

CHARLES W. REED

JUNE 7, 1926.—Committed to the Committee of the Whole House and ordered to be printed

Mr. UNDERHILL, from the Committee on Claims, submitted the following

REPORT

[To accompany H. R. 10227]

The Committee on Claims, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 10227) for the relief of Charles W. Reed, having considered the same, report thereon with a recommendation that it do pass.

The full facts in the case are stated in the letter of the Postmaster General which is made a part of this report.

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT,
Washington, D. C., March 27, 1926.

HON. CHARLES L. UNDERHILL,
*Chairman Committee on Claims,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.*

MY DEAR MR. UNDERHILL: With further reference to your communication of the 15th instant, transmitting for a report thereon bill (H. R. 10227) for the relief of Charles W. Reed, formerly clerk in the post office at Uniontown, Pa., I have to inform you that the loss which occasioned the bill for relief was caused by the disappearance of a remittance of money-order funds from McClellandtown, Pa., en route to Pittsburgh, Pa.

The post-office inspector who investigated the case states that Clerk Charles W. Reed receipted for the registered letter and that it was evidently lost while in the Uniontown post office. The inspector also reports that "no suspicion attaches to Clerk Reed, as he is considered honest and trustworthy."

Because of his responsibility, however, for the registered letter and his inability to prove that it was not lost while theoretically in his custody, the inspector collected the whole of the remittance from Mr. Reed, who, being unable to pay all of it at one time, finally discharged it by monthly installments of \$10.

It would appear that Mr. Reed was made the victim of some dishonest employee of the Uniontown office, but the inspectors did not succeed in discovering the thief.

Under these circumstances, since it is evident that the clerk did not personally benefit by any portion of the lost money, and as he suffered hardship and inconvenience by the requirement that he make good the whole amount of the remittance, I am convinced that this employee is entitled to the relief asked and that the bill should be enacted into law. The Director, Bureau of the Budget, has advised that the report herein made in this case will not conflict with the financial program of the President.

Sincerely yours,

HARRY S. NEW, *Postmaster General.*

○

CHARLES W. REED

June 7, 1907.—Committed to the Committee of the House and ordered to be printed

Mr. Chairman, from the Committee on Claims, submitted the following

REPORT

To accompany H. R. 10237.

The Committee on Claims, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 10237) for the relief of Charles W. Reed, having considered the same, report thereon with a recommendation that it do pass.

The full facts in the case are stated in the letter of the Postmaster General which is made a part of this report.

Post Office Department,
Washington, D. C., March 27, 1908.

Hon. CHARLES A. DUNN,
Chairman, Committee on Claims,

House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

My Dear Sir: Unpleasant. With further reference to your communication of the 15th instant, transmitting for a report thereon bill (H. R. 10237) for the relief of Charles W. Reed, formerly clerk in the post office at Linton, Pa., I have to inform you that the loss which occasioned the bill for relief was caused by the disappearance of a remittance of money-order funds from McChesnut town, Pa., en route to Pittsburgh, Pa.

The post-office inspector who investigated the case stated that Clerk Charles W. Reed received for the remittance letter and that it was evidently lost while in the Linton post office. The inspector also reports that "no suspicion attached to Clerk Reed, as he is considered honest and trustworthy."

In view of his responsibility, however, for the remittance letter and his inability to prove that it was not lost while theoretically in his custody, the inspector collected the whole of the remittance from Mr. Reed, who being unable to pay all of it at one time, finally discharged it by monthly installments of \$10.

It would appear that Mr. Reed was made the victim of some dishonest employee of the Linton office, but the inