the subjugated peoples of Central Europe. The arrest of Cardinal Mindszenty in 1948 marked the beginning of a new era in the fight between bolshevism and the Hungarian as well as the other Central European nations.

Since the silenced and oppressed Hungarian people is unable to express its opinion and feelings today, we who represent their interests on the free soil of the United States and in the countries of the free world, must speak for them in thanking you for your generous contribution to their fight for liberty and for your firm stand in the case of Cardinal Mindszenty. The moral support received from the United States greatly encouraged the Hungarian Nation's resistance to bolshevism, and was largely responsible for the fact that the Hungarian people did not lose faith and hope. On the contrary, their faith in ultimate liberation is today stronger than ever before, and their passive resistance has already shaken the Bolshevik regime to its foundations.

On the fifth anniversary of the arrest and trial of Joseph Cardinal Mindszenty, we appeal again to the conscience of all freemen to keep the fate of the heroic cardinal and the cause of the suffering Hungarian Nation before the forums of the free world, so that liberty and justice may eventually emerge victorious from this great human and national tragedy.

Sincerely yours,

Msgr. BELA VARGA,
*Former Speaker of the Hungarian Parliament, President of the Hungarian National Council.*

I must add at this point I received a telephone call from Monsignor Varga last Tuesday evening requesting me to make some appropriate remarks on the floor of the House today on the occasion of this tragic anniversary. As I have already explained to my colleagues, the specific request was made of me because I knew Cardinal Mindszenty personally and because I was in Hungary, attached to the United States Legation at Budapest, at the time the cardinal was arrested, tried, and sentenced. Needless to say, I am more than happy to accede to this request.

Cardinal Mindszenty was born Joseph Pehm on March 29, 1892, in the country village of Csehimindszent in southwestern Hungary. After finishing common school, he attended a Catholic boarding school at Szombathely, where he studied for the priesthood at the local seminary. He was ordained on June 12, 1915, at the age of 23.

Mindszenty had his first contact with communism in 1919 when he was arrested by the Communist regime which controlled Hungary at that time. His first imprisonment, however, was brief since the Communists were overthrown after a brief rule of 4 months.

His next totalitarian foe, however, was not Communist but Nazi in origin. As far back as 1935, a Hungarian Nazi Party had been formed and continued to grow and increase in strength. Mindszenty fought these Nazis as strenuously and vigorously as he had opposed the Communists. He went to particular lengths to save Hungarian Jews, who had been blamed for the early Communist government of Bela Kun. There is a remark attributed to him at this time which is worth repeating.

You have heard of collective responsibility—

He said—

collective crime, and collective punishment. This is Communist teaching. See that you do not fall into its error yourselves. There is no such thing as collective crime or collective punishment. Everyone must answer before God and his judges on earth only for the crimes he has himself committed. I hear voices which I do not like, voices uttering collective condemnation just as the Communists do, voices threatening to take justice out of the hands of the law and to administer it privately and wrongly. No one has the right to take justice into his own hands. The Jews are not responsible for the crimes of Bela Kun, simply because he was a Jew, any more than they may all be given distinction because of the courage and righteous patriotism of those Jews who were imprisoned with me. Are you as Catholics willing to be punished for the crimes of other Catholics? Will you condemn all Protestants because some Protestants are wicked men?

Incidentally, I should mention that this quotation is from the book Cardinal Mindszenty, by the noted Hungarian author, Bela Fabian, who is himself of the Jewish faith.

In 1944 Mindszenty was appointed bishop of Veszprem. During the remainder of that year, when the Germans were in military control of Hungary, Mindszenty continuously worked to save the Hungarian Jews from Nazi persecution, even hiding many of them in his own house. For refusing to permit the Nazis to search the episcopal palace for these poor people, Mindszenty himself was arrested on November 27, 1944. At this time, he walked the entire distance from his palace to prison, surrounded by his priests, all of whom were also arrested. The Nazis charged him with treason and many other crimes, just as the Communists did 4 years later. However, he was released from prison in April of 1945 when the Russians captured Hungary and set up a Communist coalition government. In the fall of 1945, he received news as to his appointment as cardinal or prince primate of Hungary.

Cardinal Mindszenty early became "enemy No. 1" for the Russian and Hungarian Communists. He fought them over the issue of agricultural collectivization, over Communist control of the schools, at every step of their progress toward complete Sovietization of his country. Time and again he spoke out, mostly by pastoral letters, to encourage the spirit of resistance among his people. He was everywhere regarded as the out-

standing symbol of anti-Communist resistance throughout the land.

I remember 6 years ago when I attended a high mass which he conducted in Budapest, in the Cathedral of St. Stephen, the patron saint of Hungary. Of course, the church was jammed and the streets outside crowded for blocks around, but we had reserved seats and managed to get in. That was 8 months before his arrest, but it was the last time I saw him.

He was a stern, uncompromising man, of the highest moral principles and integrity. He absolutely had a will and a determination like a rod of iron—he was afraid of nothing on earth, and he would not deviate one iota from what he believed the right course of action. There were many persons who tried to persuade him to steer a middle course with the Communists but he fought them as outspokenly as he knew how. The Communists tried to get him to leave the country, offering him a safe conduct, and then they tried to get him to come to an understanding with them but he would not give in an inch.

You may have heard that when Mindszenty was in Rome in 1946 for his investiture as a cardinal and when the Holy Father placed the red hat on his head, the ancient formula was pronounced:

> Receive this red hat, the sign of the unequaled dignity of the cardinalate, by which it is declared that thou shouldst show thyself intrepid even to death by the shedding of thy blood, for the exaltation of the blessed faith.

At this time the Pope then said to Mindszenty, "And you, my son, may be the first to suffer."

You also may remember when he visited Cardinal Spellman in New York in 1947, and his host warned him of the danger of returning to Communist-dominated Hungary, that Mindszenty replied, "My enemies can take from me no more than my life, and that has already been given to God."

I remember that black day of December 26, 1948, when Mindszenty was taken by the Communist police and disappeared from the world for nearly 2 months. But we were able to find out a little of what went on during that time. We knew that first he was interrogated continuously by police officers working in shifts, questioned for 82 hours without being allowed to leave the room or even sit down until he finally fainted. We found out that when he was revived, his former secretary, Father Andrew Zacher, who had also been arrested, was brought into the same room. Father Andrew had been beaten so brutally that he could not walk; he had to be carried into the cardinal's presence. When he saw what had happened to his secretary, Mindszenty collapsed a second time.

From that time on, no one is exactly certain just what they did to the cardinal. I did, however, contact a Hungarian doctor who told me that one of his colleagues had told him how he had been called into the prison to administer a drug to Mindszenty. Some people call this drug actedron and some say it is more like scopolamine. My friend who only knew it by its Hungarian name said the Russians had used it in criminal proceedings for a great many years and he had read about it in Russian medical journals before 1932 at which time an account of its use could no longer be published. He did say the drug was made from a plant which he described as something like the mescal cactus which grows in Mexico. Whether the drug was given to Mindszenty as a truth drug or a stimulant or for some other reason, we just don't know.

When the cardinal was brought to trial in February of 1949 all American and British diplomats were barred from attendance. One American newspaperman, representing the United Press, was permitted to attend. Another got in through an error on the part of the Hungarians. There were other foreign correspondents, all of them pretty well picked. There was an American Communist whom I knew, Peter Furst, representing Reuters News Service. I later took his passport away from him. I also remember an Englishman, Wilfred Burchett, representing some English paper at the trial—today he is covering the war in Korea from the Communist side of the lines. Most of the American wire services were represented by Hungarian citizens who of course had to write just what they were told.

As I said, all we diplomats were barred. Previously, however, I had gone to some contacts of mine and, through them, had arranged to get a couple of tickets which I actually had with me. But I made the mistake of telling my chief, the American Minister, about it. He said, "We can't get tickets in that way. We will have to request them through the Hungarian Foreign Office." I told him that if we asked for them officially we would be refused but he insisted upon it. So I had to return the tickets. We went to the Communist Foreign Office, through the proper channels, and were, of course, turned down cold, just as I knew we would be.

I heard the radio broadcast of the entire trial, however, except those parts which they cut out when something did not suit them. I remember sitting beside my radio with two interpreters taking down every word that came through. And I will never forget one time when the presiding judge—in Hungarian courts the chief judge of the five-man court interrogates the prisoners, not the prosecutor—when the judge asked Mindszenty a question. The cardinal answered it and then went right ahead and replied to another question which had not even been asked him. The judge, who, incidentally, used to be one of the biggest Nazis in Hungary, actually said, "Wait a moment; I haven't asked you that yet." Whether he had been hypnotized in some way or not, Mindszenty had obviously been forced to memorize his entire confession, which I believe lasted nearly 4 hours. I do know that there was no comparison between the way I heard him speak before and the way he talked at the trial. His voice, before so strong and sure of itself, was weak and trembling, and he definitely gave the impression of repeating words that were not his own, words that someone else had written for him and taught him to say. We also found out, for example, that various letters that were supposed to have been written by him during his imprisonment had been forged by handwriting experts.

To show you what his own mental state was during the trial, after it was all over and he had received his sentence to life imprisonment, his old mother was permitted to visit him for an hour or two. When he saw her, about 2 weeks after the trial was over, the cardinal said to her, "Mother, when will my trial begin? I have so much I have to say." We got that story right from his mother herself.

Another thing which you may not have heard about the trial: Before it started the Hungarians had made up their minds that they were going to hang him. Rakosi, the Communist boss in Hungary, advised Moscow of this decision, and the Russians wired back forbidding them to do it, as it would create too great an uproar. That was the only thing which saved Mindszenty's life.

Joseph Cardinal Mindszenty was a real martyr. The Communists broke his body and they broke his mind. You probably know that, since his trial, he has completely lost his mind. Now, actually, the Communists have taken pretty good care of him. When his heart gave him trouble, they flew in a specialist from Russia. When his lungs got bad, they moved him up to a prison in the Tatra Mountains, on the Slovak border. As a matter of fact, they continually move him from one prison to another, for obvious reasons. You know there are still attempts under way to free him, either by bribery or by other methods. But, as I say, although they now take good care of his physical needs, they can never undo what they did to his mind. That part of the man is gone forever.

The only part of the old Cardinal Mindszenty that is still with us today is his unquenchable spirit and that will live always. Maybe some people will say that Mindszenty lost his fight against the Communists. You remember that before his arrest he warned everyone not to believe any so-called confession, which, as he said, would only be due to human frailty. When he was forced to stand up in the Communist kangaroo court and repudiate this warning, some people claimed that he was finally defeated. They were wrong. Mindszenty's body and his mind may have been overcome but his spirit emerged triumphant. The Hungarian people will never forget him, the whole world will never forget him. And the example he provided stirred the people, the great mass of the people who live behind the curtain today and who are perhaps 95 percent anti-Communist; it stirred those people to a degree of passive resistance to their Communist rulers that could never have happened otherwise. I even remember the Communist policeman on my block who lost his job because he said that Mindszenty was a good man.

A few months after the Mindszenty trial I went to Easter services in Budapest, which was shortly before my departure. This time I did not have a reserved seat. On that Easter morning I not only could not get into the church; I could not even get near it. It was the same with every church in the city, Catholic and Protestant alike. People 50 and 60 years old who had lived in Budapest all their lives told me that they could not remember anything like it. It was the only form of protest that these people had left; it was the only way that they could demonstrate that, in suffering for his faith in God and his belief in the inherent freedom of man, the Cardinal had won their hearts and their spiritual allegiance.

You have seen what the Communists can do to those in their power, even so great and determined a man as was Cardinal Mindszenty. The millions of people who live back there behind the Iron Curtain can call neither their bodies nor their minds their own—the only freedom left them is that of spirit. And so I ask you today, my friends, to unite with those people back there in spirit, whether they be Poles or Czechs or Slovaks or Hungarians or any other of the oppressed. There is so little that we can do for them in their hour of need, so little help that we can give, at least we can support them in spirit. Do not be sleeping while they are waiting out their Gethsemane.

I am not of the Catholic faith, but I have the most tremendous respect and admiration for any organization which has sons as ready to fight and die for it as was Joseph Mindszenty. However, Mindszenty was not defending the principles of the Catholic Church alone. He was the champion of freemen everywhere who believe in their right to worship the Lord in their own way and according to the dictates of their own conscience. And, my friends, as long as we have men of the caliber of the Cardinal who are prepared to sacrifice everything for that belief, no Communist dictatorship can ever defeat us. The Christian religion has been persecuted before but the blood of the early martyrs gave it new life and strength in its darkest hour and the Roman Emperors found that when one convert was given to the lions, two appeared to take his place.

The martyrs of the 20th century, among whom Mindszenty is first only because of his religious rank, the martyrs behind the Iron Curtain today are also giving of their blood to ensure that the Christian religion will never die. This is something which transcends denominational lines. And while we cannot relieve their physical and their mental sufferings, we can be with them in our hearts. And in the hearts of all of us, they will live forever.

Mr. Speaker, it is fitting that we here in free America today, on the fifth anniversary of the sentencing of Mindszenty to life imprisonment in a Communist jail, take note of this man who, with many thousands of other heroes behind the Iron Curtain, showed the world how to live and, if necessary, how to die. The spirit of freedom burns strong in the human heart and, by encouraging that spirit everywhere, by helping to keep it alive and glowing in his own native Hungary, Mindszenty did not suffer in vain. No totalitarian rule can ever triumph so long as men such as Cardinal Mindszenty have the faith in God and in the freedoms which are God-given, the faith which will move mountains. Let us hope that the example of Cardinal Mindszenty will keep that faith alive forever. And let us hope that the spirit of resistance to communism inspired by Mindszenty—that that spirit will continue to grow behind the Iron Curtain. Let us hope that that faith and that spirit will become so great that one day we will see liberation and freedom and independence again in that part of the world. It was in this cause that Mindszenty was martyred.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENTLEY. I yield to my friend, the gentleman from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to tell the gentleman that Members of the House join him in the views which he has expressed with respect to Cardinal Mindszenty as typifying the slavery in which the countries of Eastern Europe are held and the suppression of religious freedom and, indeed, religious opportunity of any kind as we understand it, and to hope that the gentleman on our Committee on Foreign Affairs may give the matter further consideration at this session of the Congress, as it has before.

Mr. BENTLEY. I thank the gentleman.

I must say at this point that I received a telephone call from Monsignor Varga last Tuesday evening requesting me to make some appropriate remarks on the floor of the House today on the occasion of this tragic anniversary. As I have already explained to my colleagues, this specific request is made of me because I knew Cardinal Mindszenty personally, and because I was in Hungary attached to the United States Legation in Budapest at the time the cardinal was arrested, tried, and sentenced, and needless to say I was more than happy to accede to this request.

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENTLEY. I shall be glad to.

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. I wish to compliment the gentleman for the very fine speech he is giving us here today reminding us of the fifth anniversary of the trial of Cardinal Mindszenty; and I want to compliment the gentleman for taking this occasion to give this speech, which I believe is an historic one, because as he has indicated we know that he was there during this period and was living behind the Iron Curtain for a period of two or more years experiencing what it really means to live under the Communists, and particularly the facts pertaining to the fiendish preparation for the trial of Cardinal Mindszenty. We in the free world can hardly believe some of the things that happen in Communist courts; we find it hard to believe because we do not appreciate the extent to which the Communists have gone to prepare defendants for trial, the tortures that are inflicted upon defenseless people.

The gentleman is associated with me in the hearings in the Baltic committee in which similar tortures and religious persecutions have been related. But more important is the fact that we in the United States do not fully realize that the Soviets have instituted a systematic plan for the destruction of religion. It is only when one begins to realize the extent to which these fiends in the Kremlin will go, that we can begin to understand how defendants such as Cardinal Mindszenty can be brought to the state where he would be forced to plead guilty to almost any charge.

The apprehension that the gentleman indicated at the outset of his talk that this was perhaps the beginning, and that there would be other persecutions of a similar nature, certainly proved to be true. We have had similar situations in Czechoslovakia; Archbishop Jozaf Beran was removed from his position, and most recently we have had the persecution in Poland of Cardinal Stefan Wyszuski, and also the persecution of Protestant and of Jewish clergyman, in all of the Iron Curtain countries. I am sure the gentleman is very familiar with those cases because, as the gentleman will agree with me, I am sure, the Communists know that having invaded the field of the spirit, they will find a real resistance in the things of the spirit they knew that they must destroy this resistance in Christianity or in Judaism in order to maintain their power.

I think the gentleman is doing a wonderful thing in bringing this matter to the memory of this House, to keep alive the martyrdom that Cardinal Mindszenty has suffered.

Mr. BENTLEY. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENTLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. MADDEN. I wish to join my colleague, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KERSTEN] in commending the gentleman in bringing to the attention of the Congress and the country the deplorable experience that Cardinal Mindszenty endured as a prisoner of the Soviets. I, along with him and with the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BENTLEY] and the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KERSTEN] and members of the Baltic Committee, have learned a great deal through the testimony offered last December at our various hearings in New York, Chicago, Detroit, and Washington, of the intense and bitter barbarism that exists in the minds of the Soviet leadership, especially against religions of all kinds.

I was chairman of the Katyn Massacre Investigating Committee, of which the gentleman who is occupying the chair at this time [Mr. O'KONSKI] was a member. Through our hearings in this country and also in England and in Europe we had testimony which brought out just what the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BENTLEY] is talking about. Those Katyn hearings revealed the barbarism and the uncivilized state

of mind that exists among the leaders in the Kremlin in their mad rush for world domination. The Communist tyrants are trying to rule the world through fear, mass murder, massacre, and slave prison camps. Cardinal Mindszenty is one of the real heroes and martyrs which future world history will record as the real fighters in our future victory over the Communist menace.

I want again to commend the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BENTLEY] for bringing this to the attention of the House.

Mr. BENTLEY. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENTLEY. I gladly yield.

Mr. RABAUT. I want to compliment the gentleman on his fine statement. I want to say that I think Cardinal Mindszenty, realizing that he was a prince of the church, was cognizant of the words of the Master when He said about the church, "Behold, I am with you all days, even unto the consummation of the world." And, the gentleman has told that in his own way this morning. The fine expression that he has given this case deserves the commendation of the House.

Mr. BENTLEY. I thank my colleague from Michigan.

Mr. SADLAK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENTLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. SADLAK. I, too, desire to compliment and congratulate the gentleman on the very stirring address in which he has given his own personal observations about a great man.

Mr. BENTLEY. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENTLEY. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I, too, would like to commend the gentleman from Michigan for his timely and forceful comments on the imprisonment of Cardinal Mindszenty. The free world as a whole owes Cardinal Mindszenty, and men like him, an eternal debt. It is a very timely reminder which the gentleman from Michigan has given the House and I congratulate him for his presentation.

Mr. BENTLEY. I thank my colleague from New Jersey.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, this week marks the fifth anniversary of the infamous trial and conviction of Cardinal Mindszenty of Hungary by the leaders of communism. Cardinal Mindszenty still languishes in a dismal Communist prison—the protoype for the true Communist attitude toward religion. Since his imprisonment many thousands have joined the ranks of those victimized for this cause.

The most recent case that ranks with that of Cardinal Mindszenty is that of Cardinal Wyszysnki, of Poland. In many respects the two cardinals have parallel positions. Both were spiritual heads of the Catholic churches in their countries. Both were courageously outspoken in their devotion to the principles of their faith, and both were looked upon as sources of inspiration to their people in resisting the atheistic doctrines of communism.

The world has not forgotten Cardinal Mindszenty—nor have we forgotten the millions of others who suffer under the yoke of Communist tyranny. Perhaps this anniversary of the Cardinal's fake trial will serve to remind everyone of their great desire for freedom.

## ATTACKS ON OUR GOVERNMENT AND OUR CONSTITUTION

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. DAVIS] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, our Government and our Constitution are being subjected to many attacks. Some are made openly, some by stealth.

Those which are made openly can be recognized and resisted promptly and effectively. Undercover attempts to break down our form of government with its three separate and independent departments, under which our system of checks and balances is preserved, are more dangerous than direct and open attacks. Efforts to break down our system through disguised and stealthy attacks may remain undetected and unsuspected until irreparable harm has been done.

Our form of government with its three separate departments was the result of the wisdom and foresight of our country's founders. They knew that with the legislative powers vested in an independent Congress, neither the executive nor the judicial departments of the Government would ever be able to override the will of the people of this land. They knew that with the principles of our Government proclaimed in the Constitution and the Bill of Rights, and with that instrument itself providing that it can be amended only by a two-thirds vote of the House and Senate and a ratification of the amendment by the legislatures or conventions of three-fourths of the States in the Union, that the Constitution could only be legally amended when amendment was wanted by two-thirds of the Members of both Houses of Congress and by the people in three-fourths of the State of this Union. They knew that no pressure group or combination of pressure groups would be able to foist upon the people an unwanted amendment, and that when the organic law of the land was legally changed, it would truly express the will of the people.

The Constitution itself requires that United States Senators and Representatives, all members of the State legislatures, and all executive and judicial officers, both of the United States and the State governments, shall take an oath to support our Federal Constitution.

Throughout the years and the generations since 1776, we have been fortunate in having public officials who respected and observed their oath to support the Constitution of the United States. Throughout these years and generations our Government has stood firm, and our system of checks and balances has operated to prevent either department of Government, or a combination of any two of them, from usurping functions which do not properly belong to them.

Yet, in this present generation, there has developed an insidious movement to destroy this system of checks and balances.

I refer to a scheme which has been devised by the radicals and leftwingers of this country, both in the Government and out of it, spearheaded by such organizations as the Americans for Democratic Action, to ignore the provisions of the Constitution, to completely bypass Congress, to thwart the will of the people, who have made no move to set into motion the machinery for changing our Constitution. This scheme which these radicals and minority pressure groups have devised is one to amend the Constitution and change the laws by judicial legislation. Such a scheme can only be put into operation through bypassing Congress and through a usurpation of legislative functions by the judicial department.

I have previously called attention to this practice in speeches both on the floor of this House and elsewhere. On August 15, 1949, I pointed out that the Supreme Court was engaging in this practice. On June 18, 1953, I again called attention to this practice.

Not only has the judicial department of our Government, represented by the Supreme Court of the United States, engaged in this judicial legislation by usurpation of legislative functions, but the judicial department has now been joined by the executive department. The executive department began its collaboration with the judicial department in bypassing Congress when the Solicitor General of the United States, either as the express direction or through the connivance of the President, filed a brief as a "Friend of the Court" in the case of Henderson against Southern Railway Co., pending in the Supreme Court. This was a case in which Henderson sought a decision to change the existing law which was and had been for years to the effect that a railway company was not legally required to feed whites and blacks at the same table in a dining car. To effect this change in the law, which was a legislative function, and not a judicial one, required a construction of the Constitution which amounted to a constitutional amendment, inasmuch as the law, both constitutional and statutory, had been settled for years that no such requirement existed.

This approval of the executive department lent enough respectability to the radical groups who were joining Henderson in his far-fetched and absurd claim to give the Supreme Court all the impetus they needed to amend the Constitution and change the laws in that particular case. They had previously lifted themselves over the fence by their own bootstraps and engaged in judicial legislation in cases involving white Democratic Party primaries, admission of Negroes to white universities, and outlawing restrictive covenants in warranty deeds.

So in the Henderson case, a trial balloon was sent up by the executive and judicial departments to see how the people of the country would respond to this usurpation of legislative functions by a combination of the executive and judicial departments of our Government. Although this action was resented greatly, many people felt that this action possibly would end the usurpation of legislative powers, and because of an ingrained and deep-seated respect for the processes of Government and a strong disinclination to repudiate those who have been placed in official positions of authority, Congress and the people have permitted this usurpation of legislative functions up to this point.

Encouraged by these results, the radical groups and the executive department have spread themselves much further now, and we now find not the lowly Solicitor General, the smallest officer in the Justice Department, filing briefs as a "Friend of the Court" in behalf of these attempts to secure judicial legislation. We find in the cases now pending in the Supreme Court affecting the rights of States to operate their own public-school systems, the Attorney General himself, together with the Assistant Attorney General, a special assistant to the Attorney General, and six other attorneys in the Justice Department signing the briefs, and a note stating that two other attorneys in the Department of Justice also assisted in the historical research. We therefore find 11 lawyers in the Justice Department purporting to represent the people of the United States, in a 188-page printed brief, urging the Supreme Court to enact more judicial legislation and to further amend the Constitution by handing down a decision to the effect that the sovereign States of this Nation cannot, in the operation of their school systems, send white children to one school and Negro children to another, even though the facilities of each are equal.

It is an astounding thing that the Attorney General's office can assign 11 of its attorneys to any such task as this when in the same year that this was being done, Mr. Warren E. Burger, Assistant Attorney General, representing the Attorney General's office before the Appropriations Committee of the House of Representatives, was emphasizing their shortage of lawyers in the Department, and what it was costing the taxpayers of the country in dollars and cents because they were more than 5 years behind with their work. I quote the following testimony of Mr. Burger on March 2, 1953, when he was testifying before the Subcommittee on Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, on page 47 of that subcommittee's hearings:

> I am startled, if I may use a strong word, to find that there is a minimum of $475 million worth of caseload, business of this Department, more than 5 years old. How much more I do not know because I did not anticipate asking for a breakdown by years of more than 5 years. * * *
>
> We are, in round figures, I do not want to try to be exact, about 5 years behind in the work of that division, with the result that interest is running on a very, very large part of the claims against the Government in that section.
>
> I have had several people try to give me estimates as to how much interest the Government is losing. I will not present it as an estimate but as a reasonably informed guess that it is costing the Government upward or downward of $1 million in that one section of the civil division because of the lag in the workload. I think it is more than $1 million. That is my own judgment on it.

But, being more than 5 years behind in their work, having so many cases unattended to that it is costing the taxpayers in the opinion of Mr. Burger, more than $1 million a year because of this nonattention to business by the lawyers of that Department, the Attorney General nevertheless has enough lawyers to put 11 of them at work preparing and filing a 188-page brief in the Supreme Court in an unauthorized effort to speak for the people of the United States in an attempt to procure that Court to again bypass Congress, the States, and the people, and hand down another judicial legislation and Constitution-amending decision.

I am pressed for time, and this adds to my load of work, but I do not intend to sit silently by and see our Constitution ignored and our system of checks and balances destroyed through any such action without protesting such action as vigorously as I can.

Mr. FORRESTER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. I will be glad to yield to the distinguished gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. FORRESTER. The gentleman has a most enviable record in the State of Georgia, as one of the outstanding jurists that our State has produced. I want to congratulate the gentleman upon the logic of his discussion and upon his ability to correctly interpret the law. If the gentleman has time, I would like to pursue another matter with him at this time.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. I thank the gentleman very much for his remarks, and I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. FORRESTER. I want to ask the gentleman if he read the decision of the United States Supreme Court to the effect that a grantor in a deed to real property has no right of action for damages or court relief arising by reason of the grantee's conveying that property to persons of other races, although the property was deeded with a covenant that grantee would not deed said property to persons of certain races? Did the gentleman read that decision?

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. I have not read it in full; I have read reports on it, and I have asked that the reference be furnished to me at my office so I may read it in full.

Mr. FORRESTER. The reasoning of the court in that case, I may say to the gentleman, was that such restrictions might injure some unidentified person at some time in the distant future. I want to ask the gentleman: Does not that theory and that reasoning violate every rule of law?

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. I thoroughly agree with the gentleman in the conclusion which he has reached about that provision.

Mr. FORRESTER. Does not that decision in effect amount to confiscation of the grantor's property? For instance, the grantor might own 10 city lots. By observance of that covenant the value of the property would remain high and maybe advance, but willful violation of the covenant by the grantee, which was part of the consideration of the deed, destroyed the value of the balance of the property owned by the grantor.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. That is certainly the effect of it.

Mr. FORRESTER. Has not the gentleman seen that in action right here in the District of Columbia?

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. I would say to the gentleman that I have seen here in the District of Columbia many blocks of property formerly occupied by white people exclusively that when submitted to what is referred to as the blockbusting technique, that is, one Negro family would move into a block, immediately all the other residents of the block began a pell-mell effort to sell out and move and go to some other section where they are not subjected to that practice. That means that the property owners here in the District of Columbia and elsewhere have to sacrifice property values and lose dollars and cents rightfully theirs because of this very Supreme Court decision.

Mr. FORRESTER. In other words, it is nothing less than a deliberate confiscation of property.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Certainly it is; and I want to say to the gentleman also in that connection that I saw an article in the Washington papers 2 or 3 days ago to the effect that a statement has been issued by the authority in charge of public housing here in the District of Columbia that they had tried out a system of integration in certain public-housing projects and had found that it worked all right, that no incidents resulted from it. Let me say in this connection that in the first place these unfortunate people are low-income people who must by reason of necessity live in these housing projects. They represent only a small percentage of the people of the District of Columbia. They are there because they have to be through force of circumstances.

They know that if they create an incident, they will be put out; they, therefore, do not dare to protest any action of those in authority, whatever it may be. The mere fact that they have moved some Negro families into those low-income housing projects and the white occupants have not moved out, is in no sense of the word indicative of what the attitude of the people generally in the District of Columbia is with reference to moving Negroes into white sections. If you want to find what the real sentiment is among people who are at liberty to act for themselves, look at some of these blocks where the property owners live in the houses. What happens to them when some Negro family moves in—a blockbuster? They sell out and move.

Mr. FORRESTER. I would like to ask the gentleman another question, pursu-

ing this decision I was talking about a little further. Has the gentleman in all of his life, either as a lawyer or a judge, ever read of any decision prior to the decision of the United States Supreme Court which held that a grantor in a deed could not recover damages from the particular grantee although the grantee might be allowed to convey that property and that the person buying from that grantee would not be liable? In other words, this is a complete confiscation of property and a property owner is entitled to have his property protected.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. I have read, and the gentleman has, too, of cases where a contract was entered into for illegal purposes, such as to operate a bawdy house, or the owner of a bawdy house had purchased furniture and the seller could not recover the price of it because it was to be used in a criminal enterprise; but so far as a contract that was entered into, not violative of any criminal provision of the laws of the land, I recall no such decision at the moment as the gentleman has referred to.

Mr. FORRESTER. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. I have listened with a great deal of interest to what the gentleman has had to say. In my opinion his speech was merely an expression or a restatement of what I consider to be basic fundamental American philosophy. In another week or so we will observe our annual custom of having Washington's Farewell Address read to us herein the House of Representatives. If we listen close enough we will find that George Washington in his Farewell Address recognized the fact that at some time in the future the Constitution would be under an indirect attack when he admonished the people that if the Constitution be wrong in any respect, he said let it be corrected in the manner provided in the Constitution.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. That is the only way it legally can be corrected.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. In the form of an amendment and letting the people pass upon it. There are those, I am sure, who will argue that because of changing times there should be changes in the interpretation of the Constitution. With that I entirely disagree because I agree with Washington that if we are to change the Constitution let us not change the Constitution, nor should we change the law, by judicial interpretation or judicial legislation, as the gentleman has pointed out. What the gentleman has said will be but a voice crying in the wilderness, but I want to repeat, it is basic, it is fundamental, even though it may be drowned amid the clamor of highly organized and heavily financed pressure groups who have no regard whatsoever for our triparty system of Government or for the Constitution upon which it is based.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. I thank the gentleman very much for his contribution. Whenever the time comes, and from actions recently in evidence it appears to be very close by, that our Constitution can be changed in any manner other than that which the Constitution itself provides, then our Government, which has been strong and which has been a bulwark of freedom, liberty, and opportunity through the ages and generations, will very likely fall down around our ears. Of course, the radical groups and the minority pressure groups and their followers are responsible now for these attempts to bypass Congress; but any illegal change in the organic law of the land is dangerous not only to those against whose interest it takes place at the time but to every person in this country.

While now those who favor these policies and principles on which these usurpations of legislative functions are based, there may come a time when the court will be packed with persons of a different philosophy and then those who promote and welcome and embrace these things now will find that they have done so to their own great injury.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. When the integrity of any one of our branches of Government is destroyed, our Government will fall down amid the rubble. What the Justice Department is asking the Supreme Court to do—and incidentally, it is the same thing they asked them to do in the Henderson case—they are asking the Supreme Court to rule not on the law as the law is written but on the law as they think it should have been written.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. That is correct.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. In my opinion that is very dangerous, and if the law is not right, let us change the law in the legal manner.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. That is the only safe thing to do.

Mr. Speaker, I am going to make more speeches spotlighting these activities, and I shall continue to point out that amendment of the laws is a function which belongs to the legislative department, and that amendment of the Constitution is a function which belongs to the Congress, the States, and the people.

## POLITICAL BLUNDER AGAINST CIVIL SERVICE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentlemen from Indiana [Mr. MADDEN] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, Postmaster General Arthur E. Summerfield last week expanded the Republican politicians' policy of sabotaging civil-service protection to Federal employees when he ordered the dismissal of Postmaster James Neugebauer, of Gary, Ind. This, to my knowledge, is the first official notice that Indiana postmasters are to be the next victims of the Republican program to circumvent and nullify the Federal law extending protection and security to Federal employees.

Political leaders in the new Republican administration have been laying the groundwork for almost a year with disgruntled employees in various post offices to undermine incumbent postmasters so the appointment of postmasters throughout the United States be relegated into the maelstrom of partisan politics. Had the vast majority of postmasters throughout the country realized that the new Republican administration in the Post Office Department would be a party to circumvent the civil-service law, they would have resigned January 20, 1953, and be content with the knowledge that the postmasterships were once again under the club of the political spoils system. Had the Postmaster General informed all incumbent postmasters of this fact, the sabotage and brainwashing which a great number of incumbent postmasters have submitted to in the last 8 months could have been avoided. This campaign of harassment against postmasters by certain employees in the Inspection Department has been a well-organized political conspiracy to force incumbent postmasters to resign. If the postmaster fails to resign, a foundation would then be laid for the filing of phony charges in order to create a vacancy for Republican politicians.

I hold no brief for the few who have been discharged by reason of malicious misfeasance and malfeasance in office. Officials of this type have been dismissed under both Republican and Democratic national administrations and these dismissals have been accomplished in conformity with civil-service regulations.

The case of the discharging of Postmaster Neugebauer, at Gary, Ind., is a malicious, intentional and unlawful circumvention of the civil-service law as set out by Public Law 720, passed in the 75th Congress. James Neugebauer was appointed postmaster October 1, 1950, from the ranks of the postal service. He started in as substitute carrier in 1935 and, through diligence and application, made an outstanding record as a postal employee for almost 20 years, with the exception of the time he served in the Armed Forces during World War II. At the time of his appointment, he received the endorsement of dozens of prominent businessmen and postal patrons in the city of Gary. He also received the endorsement of veterans and labor organizations. Since being postmaster, he has received the following ratings from the Inspection Service of the Post Office Department: In 1950, his rating was 94.5. There was no inspection rating given out in 1951. In March 1952 he received a rating of 91.5, and in 1953 he received a rating of 94.5. In the year 1949, before Mr. Neugebauer became postmaster, the office showed a loss of $100,633.69. In 1953, the Gary post office showed a gain of $89,511.00. Today the postal patrons of the city of Gary, including big business, small business, groups, individuals, Republicans and Democrats generally, comment with high praise on the outstanding postal service which Postmaster Neugebauer has installed. The Chicago Tribune, of Friday, February 5, 1954, on page 5, in commenting on Neugebauer's ouster, stated the following:

It was reported in Gary that Neugebauer instituted many reforms and improvements in mail service, and incurred the dislike of some employees because of crackdowns on loafing and excessive sick leaves. Last

month Neugebauer received a congratulatory telegram from Postmaster General Summerfield which said delivery of mail last Christmas in Gary had been better than in years.

All the above improvements of service have been accomplished by Neugebauer in spite of the fact that three or four politically minded, disgruntled employees in the Gary post office have been harassing and attempting to undermine the postal service in order to hinder progress and discredit the postmaster.

I am confident that it will be proven to the satisfaction of the Civil Service Commission that this small group has been working in conjunction with Republican politicians in an effort to oust Neugebauer. Postmaster Neugebauer informs me that if the Civil Service Commission fails to uphold him on his appeal, he will take advantage of his veterans preference rights given under Public Law 720 and ask that the Federal courts not only protect him but also decide whether the veterans' civil-service law can be nullified and circumvented by patronage-seeking politicians.

Congressman HALLECK, our distinguished majority leader, was quoted in the newspapers and over the air yesterday, in a speech which he delivered before the Republican National Committee on Saturday, as follows, and I quote from the February 7, 1954, edition of the Washington Post:

He called for congressional legislation firing all present postmasters, most of whom he said, were appointed under civil service by the preceding Democratic administrations. "I'll vote for a bill to throw them all out," HALLECK said, adding: "They were blanketed in. It's a phony civil service."

I wish to commend my good friend and colleague from Indiana for being frank and advocating the repeal of the civil-service law as the only legitimate and legal way to secure Republican postmaster appointments throughout the Nation. If the majority leader would file his repeal bill and follow through, it would save incumbent postmasters the humiliation and disgrace of the brainwashing and harassment that they have been subjected to during the last year. If Congressman HALLECK's repeal of civil service would be enacted into law, every incumbent postmaster in the country no doubt would resign in 24 hours.

I find that this brutal purging of postmasters for political advantage is not an occurrence peculiar to Gary. Two Democratic Senators—SPARKMAN and MONRONEY—have reported publicly that this same pattern is followed elsewhere—a pattern of postal inspectors sent in to hunt for pretexts for bringing charges against Democrats.

As an example: The Department's Inspection Office located in Chattanooga, Tenn., was requested to investigate the postmaster at Sylacauga, Ala. An inspector of Republican faith was sent to Sylacauga to conduct this investigation. After weeks of inspection, this inspector finally recommended that the incumbent postmaster at Sylacauga be commended for doing such a splendid job. When this report was received in Washington, a letter was immediately fired back to the Inspection Office at Chattanooga that a reinvestigation be started immediately because "this postmaster owns one-half interest in the local newspaper and during the presidential campaign of 1952 this newspaper wrote an editorial mildly in the support of the Stevenson-Sparkman ticket." The Inspection Office was told specifically to choose an inspector for this second inspection whose ideas coincided with those of the new Washington team.

In the little town of Elkhart, Ind., the Republicans fired the postmaster for suggesting publicly that Mr. Summerfield's background as automobile dealer and political boss of the GOP were not ideal qualifications for this new post. This, incidentally, is not the only case of thought control by the new Post Office administration. Recently they impounded the mail of a poor old Oklahoma cowboy who was sending out postcards which intimated that Secretary Benson's farm program was not bringing perfect results to cattle raisers.

We hear of other peculiar things in the Post Office Department. An inspector tells a postmaster "We're going to file charges against you. We don't know what they are now, but we will before we leave." A postal inspector charges a postmaster with hiring a secretary in violation of civil-service rules. The secretary is the needy widow of a postal inspector and the inspector who filed the charges is the same one who asked the postmaster to hire the widow.

The evidence of fake charges, cheap political trickery, to obtain Republican patronage in the Post Office Department is widespread, but I believe it is the duty of Democrats to rise above politics on this issue and do all we can to save the Republicans from their own greed for patronage. If we can keep the efficient people in the Post Office Department and keep politics out, it will be unnecessary to pass Postmaster General Summerfield's bill to increase letter postage to 4 cents. Having great faith in the Civil Service Commission and our Federal court system, I am confident that the postal patrons of Gary, Ind., will enjoy the present, efficient postal service under the executive leadership of Postmaster James Neugebauer for a long time in the future.

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. O'NEILL. I do not know whether the gentleman from Indiana realizes it or not, but the Post Office Department has already made ready the guillotine by either dismissing or the bringing up of charges and suspending 152 postmasters or postmistresses throughout the country up to this date. We have had two interesting experiences in New England. One of them is the postmistress in the town of Agawam, a Mrs. Brady, who is a widow. Her husband had been a veteran. She is also a gold-star mother, and had a daughter in the service.

They have brought up these trumped-up, phony charges about which the gentleman has been talking against Mrs. Brady. The people of the town, which is a strongly Republican town, all came to her help. As a matter of fact, they had a mass meeting. Last Thursday night the leaders of the town organized and had a banquet in her honor, and over 300 people attended the banquet.

Those who live by the sword will die by the sword. This administration fired the postmaster of the city of New Haven, Conn., and for the first time in many, many years a Democrat was elected mayor of the city of New Haven. This retribution will show in the end. The people just will not stand for it. I do not want the gentleman from Gary, Ind., to think he is alone in this problem. This is a nationwide problem.

Mr. MADDEN. I thank the gentleman.

## EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. WOLVERTON.

Mr. JENKINS in two instances.

Mr. FOGARTY.

Mr. KEATING.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri (at the request of Mr. SADLAK).

Mr. HOPE.

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON (at the request of Mr. MCGREGOR).

Mr. SIEMINSKI.

## ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 40 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, February 9, 1954, at 12 o'clock noon.

## EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1241. A letter from the Assistant to the Chairman, Commission on Foreign Economic Policy, transmitting a minority report submitted by Representatives DANIEL A. REED and RICHARD M. SIMPSON, pursuant to Public Law 215, 83d Congress, approved August 7, 1953 (67 Stat. 472) (H. Doc. No. 290, pt. 11); to the Committee on Ways and Means and ordered to be printed.

1242. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting the report on cooperation of the United States with Mexico in the control and eradication of foot-and-mouth disease for the month of December 1953, pursuant to Public Law 8, 80th Congress; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1243. A letter from the Chairman, District of Columbia Armory Board, transmitting the Sixth Annual Report of the District of Columbia Armory Board, pursuant to section 10, Public Law No. 605, an act of June 4, 1948; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1244. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Navy, transmitting the Department of the Navy's fifth annual report on the disposal of Navy excess property in foreign areas, pursuant to section 404 (d) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, (40 U. S. C. 514 (d)); to the Committee on Government Operations.

1245. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a report on withdrawals and restorations of public lands in certain cases, pursuant to an act approved June 25, 1910 (36 Stat. 847, 16 U. S. C., sec.

471, 43 U. S. C., sec. 141, et seq.); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1246. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a proposed award of a concession permit to Mr. E. G. Wellman which will, when approved by the regional director, region 2, National Park Service, authorize him to operate a saddle horse concession within Glacier National Park, Mont., for a period of 1 year from January 1, 1954, pursuant to the act of July 31, 1953 (67 Stat. 271); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1247. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a detailed list of the lands exchanged for the patenting to States, counties, and municipalities of lands classified chiefly valuable for recreational purposes in exchange for lands of equal value or equal quantity, pursuant to the act of June 14, 1926 (44 Stat. 741, 43 U. S. C. sec. 869); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1248. A letter from the Chairman, Securities and Exchange Commission, transmitting the 19th Annual Report of the Securities and Exchange Commission for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1953, pursuant to section 23 (b) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, approved June 6, 1934, etc.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1249. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting the report of the activities of war-risk insurance and certain marine and liability insurance for the American public for the period as of December 31, 1953, pursuant to section 1211 of Public Law 763, 81st Congress; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

1250. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated October 14, 1953, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers on a review of reports on the Illinois and Mississippi Canal, Ill., and also to review prior reports on the Rock River, Ill., and Wis., particularly as regards the advisability of improvements in the interest of navigation above Sterling, Ill., requested by a resolution of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, House of Representatives, adopted on April 24, 1945; to the Committee on Public Works.

1251. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated December 8, 1953, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a preliminary examination and survey of Wilmette Harbor, Ill., authorized by the River and Harbor Act approved August 30, 1935; to the Committee on Public Works.

## REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN: Committee of conference. House Joint Resolution 358. Joint resolution to discharge indebtedness of the Commodity Credit Corporation (Rept. No. 1184). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. GROSS: Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. H. R. 7554. A bill to provide for compensation of certain employees on days when departments or establishments of the Government are closed by administrative order; with amendment (Rept. No. 1185). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H. R. 4984. A bill to remove certain limitations upon the purposes for which the city of Miles City, Mont., may use certain land heretofore conveyed to it by the United States; with amendment (Rept. No. 1187). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H. R. 5620. A bill to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Interior to correct an incomplete and faulty survey in township 8 north, range 53 west, of the sixth principal meridian in Colorado, and to issue patents describing any new areas included in lots 1, 2, 3, and 4 in sections 1 through 6, township 8 north, range 53 west of the sixth principal meridian in Colorado; with amendment (Rept. No. 1188). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H. R. 6251. A bill to authorize the abolishment of the Shoshone Cavern National Monument and the transfer of the land therein to the city of Cody, Wyo., for public recreational use, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1189). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. VAN ZANDT: Committee on Armed Services. H. R. 4231. A bill to authorize appointments to the United States Military Academy and United States Naval Academy of sons of certain individuals who were killed in action or who died or shall die as a result of active service in World War I, World War II, or between the period beginning June 27, 1950, and ending on a date proclaimed by the President or the Congress; with amendment (Rept. No. 1190). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. JOHNSON of California: Committee on Armed Services. H. R. 459. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to prohibit the unauthorized wearing, manufacture, or sale of medals and badges awarded by the War Department," as amended; with amendment (Rept. No. 1191). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. VELDE: Committee on Un-American Activities. Annual report of the Committee on Un-American Activities pursuant to House Resolution 5, 83d Congress; without amendment (Rept. No. 1192). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan: Committee on Government Operations. H. R. 6290. A bill to discontinue certain reports now required by law; with amendment (Rept. No. 1193). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan: Committee on Government Operations. House Joint Resolution 300. Joint resolution to provide for the conveyance to the Texas Hill Country Development Foundation of certain surplus land situated in Kerr County, Tex.; without amendment (Rept. No. 1194). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE: Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. H. R. 7371. A bill to provide for the disposal of paid postal-savings certificates; with amendment (Rept. No. 1195). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

## REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Miss THOMPSON of Michigan: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 962. A bill for the relief of Gabrielle Staub; with amendments (Rept. No. 1179). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Miss THOMPSON of Michigan: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2441. A bill for the relief of Husnu Ataullah Berker; without amendment (Rept. No. 1180). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 3961. A bill for the relief of Margherita Di Meo; without amendment (Rept. No. 1181). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. HYDE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 4738. A bill for the relief of Gabriel Hittrich; without amendment (Rept. No. 1182). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. REED of Illinois: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 5085. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Marie Teherepnin; without amendment (Rept. No. 1183). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H. R. 1705. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Jesse Bell; with amendment (Rept. No. 1186). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

## PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ALLEN of California:

H. R. 7763. A bill to amend certain sections of chapter 21 of the Internal Revenue Code, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ANGELL:

H. R. 7764. A bill to provide that the United States shall aid the States in wildlife-restoration projects, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. BAILEY:

H. R. 7765. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to eliminate the requirement that a widow once entitled to a current insurance annuity must have a child of the deceased employee who is under the age of 18 in order to remain entitled to such annuity; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BOLLING:

H. R. 7766. A bill to establish an effective program for the planning and construction of needed public works and to create the Office of Public Facilities Administrator; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 7767. A bill to safeguard the health, efficiency, and morale of the American people; to provide for improved nutrition through a more effective distribution of food supplies through a food-allotment program; to assist in maintaining fair prices and incomes to farmers by providing adequate outlets for agricultural products; to prevent burdening and obstructing channels of interstate commerce; to promote the full use of agricultural resources, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BUDGE:

H. R. 7768. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to include in the definition of "agriculture" the maintenance and operation of ditches, canals, reservoirs, and waterways when maintained and operated for farming purposes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. DOLLIVER:

H. R. 7769. A bill to provide for apprentice or other training on the job in agricultural occupations; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 7770. A bill to provide institutional on-farm training for the veteran who performs part of his course as the employee of another; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 7771. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code to reduce from 3 years to 6 months the period of limitation upon the

assessment of estate taxes and upon proceedings in court for the collection of such taxes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. EDMONDSON:

H. R. 7772. A bill relative to restrictions applicable to Indians of the Five Civilized Tribes of Oklahoma; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN:

H. R. 7773. A bill to increase the amount of articles acquired abroad by residents of the United States which may be brought into the country without payment of duty; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HAGEN of Minnesota:

H. R. 7774. A bill to establish a uniform system for the granting of incentive awards to officers and employees of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HOPE:

H. R. 7775. A bill to provide for the development of a sound and profitable domestic wool industry under our national policy of expanding world trade; to encourage increased domestic production of wool for our national security; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 7776. A bill to provide for the appointment of a district judge for the district of Kansas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. IKARD:

H. R. 7777. A bill to increase from $600 to $800 the income-tax exemptions allowed for a taxpayer, his spouse, and his dependents, and the additional exemptions allowed for old age and blindness; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KING of California:

H. R. 7778. A bill to rescind the order of the Postmaster General curtailing certain postal services; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. KING of Pennsylvania:

H. R. 7779. A bill to amend section 422 (b) of the Internal Revenue Code; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LESINSKI:

H. R. 7780. A bill to include all types of compensation paid to officers and employees of the Federal Government by the Federal Government within the scope of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 7781. A bill to grant longevity pay-step increases to Federal employees on an equal basis upon the completion by them of 10, 13, and 16 years of service, respectively; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. LIPSCOMB:

H. R. 7782. A bill to provide for payments by the Federal Government to States or local taxing units adversely affected by Federal acquisition, ownership, or use of defense production facilities, to provide for the taxation of certain Federal properties, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MOULDER:

H. R. 7783. A bill to provide equal pension or compensation benefits to all veterans disabled in the military service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 7784. A bill to extend to the veterans of the Mexican Border Service of 1916 and 1917 and their widows and minor children all the provisions, privileges, rights, and benefits of laws enacted for the benefit of veterans of World War I; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. REES of Kansas:

H. R. 7785. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, to make permanent the increases in regular annuities provided by the act of July 16, 1952, and to extend such increases to additional annuities purchased by voluntary contributions; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 7786. A bill to honor veterans on the 11th day of November of each year, a day dedicated to world peace; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 7787. A bill to provide for the payment of annuities to certain former employees of the Government; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. SHORT:

H. R. 7788. A bill to provide that the enlistment contracts or periods of obligated service of members of the Armed Forces shall not terminate by reason of appointment as cadets at the United States Military Academy or as midshipmen at the United States Naval Academy or as midshipmen in the Naval Reserve or as cadets at the United States Coast Guard Academy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. SIMPSON of Illinois:

H. R. 7789. A bill providing for the development of a highway and appurtenances thereto, traversing the Mississippi Valley; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. SMITH of Mississippi:

H. R. 7790. A bill to provide for the establishment of a policy of placing certain contracts in States having the lowest per capita income; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. TOLLEFSON (by request):

H. R. 7791. A bill to amend section 4153 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H. R. 7792. A bill to amend section 490 of title 14, United States Code, entitled "Coast Guard," and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. WESTLAND:

H. R. 7793. A bill to authorize the improvement of Anacortes Harbor, Wash.; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 7794. A bill to authorize the improvement of Neah Bay Harbor, Wash.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. WOLVERTON (by request):

H. R. 7795. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 in regard to protests of grants of instruments of authorization without hearing; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. OAKMAN:

H. J. Res. 371. Joint resolution amending the joint resolution of June 22, 1942, with respect to the pledge of allegiance to the flag; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania:

H. Res. 434. Resolution requesting the President of the United States to furnish to the House of Representatives certain information with respect to the discharge of Federal officers and employees for security reasons during the past year; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. Res. 435. Resolution directing the chairman of the United States Civil Service Commission to furnish to the House of Representatives certain information with respect to the discharge of Federal officers and employees for security reasons during the past year; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. Res. 436. Resolution directing the Attorney General of the United States to furnish to the House of Representatives certain information with respect to the discharge of Federal officers and employees for security reasons during the past year; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

## MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By Mr. GOODWIN: Resolutions of the Massachusetts Legislature urging the Congress of the United States to investigate fully the unjust annexation of Lithuania by the Soviet Union, and the atrocities committed therein by the Communist leaders; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Massachusetts Legislature to the Congress of the United States in favor of the passage of legislation granting aid to the Israeli Government; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, resolutions of the Massachusetts Legislature relative to a study and revision of the Taft-Hartley law; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

Also, resolutions of the Massachusetts Legislature memorializing the Congress of the United States relative to certain legislation seeking Federal financial aid for flood control and pollution abatement; to the Committee on Public Works.

Also, memorial of the Massachusetts Legislature to the Congress of the United States against granting concessions on textile imports from foreign countries; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the Massachusetts Legislature to Congress to remove that part of the social-security law limiting the earnings of a recipient of benefits; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HESELTON: Resolutions of the General Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts relative to a study and revision of Taft-Hartley law; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

Also, resolutions of the General Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts memorializing the Congress of the United States in favor of the passage of legislation granting aid to the Israeli Government; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, resolutions of the General Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, memorializing the Congress of the United States relative to certain legislation seeking Federal financial aid for flood control and pollution abatement; to the Committee on Public Works.

Also, resolutions of the General Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts memorializing the Congress of the United States against granting concessions on textile imports from foreign countries; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Colorado, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to deed the title to all the area of Fort Logan, except that area now used as a national cemetery, to the State of Colorado, together with all appurtenances thereto; to the Committee on Armed Services.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Kentucky, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to continue to maintain and operate locks on the Kentucky River; to the Committee on Public Works.

## PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BAILEY:

H. R. 7796. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Elsa Danes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. CHURCH:

H. R. 7797. A bill for the relief of Hans Horn; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska:

H. R. 7798. A bill for the relief of Vera Maria Luise Bitterlich; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DAVIS of Georgia:

H. R. 7799. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Norman Rowe; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DONOHUE:

H. R. 7800. A bill for the relief of Adrian Van Leeuwen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 7801. A bill for the relief of Adrian Van Leeuwen; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. GROSS:

H. R. 7802. A bill for the relief of Hanna Werner and her child, Hanna Elizabeth Werner; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HINSHAW:

H. R. 7803. A bill for the relief of Hector Mokhtarian; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MULTER:

H. R. 7804. A bill for the relief of Renee Hamwee, Charles Hamwee, Sheila Hamwee, and Lillian Hamwee; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 7805. A bill for the relief of Esther Tawil, Isaac Tawil, Jaqueline Tawil, Kathy Tawil, Solomon Tawil, and Sarina Goldman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PELLY:

H. R. 7806. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Bertha Bider; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROONEY:

H. R. 7807. A bill for the relief of Heinz Gerhard Rolappe; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCUDDER:

H. R. 7808. A bill for the relief of Claudio Rodriguez (Puente); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. YOUNGER:

H. R. 7809. A bill for the relief of Julian S. Lizardo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

## PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

499. By the SPEAKER: Petition of President Consejo Puertoriqueno de Partidarios de la Paz, San Juan, P. R., protesting the dispatch of United States troops to countries near and bordering on Guatemala, which likewise constitutes a grave threat to the peace of the continent; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

500. Also, petition of the secretary, Scioto County Democratic Central-Executive Committee, Portsmouth, Ohio, requesting enactment of legislation for an increase in the compensation of postal employees commensurate with the cost-of-living level; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

501. Also, petition of the clerk, Board of Supervisors of the County of Delaware, N. Y., opposing the proposed flood-control dam, Charlotte River, town of Davenport, N. Y.; to the Committee on Public Works.

502. Also, petition of the secretary, Medford Central Labor Council, Medford, Oreg., requesting that they be placed on record as in favor of personal income taxes being levied on income, regardless of source, and being opposed to any special exemption on income derived from dividends; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

# EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

## The Late Ernest Harold Cluett

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
**HON. DEAN P. TAYLOR**
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Monday, February 8, 1954*

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, the House will be saddened to learn of the death of Ernest Harold Cluett, late a Representative of Congress from New York.

Mr. Cluett was born in Troy, N. Y., on July 13, 1874. He was elected to the 75th, 76th, and 77th Congresses.

There are Members who are present today who served with him during those terms, and I am sure that they will remember him as a man of high principles and an able servant to those whom he represented in the Congress.

Mr. Cluett's life was a full one. He was a graduate of Williams College and later studied at Oxford University in England. Early in his career he became treasurer of Cluett, Peabody & Co. and in later years became chairman of the board of directors of that company.

During World War I he became head of the employment division of the Government arsenal at Watervliet, N. Y., and in 1918 he served on a special mission to France for the YMCA.

The Republican Party of New York State nominated him as its candidate for the United States Senate in 1934.

At the end of his term in the 77th Congress he retired from public life.

The people of my community will remember Mr. Cluett as one who devoted himself unsparingly to the welfare of the community.

It was my good fortune to have known Mr. Cluett intimately, and my respect and esteem for him was boundless.

I extend to the members of his family my deep and sincere sympathy in the great loss they have sustained and in their hour of bereavement. I hope they will find some comfort in the knowledge that his passing is mourned by a host of friends.

## Anniversary of Cardinal Mindszenty Sentencing Reminds Us That All Freedoms Are in Jeopardy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
**HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON**
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Monday, February 8, 1954*

Mrs. FRANCIS P. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, we in America must remind ourselves constantly of the pattern of aggression taken by the Communist conspiracy all over the world. Just as individual Communists are guided by a tight formula of behavior toward the end of dominating the world, so are individual acts of international communism not separate moves but part of an overall pattern to stamp out all opposition.

The menace of communism was emphasized by the brutality of its attacks on the Roman Catholic Church. But it was not just freedom of religion in Communist nations that perished. With it went freedom of the press, freedom of assembly, freedom of petition and freedom of speech. Only last week the Red-dominated government of Guatemala gave us a graphic example of that pattern. Besides expelling two American newsmen, it ousted a Franciscan missionary, the Reverend Sebastian Buccellato.

Thus, Mr. Speaker, today, the fifth anniversary of the life imprisonment of Cardinal Mindszenty, the Primate of the Roman Catholic Church in Hungary, we shall do well to review the pattern of events and remember that with the advance of the Red tide, all human freedoms are in jeopardy.

In 1948 when the Communists of Hungary had consolidated their position, and had virtually eliminated all political, economic and social groups opposed to them, they moved into another arena—the ideological and spiritual sphere. They hoped that their success in this arena would crown their firm hold over the populace of Hungary. In this phase of their struggle for supremacy, godless Communists were face to face with a devout people. And the Catholic people, always guided in the ways of God by their devoted and dauntless leaders, were no easy prey to Communist blandishments and brutalities. The clergy as well as the people were subjected to all sorts of cruelties; their freedom of movement was restricted; their activities were brought under surveillance and rigidly circumscribed; the religious press was muzzled, and freedom of speech became a thing of the past. Parochial schools were taken over by the Government and their properties were confiscated. Religious publications were banned, and many courageous clergymen were imprisoned or liquidated.

During all this time the Primate of the Roman Catholic Church in Hungary was displaying indomitable courage in condemning all these moves made by civil authorities. In his sermons he was exposing the villainy and brutality of the secret police. His was a defiant voice, and the Government sought ways of silencing him. Finally, on the night of December 26, 1948, 16 secret agents of the Government surrounded his official residence, arrested him on charges of antistate activity, and led him to prison. A few days later when the news of this startling event was revealed to the outside world, peoples in western democracies were stunned. Protest meetings were held in many countries condemning this arbitrary act of the Hungarian Government; our Acting Secretary of State Robert Lovett branded this act as a "sickening sham." These protests and condemnations, however, did not save the cardinal from prison. On February 3 of the following year he was tried and accused of espionage, treason, and black-market activities. It was reported officially that the cardinal admitted the charges and confessed his guilt.

On February 4, 1949, Great Britain and the United States officially protested to the Hungarian Government because representatives from their Governments

were not allowed to be present at the trial proceedings.

The appearance of the cardinal at various stages of the trial indicated quite conclusively that he had been "brainwashed." The result was a confession by the cardinal.

On February 8, 1949—5 years ago today—Cardinal Mindszenty was found guilty of treason, espionage, and currency offenses and he was sentenced to life imprisonment.

Since that fateful day, this humble servant of the church, this stanch champion of human freedom, has carried on his fight against tyranny and brute force from his prison in some unknown corner in Hungary. On this day, marking the fifth year of his life imprisonment, we pay tribute to him for his courageous defiance of evil forces and for his championing supreme ideals.

Last week President Eisenhower, in a letter to the United Catholic Organization for the Freeing of Cardinal Mindszenty, stated:

> We in the free world have not forgotten this is the fifth anniversary of Cardinal Mindszenty's trial and imprisonment. * * * The unjust nature of the proceedings against Cardinal Mindszenty is, of course, well known to the American people. They regarded the attack upon him as a blow against religious freedom in Hungary and an unprincipled attempt to destroy spiritual and moral influences in that country.

## Development of Atomic Energy for Public and Commercial Purposes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. THOMAS A. JENKINS
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, February 8, 1954*

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, the development of information concerning atomic energy has been one of the most interesting epochs of modern times. Until a few months ago we looked upon atomic energy only as something that might be used in war with great destructibility. But we are now coming to realize the great possibilities of atomic energy in the field of domestic usefulness.

Probably no part of the United States has come to appreciate these great atomic energy developments any more than that part of the country that I have the honor to repreesnt in the Congress of the United States. Several months ago the Atomic Energy Commission, which by Federal law is directly under the control of the Congress of the United States, entered upon a tremendous atomic energy construction program in southern Ohio. This program is now well on its way, and is considered as one of the most wonderful programs of our time. The initial building program will cost the Government about $1,200,000,000. There will be several kindred programs that will operate with the main project, and these will also cost many millions, most of which will be furnished by private capital.

Fifteen power-producing companies have joined their finances together and are building two of the largest electric power plants in the country. The total production of these two plants is to be consumed by the atomic-energy plant to which I have referred.

Now that the Government has proved that atomic energy can be produced, the Congress and the Joint Congressional Committee on Atomic Energy, of which I am a member, are looking forward to the time when atomic energy will be produced and used for domestic purposes. Automobiles no doubt will be operated by atomic energy. Homes no doubt will be heated by atomic energy. In order that this phase of atomic energy might have a fair chance to develop the Atomic Energy Commission and the Congress are planning to encourage private industry to enter the field of production and distribution. The Commission has invited those private industries that are equipped to enter this field to present the Commission with plans as to what they are able and willing to do toward the furthering of this great program to make atomic energy useful. It is understood that already several of these groups are prepared to submit their plans and the Commission will soon be ready to consider them.

It is the belief that as soon as these plans are approved a plant will be constructed somewhere in close proximity to the present atomic-energy plants. The people of southern Ohio have been advancing the advantages offered by our own section. We feel that the wonderful showing made in the construction of the mammoth atomic-energy plant, and the two great electric power plants in southern Ohio will convince the Atomic Energy Commission that southern Ohio will be the ideal place for this new plant that will make atomic energy useful for domestic purposes. There are a number of desirable locations that can be secured in the district which I have the honor to represent.

## Federal Communications Commission Requests Amendment of Communications Act With Regard to Protest Rule

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. CHARLES A. WOLVERTON
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, February 8, 1954*

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced today a bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 in regard to protests of grants of instruments of authorization without hearing. Enactment of this legislation has been requested by the Federal Communications Commission. The reasons for the Commission's request are set forth in a letter which the Commission addressed on January 22, 1954, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives. In order to give the Members of the House of Representatives and all other interested persons an opportunity to study the Commission's arguments in favor of the proposed amendment, the letter of the Commission is set forth here in full:

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION,
*Washington, D. C., January 22, 1954.*

Hon. JOSEPH W. MARTIN, Jr.,
*Speaker, House of Representatives,*
*Washington, D. C.*

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: The Commission wishes to recommend for the consideration of the Congress a proposed amendment to section 309 (c) of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended. A proposed bill is attached as an appendix to this letter. The objective of the proposed legislation is to clarify the so-called protest rule contained in section 309 (c) which was incorporated into the Communications Act by the Communications Act Amendments, 1952 (66 Stat. 711), so as to obviate the use of the new procedure as a device for delaying radio station grants which are in the public interest while at the same time retaining the rule's primary objective of providing interested parties with a means by which they may bring to the Commission's attention bona fide questions concerning grants made without hearing.

Section 309 (c) provides that all authorizations granted without a hearing shall remain subject to protest by any party in interest for a 30-day period. The protest must show that the protestant is a party in interest and must specify with particularity the facts relied on to sustain the protest. Within 15 days from the date of filing of a protest, the Commission must determine whether the protest meets these requirements. If the Commission so finds, the application involved must be set for hearing on the issues specified in the protest as well as such additional issues as the Commission may prescribe. The protestant has the burden of proof and the burden of proceeding with the evidence on issues set forth in his protest and not specifically adopted by the Commission. The Commission is directed to expedite protest hearing cases, and the effective date of the Commission's action protested is to be postponed until the Commission's decision after hearing, unless the particular authorization is necessary to the maintenance or conduct of an existing service. It should be noted that a bill extending the time in which the Commission may act on a protest to 30 days, H. R. 4558, has passed the House of Representatives and an identical bill, S. 1627, has been introduced in the Senate.

The protest rule has resulted in substantial delays in the construction and operation of new television or radio stations authorized by the Commission without hearing. For any party in interest may file a protest and it seems clear, under relevant court decisions, that the term "party in interest" includes not only existing stations in the same service as the grantee who might be adversely affected economically by the grant, but also stations in other broadcast services who might similarly suffer economic injury as a result of competition afforded by the new stations. Furthermore, if the protestant shows himself to be a party in interest and details his objections to the grant, the Commission is required to designate the application involved for hearing; it may not dispose of the protest on the pleadings, even though it would be otherwise possible to do so. And finally, since with respect to the authorization of new stations there is no existing service to be maintained, the Commission is required to postpone the effectiveness of the authorization pending any such hearing and the decision by the Commission. The result has been to make pos-

sible delaying tactics on the part of existing licensees or permittees attempting to forestall competition. And such hearings not only delay the effectiveness of the particular authorization involved but also occupy the time and efforts of members of the Commission's limited staff who could otherwise be utilized in connection with other proceedings, including necessary hearings involving competitive television applications.

In order to obviate these difficulties the enclosed proposal would amend section 309 (c) to make clear that while any party in interest could protest a grant of a permit made without hearing, such protest would not automatically result in staying the effectiveness of the grant or require a hearing regardless of the merits of the claims advanced by the protestant. Instead, the proposed new language would provide merely that within 30 days of the filing of such a protest the Commission, upon consideration of the protest and any reply thereto, would issue a decision either affirming its previous grant or suspending its effectiveness and designating the application for hearing. The proposed revision would also provide that the filing of a protest would not operate to stay the effective date of the grant unless the Commission expressly so ordered. It is believed that the revised language would achieve the apparent objective of the protest rule in affording interested parties an opportunity to bring to the attention of the Commission questions about grants made without hearing and to obtain a determination thereon. At the same time, it would avoid the utilization of the protest rule as a device for delay on the part of potential competitors.

The Commission, therefore, recommends that section 309 (c) should be amended as set forth in the attached proposed bill. The submission of this proposal to the Congress has been approved by the Bureau of the Budget. If there is any further information concerning this matter which the Commission can furnish you with, please do not hesitate to let us know.

By direction of the Commission:

ROSEL H. HYDE,
*Chairman.*

## The Ohio Valley Is Fast Becoming a Great Industrial Section

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. THOMAS A. JENKINS
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Monday, February 8, 1954*

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, soon after the close of the Revoluntionary War, there began a movement of people toward the settlement of the West. The Ordinance of 1787 set up what was then known as the Northwest Territory, and soon thereafter the hardy pioneers proceeded to migrate to the great West. The first settlements were made in southern Ohio. Marietta, Chillicothe, and Gallipolis were, in that order, the first settlements. Marietta was founded in 1788—Chillicothe in 1789—and Gallipolis in 1790.

The great river in that section had for many years been named Ohio by the Indians. The name Ohio in the Indian language means "beautiful river."

The pioneers moved into Ohio with great hopes and in great numbers. In 15 years there were 40,000 pioneers living in Ohio. Ohio was admitted into the Union in 1803.

The Ohio River and the Ohio Valley have offered many encouragements to people and to industry. A few years ago one of the great industries of the country caused a survey to be made so as to ascertain where, east of the Mississippi River, electric power could be produced and distributed most economically and most advantageously. This survey indicated that there was no doubt but that this distinction should go to the Ohio Valley.

In response to this survey there has been a tremendous development in the manufacture of electric power in southern Ohio in the past 4 or 5 years. These developments are continuing, and as a result the Government is building an atomic energy plant in that section. Many other smaller industries are coming into that section.

For a few years I and a number of other men and organizations have been promoting the location of an airfield in that section. The city of Portsmouth, near which the Government's great atomic plant is located, has been pressing, vigorously, for Federal aid in the construction of an airport. We have shown the great increase in big Government business and other businesses in our section. We have also shown that the people of the city of Portsmouth, believing that the Government would extend some aid to this airport program, issued bonds in the sum of $400,000. This would be an ample contribution on the part of the people. The city of Portsmouth felt that this would be proof of their faith in this project.

Other people of that section of the State, not only the people of Portsmouth, have done their best to convince the proper Government officials and congressional committees of the necessity for this airport, still the money raised by the city of Portsmouth from this bond issue is reposing in the Portsmouth banks, and the bonds are drawing interest in the hands of those who own them.

This airport should be built. I hope the proper Government officials and the proper congressional officials willl do what should be done under the conditions. At present there is no airport within about 100 miles, and there are many Government officials interested in the millions of dollars the Government is spending in that section of the country. The airplane is an accepted method of travel, and while this airport will be to the advantage of the people of that section it will be of great and immediate advantage to the hundreds of Government officials, engineers, and employees who will be coming and going into that section.

I hope the people of southern Ohio will keep up their fight for this airport—they deserve consideration. I shall continue my efforts in this just cause.

Will the Government officials and the Congress tell the people of Portsmouth that the $400,000 which they have on deposit in the banks will avail them nothing, and that these fine people must go on paying interest on the bonds which were sold on the market several months ago?

## Inspection of Cuban Agriculture and Sugar Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. CLIFFORD R. HOPE
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Monday, February 8, 1954*

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, under the provisions of the Sugar Act of 1938, as amended and extended, the producing areas which provide our sugar are allotted quotas. In 1953 the respective areas supplied approximately the following proportions of our total sugar consumption: Domestic beet 21 percent; domestic cane, 6¼ percent; Hawaii, 13 percent; Puerto Rico and Virgin Islands, 14 percent; Cuba, 33 percent; Philippines, 11 percent; other foreign countries, 1⅓ percent.

The Sugar Act, which has been under the jurisdiction of this committee since its inception, was last extended in 1951. The present extension of the law continues to December 31, 1956.

In carrying out its responsibilities with regard to this legislation, the Committee on Agriculture is undertaking, during this period when extension and revision of the act is not immediately before the committee, to familiarize itself with the conditions and problems incident to production in the various areas.

At the invitation of the Government of Cuba and as the guests of that Government, the committee was able to make an inspection of the Cuban sugar industry and other phases of Cuban agriculture in the period January 23–30, 1954.

Presented herewith for use of the Committee on Agriculture and for the information of other Members of the House is a brief report of that study:

INSPECTION OF CUBAN AGRICULTURE AND SUGAR INDUSTRY

The Sugar Act of 1937, regulating production of sugar for the American market, has been one of our most successful agricultural programs. It has provided American consumers, even during the war years, with an ample supply of sugar at a reasonable and stabilized price level, at times even below world market prices.

At the same time, the act has contributed materially to national security by making possible production of significant quantities of sugar within continental United States. Economically, the stability which operation of the act has brought to our own offshore areas (Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands) and to our neighboring nation of Cuba has been a most important factor in the greatly improved economy of the whole Caribbean area.

Financially, the program has operated consistently at a profit. In the 16 years of its operation it has returned a net profit to the Treasury, over and above all expenses including administration, of approximately $269 million.

The law has been amended and extended from time to time but has continued the basic concept of providing for production of part of our sugar supply in continental

United States and dividing the total consumption of this country between our domestic producing areas and our other historical sources of supply. The legislation has been consistently under the jurisdiction of the Committee on Agriculture.

The latest extension of the act was in 1951, at which time it was extended with minor changes through 1956. It is unlikely, therefore, that there will be any sugar legislation before Congress this year. In the course of the hearings on the 1951 extension of the act, the committee indicated the hope that it would be able to visit each of the major sugar-producing areas before the act came up for reconsideration again and familiarize itself more thoroughly with production in the various areas.

In conformity with that intention, a subcommittee visited Hawaii in the fall of 1952 and spent several days inspecting the Hawaii sugar-production industry. In the spring of 1953 a majority of the members of the committee visited Puerto Rico at the invitation and as guests of the Puerto Rican Government and obtained much valuable firsthand information on the place of sugar in that island's economy and some of the problems connected with its industry.

During the last week in January 1954 the committee carried out the third step of its intention to familiarize itself with the sugar-producing areas with an inspection of the Cuban sugar-producing industry. The committee's visit to Cuba was possible only because of the invitation of the Government of Cuba, since the committee obviously is not in a position to invite itself to make a detailed inspection of the industry of another sovereign nation.

The invitation of the Cuban Government was extended to the committee by the Cuban Ambassador to Washington on July 13, 1953, and was officially accepted by the committee in executive session on July 17. A subcommittee was appointed to work with the Cuban Ambassador in perfecting arrangements for the trip. All expenses of the trip were paid by the Government of Cuba.

As is customary in the case of field hearings and trips of the Committee on Agriculture, representatives of the press were invited to accompany the committee, and the meetings and inspection trips in Cuba were fully covered by reporters both from the United States and Habana.

The sugar harvest in Cuba starts about January 15 and is normally completed in 3 to 4 months. It was impossible, therefore, for the committee to make its visit during the recess of Congress and see the sugar mills in operations. The date of the inspection trip was set, therefore, at a time when it was anticipated that the mills would be in operation and that the legislative situation would permit members to be away from Washington for a few days.

The following brief summary of the committee's visit to the Republic of Cuba will give some idea of the scope of the studies conducted by the committee:

On its arrival in Habana Saturday, January 23, the committee was met by Chester Davis, the sugar economist of the American Embassy in Habana; John Johnston, the chief of our point 4 program in Cuba; and the director of experiment stations of the Cuban Department of Agriculture. The Ambassador assigned Mr. Davis and Mr. Johnston to the committee for the duration of its stay and they were a valuable source of information and interpretations.

The committee was also fortunate in having in its membership Dr. FERNÓS-ISERN, Resident Commissioner of Puerto Rico, who acted frequently as interpreter when members of the committee were interviewing farmers and others who did not speak English readily.

At noon Saturday the committee attended a luncheon meeting as guests of the Secretary of Agriculture of Cuba. In addition to the formal statements presented at the luncheon, the committee members discussed various aspects of Cuban agriculture personally with the large number of officials of the Cuban Department of Agriculture who were present. Later Saturday, members attended a reception at one of Habana's oldest newspapers El Diario de la Marina, at which committee members were able to discuss general Cuban business conditions with many of the outstanding Cuban and American businessmen of Habana.

Monday, January 25, the committee, accompanied by American Ambassador Gardner, went first to the Cuban Department of State for an official call on the Minister of State. Most of the rest of this day was spent at the Cuban Sugar Stabilization Institute in a meeting with the members of the institute and with the Association of Hacendados, the association of the sugar-mill operators.

Monday evening members of the committee were the guests of Gen. Fulgencio Batista at a reception and buffet supper at the President's palace. Committee members had an unparalleled opportunity during the informal 3 hours spent at the presidential palace for personal discussions with the President of the Republic.

Early Tuesday morning the committee left by auto for a Cuban agricultural experiment station at Santiago de las Vegas, a few miles outside of Habana. This experiment station is the headquarters of our point 4 agricultural program in Cuba and about 1 hour of the visit at the experiment station was devoted to a conference with those in charge of our point 4 program. The committee then inspected the operations connected with the growing and production of kenaf fiber, which is one of the major objectives of our point 4 program in Cuba. Kenaf is a rough fiber produced from an annual plant which can apparently be adapted with considerable success for growth in Cuba. It is a fiber which can be used readily instead of jute for the manufacture of burlap, bagging, and similar rough cloth.

Kenaf seems to hold particular promise for production in Cuba for two reasons: (1) Cuba is a large user of burlap and similar jute cloth for sugar bags and tobacco baling. Virtually all of this material is now imported. (2) Kenaf is normally harvested during the time of year when sugar is not being harvested and when there is little or no work in the fields for the large number of laborers who must be maintained to harvest the sugar crop. Development of the kenaf crop would give employment to many of these laborers during the off season of sugar production.

On its return to Habana, the committee inspected the modern central bank maintained by the Associacion de Colonos, the Association of Sugar Growers. The bank is operated on a cooperative basis and is similar to regional banks for cooperatives and production credit associations serving our own farmers. It serves as a central source of credit for the growers of sugarcane.

In the large auditorium on the top floor of the modern bank building, the committee then attended a mass meeting of several hundred sugar growers and farmers. The statements presented by these Cuban farmers were similar to the many statements the committee has heard from American farmers during the course of its recent hearings throughout the United States.

Like any American farmers, Cuban sugar farmers are faced this year with a sharp reduction in their quotas. Cuban sugar quotas have been reduced by about 1,500,000 acres this year, or about 17 percent of the total acreage planted. Like American farmers, Cuban producers of sugarcane are also caught between lower prices for their crops and rising or stationary costs of labor and other production expenses.

Wednesday morning the committee left by bus for a 2-day trip into the interior of the island southeast of Habana. It was accompanied on the trip by officials of the Cuban Department of Agriculture, by the agricultural and commercial experts of the American Embassy in Habana, and by the directors of our point 4 program in Cuba.

The committee spent all day Wednesday visiting sugar plantations, a raw-sugar mill or "central," and a sugar refinery.

Although some modern machinery is used in handling the cane and transporting it to the mills, two-wheeled carts drawn by ox teams were still much in evidence in almost every field and the actual cutting of the cane is still entirely a hand operation. The cane cutting requires a labor force of from 500,000 to 700,000 workers during the 3 to 5 months of the cane harvest. The finding of some profitable employment for this army of sugar workers during the months when they are not employed in the cane fields, thus relieving the sugar industry of the entire burden of their support, is one of the obvious economic problems confronting the island nation.

The sugar mill visited by the committee, Central Cuba, is one of the more modern on the island. There are 161 such mills or "centrals" scattered throughout the sugar-producing areas of Cuba. These mills crush the juice from the cane and reduce it to crystalline raw sugar. Much of it is exported in that form but some is refined into granulated white sugar and other products in Cuba. Late on Wednesday the committee visited and inspected one of the large Cuban sugar refineries.

Thursday morning the committee went by airplane from Veradero, where it had spent the night, southeast across the island to Topes de Collantes, Trinidad, and Las Villas, in the Province of Santa Clara on the south-central coast of Cuba. This is one of the major coffee-producing areas of the island and the committee inspected one of the larger plantations. Here the committee also visited a new rural electric-generating plant and the Cuban forest-experiment station. A new tuberculosis hospital was also inspected at the special invitation of President Batista. The group returned to Habana by plane late Thursday.

Friday the committee went by bus almost to the western tip of the island to inspect the area which produces the famous Cuban tobacco. Stops were made at a number of tobacco farms en route. An informal luncheon meeting with tobacco farmers was held at the Cuban agricultural experiment station at San Juan y Martínes. The committee returned to Habana late that evening.

Saturday forenoon the committee visited the capitol building and afterward placed a wreath on the impressive memorial to José Martí, considered the father of Cuban freedom. Cuba is just completing celebration of the 100th anniversary of Martí's birth.

Before leaving Cuba, committee members made another visit to the American Embassy for a final session with its sugar expert, Chester Davis, and for general orientation on the information the committee had obtained.

In its inspection of the Cuban sugar industry and agriculture, the committee traveled about 650 miles by bus and automobile and about 350 miles by airplane. It participated in six formal meetings with agricultural groups and in at least twice that many informal discussions with groups encountered in the course of its travels. At least equally as valuable to the committee members as the group meetings, however, was the excellent opportunity throughout the committee's stay in Cuba, and particularly during the bus and auto trips into the rural areas, to discuss with individual Cubans the many aspects of Cuban agricultural and economic life which presented themselves.

The great importance of sugar in the relationships and trade between the United States and Cuba is easily summed up: Under the provisions of our Sugar Act, Cuba pro-

vides about 34 percent of the sugar consumed in the United States. This sugar normally comprises 80 to 85 percent of Cuba's total of all exports to the United States.

The dollars provided by our purchases of Cuban sugar comprise the funds for Cuban purchases in the United States so extensive as to make that nation our sixth best foreign customer and to give it a per capita consumption of American goods beyond that of any other foreign country except Canada. In 1952 American exports to Cuba amounted to about $1.18 for each dollar of our imports from that country.

The committee is deeply appreciative of the many courtesies and the great assistance extended to it throughout its visit by the Government of the Republic of Cuba and by the many citizens of the island who assisted materially in its quest for information. The committee desires particularly to express its thanks to President Batista for the generous manner in which he placed every facility and every office of the Cuban Government at the disposal of the committee during its visit to the Republic.

The committee also desires to express its appreciation to Dr. Aurelio F. Concheso, the Ambassador of Cuba to Washington, for his great assistance in making the arrangements for the trip, and to Dr. Mario Nuñez de Villavicencio, first Secretary of the Cuban Embassy, who accompanied the committee from Washington and throughout its entire trip, and who handled arrangements for transportation and accommodations in most exemplary fashion.

The committee is also grateful to Dr. Alfredo Jacomino López, Minister of Agriculture of Cuba, for placing the informed personnel and the facilities of his department at the service of the committee and for personally accompanying the committee on much of its inspection of the island's agriculture. Also to Dr. Miguel Angel Campa, Minister of State of Cuba, who assisted the committee in many ways, including the assignment of Dr. Charles A. Mendiola and Sr. Pedro Diaz, of the Cuban State Department, who were of great assistance to the committee throughout the entire period of their visit to Cuba.

The committee also desires to express its appreciation to Mr. Arthur Gardner, American Ambassador to Cuba, whose personal assistance and cooperation, and that of his able staff, added much to the information obtained by the committee during its visit.

## Statement by Hon. Henry C. Dworshak, of Idaho, Regarding Atomic Energy Commission's Reactor Testing Station on the Lost River Desert of Eastern Idaho

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. HENRY C. DWORSHAK
OF IDAHO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
*Monday, February 8, 1954*

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a brief statement which I made regarding the Atomic Energy Commission's reactor testing station established on the Lost River Desert of eastern Idaho some 4 years ago.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. President, I address myself to a matter which I hope will not be construed as emanating purely from State or local pride, because I sincerely believe it is one which should evoke national admiration.

My reference is to the magnificent manner in which the Atomic Energy Commission's reactor testing station, established on the Lost River Desert of eastern Idaho some 4 years ago, has been integrated into the area community, both economically and socially. The results of this integration are so outstanding that they should provide the pattern for AEC operations elsewhere. They demonstrate that an instrumentality of the Federal Government can be made to function as a cohesive part of a community without overpowering it. And they establish that local communities, with a desire to progress without the frothing, transitory impetus of a boom, can rise to meet the challenge thrust upon them by suddenly increased population loads.

Mr. President, my purpose in these remarks is intended for more than mere boasting. It is to call attention to the ideal conditions, the unusually fine community atmosphere and the vast potentials of the area for further expansion of AEC operations there. As a matter of fact, I feel it would be the ideal location for the headquarters of the international atomic pool when it is created. It is at the east Idaho reactor station where theory is being converted into the practical. If for no other reason, that is why the area would be the ideal and sensible location for the headquarters of the pool.

Further, the area is superbly suited for the construction of the atomic reactor powerplant which the AEC intends to serve as the pilot facility for the production of electric power through atomic energy. The east Idaho project already has available the brains and the trained personnel to perfect such a powerplant—the men who developed the propulsion mechanism for the *Nautilus*, America's first atom-driven submarine. It would also be desirable to develop the prototype reactor powerplant there because the power could be used to good advantage at the reactor station.

It is my hope that the Atomic Energy Commission will not overlook Idaho during consideration of these matters.

When the AEC picked the eastern Idaho area from a list of 74 prospective sites for its reactor testing project, I know that there was great concern among the people of my State that the AEC would follow the pattern established elsewhere and construct a Government town.

Idaho Falls, Arco, Blackfoot, Pocatello, and other communities of eastern Idaho opposed construction of a Government town because they had learned of the endless difficulties which beset areas where such projects were established.

They said: "Let us meet the challenge of housing and community facilities. We can absorb the impact, we can save the Government millions of dollars and we can avoid the frictions of living as neighbors to an artificial, Government-run community."

Happily, the decision was made to integrate. The result has been the savings of millions of dollars of taxpayers money and orderly growth. I would like to quote from the December issue of Engineering News-Record, which discussed the National Reactor Testing Station in east Idaho:

"The nature of the work at NRTS has led to marked differences in the development program there from other AEC installations. These factors stand out:

"There is no Government town.

"There have been no labor troubles.

"Major work has been divided among several design firms and several construction firms rather than lumped into one big job."

I would like to quote from an article written by Herman Edwards, a staff writer for the Portland Oregonian, who visited the NRTS in east Idaho:

"NRTS employees have found housing facilities sufficient for their needs. Most find two or more choices of residence, and rentals and other costs apparently have not been boosted. The visitor gains the impression these new people have been accepted into the Idaho communities in an hospitable spirit as new neighbors rather than as new and transient sources of revenues."

Mr. President, the potential of Idaho and especially in the atomic area in the eastern part of the State has been tapped to only a small degree. Opportunities are unlimited. The AEC would do well to recognize this.

## Morale in the Postal Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. JOHN E. FOGARTY
OF RHODE ISLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Monday, February 8, 1954*

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, we have been hearing a great deal about morale in the postal service. Numerous studies are being conducted by both Houses of Congress, by Departments and agencies, to determine a proper program to bring about improved morale.

It seems to me that the answer to the problem is very simple indeed. There are two ills that have plagued the postal service. I do not believe it is necessary for the Congress or any committee of Congress to conduct any lengthy involved study to determine what these ills are and what is the proper remedy to correct these ills.

We simply have to pass legislation repealing the restrictions placed upon the postal service by the Whitten amendment, and pass legislation providing the postal employees with a decent American wage.

According to the last published report of the Postmaster General, there were 168,000 part-time employees, compared to 355,000 full-time employees. Obviously, this condition requires correction, and correction cannot be had until the restrictions of the Whitten amendment are repealed.

The Post Office Department is having a great deal of difficulty convincing men to accept employment. What chance do you have to convince a prospective employee to come to work for Uncle Sam when he can walk down the street and secure a position paying 20 or 25 cents more per hour? This is particularly true when the employing officer in the postal service cannot offer the man a permanent job and is compelled to offer him an entrance salary far below what he can secure in most industries.

In 1951, when we last adjusted postal salaries, the entrance pay in the post office was 2 cents above the average hourly earnings in factories. Today, the average hourly earnings in factories is 18 cents above postal pay. In the large cities, postmasters are finding it extremely difficult to recruit personnel. Hundreds of people take an examination for entrance in the postal service, which is evidence of the fact that they have the desire to work for Uncle Sam, but when they are called to report for duty, it has been the experience in many large cities that well over 50 percent of these men refused to accept the position. They are offered a starting salary of

$62.88 a week. In 1953, the take-home pay out of this salary of a man with three dependents was only $54.52. Effective January 1, 1954, there was a reduction in withholding tax, which added the munificent sum of 50 cents to the take-home pay of this employee, so now in this period of extremely high prices, the postal employee with three dependents is expected to maintain an American standard of living with weekly income of $55.02. It simply cannot be done.

In talking with many of my friends in the postal service in Rhode Island, I find that a good number of them have been forced to take outside jobs in order to make ends meet. Others tell me that their wives have had to seek work outside the home in order to supplement the family's income.

Can we in the Congress permit such conditions to continue? Can we say that we are meeting our responsibility to Federal employees when we take no action to remedy the injustice with which they are presently faced? In my opinion, neither further study nor further talk constitutes a remedy. What the situation demands is a substantial pay increase now—not months in the future.

I am happy to learn that the Post Office and Civil Service Committee has scheduled hearings on this important legislation commencing February 8. I wish to urge my colleagues on that committee to speed up these hearings so that we can pass legislation in the House of Representatives during the month of February and so that the postal employees will be given the increase that they so sorely need promptly in this session. In my opinion, this is an emergency situation and we should waste no time in correcting it.

## His Excellency the Cardinal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. ALFRED D. SIEMINSKI
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Monday, February 8, 1954*

Mr. SIEMINSKI. Mr. Speaker, it is always a pleasure for me to be offered the opportunity to express the sentiments of the great people of the district I am honored to represent—the 13th District of New Jersey—especially when those sentiments recoil against the cruelties of man, recoil against cruelties as those imposed on Cardinal Mindszenty.

The letter sent to me recently by Msgr. Bela Varga, former speaker of the Hungarian Parliament, citing the gallant stand of his excellency the cardinal against the real goal of the Bolsheviks—submission of man to confiscation, torture, and death—reminds one how precious liberty is—worth life itself.

What is the lesson for Americans in this? For the people of Hungary and all the world? As each of us is strong, so do we strengthen each other. While a bundle of fagots cannot easily be broken, it can be, if the sticks are broken one by one. Thus do we in America address ourselves to the dignity of man and his inalienable right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, here and for the hereafter.

Socrates gave Europe its concept of soul. Christ showed man the beatitude of its salvation. Both were killed.

What of the upward road? The road from here to the hereafter: Lighted by men like his excellency the cardinal—saintly soul, glimpsed in his life are these lines:

I would be true, for there are those who trust me.
I would be pure, for there are those who care;
I would be strong, for there is much to suffer;
I would be brave, for there is much to dare.
I would be friend of all, the foe, the friendless;
I would be giving, and forget the gift;
I would be humble, for I know my weakness;
I would look up, and laugh, and love, and lift.

Thank you Msgr. Bela Varga, for calling to our attention the heroic epic of Joseph Cardinal Mindszenty. We have not forgotten. The world will gain by his faith and example.

## A Bill To Curb Illegal Gambling Activities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. KENNETH B. KEATING
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Monday, February 8, 1954*

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, a bill which I am today introducing would substantially broaden the Lottery Act of 1895 so as to reach other gambling enterprises and gambling devices. Such a revision of the Lottery Act has been specifically endorsed by the American Bar Association.

The Lottery Act was the very first blow aimed by Congress at organized crime in interstate commerce. It quickly put an end to the national lottery racket which has outgrown the powers of any State, 60 years ago. So this is a tried and true approach. Expanding it to include other kinds of gambling is a most logical way to deal with today's overlords of crime who are still fattening themselves on nationwide gambling operations in all the other categories except lotteries. It is no accident that lotteries are not the problem now. It is virtually certain that other illegal gambling activities—most notably illegal bookmaking—will respond just as readily to this same approach.

H. R. 7311, introduced on January 18, 1954, is designed to control the interstate transmission of gambling information upon which illegal bookmaking largely depends. This so-called wire service bill, coupled with the instant measure, would effectively blanket the gambling activities of notorious crime syndicates.

Under leave granted, there follows a copy of the bill to amend chapter 61 of title 18 of the United States Code:

A bill to prohibit certain acts and transactions with respect to gambling materials

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That chapter 61 of title 18 of the United States Code is amended to read as follows:

"CHAPTER 61—LOTTERY AND GAMBLING ENTERPRISES

"Sec.
1301. Importing, transporting, or mailing gambling or lottery materials.
1302. Postmaster or employee as gambling or lottery agent.
1303. Broadcasting gambling or lottery information.
1304. Fishing contests; track racing events; foreign publications.

"SEC. 1301. Importing, transporting, or mailing gambling or lottery materials.

"(a) Whoever knowingly brings into the United States for the purpose of disposing of the same; or whoever knowingly deposits with any express company or any other carrier for compensation or carries in interstate or foreign commerce; or whoever knowingly deposits in the mail, or sends or delivers by mail—

"Any letter, package, postal card, or circular concerning any gambling enterprise, lottery, gift enterprise, or scheme of any kind offering money or other prizes dependent in whole or in part upon lot or chance;

"Any gambling or lottery ticket or part thereof, or paper, certificate, or instrument purporting to be or to represent a ticket, chance, share, or interest in or dependent upon the event of any gambling enterprise, lottery, gift enterprise, or scheme of any kind offering money or other prizes dependent in whole or in part upon lot or chance;

"Any punchboard or pushcard;

"Any check, draft, bill, money, postal note, or money order, for the purchase of any ticket or part thereof, or of any share or chance in any such gambling enterprise, lottery, gift enterprise, or scheme, or for the purchase of, or in payment of any chance taken on, any punchboard or pushcard, or in payment of any bet or wager in connection with any gambling enterprise, lottery, gift enterprise, or scheme of any kind offering money or other prizes dependent in whole or in part upon lot or chance; or

"Any newspaper, circular, pamphlet, or publication of any kind containing any advertisement of, or soliciting any business in connection with, any gambling enterprise, lottery, gift enterprise, or scheme of any kind, offering money or other prizes dependent in whole or in part upon lot or chance, or containing any list of the prizes to be drawn or awarded by means of any such gambling enterprise, lottery, gift enterprise, or scheme, whether such list contains any part or all of such prizes, or containing any advertisement of any punchboard or pushcard

shall be fined not more than $1,000 or imprisoned not more than 2 years, or both; and for any subsequent offense under this section shall be imprisoned not more than 5 years.

"(b) Whoever knowingly takes or receives any paper, certificate, or instrument purporting to be or to represent a ticket, chance, share, or interest in or dependent upon the event of a lottery, gift enterprise, or similar scheme, offering prizes dependent in whole or in part upon lot or chance, or any advertisement of, or list of, the prizes to be drawn or awarded by means of any such lottery, gift enterprise, or similar scheme, which have been brought into the United States or deposited with any express company or any other carrier for compensation, or carried in interstate or foreign commerce, shall be fined

not more than $1,000 or imprisoned not more than 1 year, or both.

"(c) All matter, the mailing of which is forbidden by subsection (a) hereof, is hereby declared to be nonmailable and shall not be conveyed in the mails nor delivered from any post office, nor by any letter carrier, but shall be withdrawn from the mails under such regulations as the Postmaster General may prescribe.

"(d) For the purposes of this section the phrase 'punchboard or pushcard' shall include such boards, cards, or similar devices designed and manufactured primarily for use in connection with gambling, but shall not include devices numerically keyed to an answer sheet or containing no numerical identification of individual plays and designed and manufactured primarily for amusement purposes.

"SEC. 1302. Postmaster or employee as gambling or lottery agent.

"Whoever, being a postmaster or other person employed in the postal service, acts as agent for any gambling or lottery office, or, under color of purchase or otherwise, sends gambling or lottery tickets, or knowingly sends by mail or delivers any letter, package, postal card, circular, or pamphlet advertising any gambling enterprise, lottery, gift enterprise, or scheme of any kind offering money or prizes dependent in whole or in part upon lot or chance, or any ticket, certificate, or instrument representing any chance, share, or interest in or dependent upon the event of any such gambling enterprise, lottery, gift enterprise, or scheme, or any list of the prizes to be drawn or awarded by means of any such gambling enterprise, lottery, gift enterprise, or scheme, whether such list contains any part or all of such prizes, shall be fined not more than $1,000 or imprisoned not more than 1 year, or both.

"SEC. 1303. Broadcasting gambling or lottery information.

"Whoever broadcasts by means of any radio station for which a license is required by any law of the United States, or whoever, operating any such station, knowingly permits the broadcasting of, any advertisement of or information concerning any gambling enterprise, lottery, gift enterprise, or scheme of any kind offering money or prizes dependent in whole or in part upon lot or chance, or any list of the prizes to be drawn or awarded by means of any such gambling enterprise, lottery, gift enterprise, or scheme, whether such list contains any part or all of such prizes, shall be fined not more than $1,000 or imprisoned not more than 1 year, or both.

"Each day's broadcasting shall constitute a separate offense.

"SEC. 1304. Fishing contests; track racing events; foreign publications.

"The provisions of this chapter shall not apply with respect to—

"The sponsorship, management, or advertisement of any fishing contest not conducted for profit wherein prizes are awarded for the specie, size, weight, or quality of fish caught by contestants in any bona fide fishing or recreational event;

"The sponsorship, management, or advertisement of any track-racing event to which the general public is admitted and upon which betting is legal under applicable State laws; or

"The importation and distribution of any foreign newspaper, pamphlet, or other publication distributed as a bona fide medium for news, information, or opinions in any foreign country."

## Count Albert Apponyi, of Hungary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, February 8, 1954*

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I am inserting into the RECORD a sketch I had prepared by the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress of the life and ideals of Count Albert Apponyi, of Hungary. In my opinion it is a good thing to refresh our memories from time to time of the careers of men who have led inspirational lives so that their example might further inspire present generations to meet the problems that still beset us boldly, objectively, and with foresight.

The sketch follows:

February 8 marks the anniversary of the death in 1933 of one of Europe's most respected elder statesmen, Count Albert Apponyi, of Hungary. He was long a leader in Hungarian public affairs. A man whose authority was moral more than political he was respected even more for his own personal integrity rather than for his public positions. Throughout his extensive career he was a man who stood above politics and in all things remained true to his own principles and ideals.

Although he was a member of one of Hungary's oldest aristocratic families, Count Apponyi was devoted to the precepts of democracy and to progressive social reform. He believed in "social equality in everything which is fundamental to human dignity and to the requirements of human happiness."

Following the death of the great patriot, Louis Kossuth, Count Apponyi succeeded to the leadership of the Hungarian Independence Party. As its head he was an advocate of universal suffrage and a strong supporter of Hungarian independence. His long and distinguished career in his country's service included many prominent posts—speaker of the house of representatives, minister of education, minister of worship and privy councilor.

Count Apponyi, however, is best known for his distinguished career in the field of international relations. Although he was an ardent supporter of Hungarian nationalism and a great patriot, he saw beyond the divisions of geographic and ethnic boundaries. Even before the creation of the League of Nations he devoted himself to the cause of world peace. In this respect, his work as a member of the Interparliamentary Union was especially outstanding.

After World War I he pleaded Hungary's cause at the peace conference with such dignity and nobility that he won the respect even of his enemies. He was indefatigable in his efforts to build up the League of Nations. His great gift of oratory enabled him to plead with conviction on behalf of international cooperation. He had faith that the "spirit and letter of cooperation will replace our old struggle for supremacy." Therein lay the only path of progress for the postwar world.

Count Apponyi himself was an example of the ability of patriotism and internationalism to reach a compromise. His belief that "no nation can enrich itself by destroying another" led him to the belief that international cooperation did not lead to the subjection of national sovereignty, but was in the national interest as well as in the interest of humankind. His career was itself patriotism and internationalism, each used for the highest good, separately and together.

Count Apponyi early recognized the increasing importance of the United States in world affairs. He had been an enthusiastic visitor of this country three times—first, as a delegate to the Interparliamentary Union Conference, and later as a highly successful guest lecturer. He was received with the same warmth which he himself felt for America. At a time when this country was being sharply criticized abroad, he praised it for "its youthful freshness, compared to which old Europe appears to be worn out." Europe had achieved her best, and in her ripeness there were already the first signs of decay. The world depended on American optimism and enthusiasm as well as on its rich idealism. Gradually this country was beginning to emerge from her traditional policy of no entanglements. But although Europe had reached and passed her zenith, her rich heritage could offer invaluable experience to a country entering the European scene as a relative novice. Europe's background and America's new vigor were in the eyes of Count Apponyi the strongest combination for the perpetuation of international peace and cooperation.

Fittingly enough, Count Apponyi died fighting to attain world peace while serving as his country's delegate to the International Disarmament Conference. Mankind has not yet reached its ultimate goal. More than ever it is important to realize, as Count Apponyi did, that its attainment is only possible through the effective cooperation of all nations.

# SENATE

TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 9, 1954

*(Legislative day of Monday, February 8, 1954)*

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Eternal Father, Thou only art the fountain of our being, the light of all our seeing; our helper Thou amid the flood of mortal ills prevailing. Our puny mortal strength is unequal to the tests and tasks of these terrific times which are upon us; the arm of flesh fails us, we dare not trust our own devices and counsels. At this altar of Thy grace may our hearts be steadied and stilled, purged of self, emptied of strain and stress, filled with peace and poise, satisfied with each new morning just to wake and find Thee there: For Thine is the kingdom to which the future belongs, the power and the glory for ever and ever. Amen.

## THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. KNOWLAND, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, February 8, 1954, was dispensed with.

## MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILL

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced that today, February 9, 1954, the President had approved and signed the act (S. 373) to extend the time for filing claims for the return of property under the Trading With the Enemy Act.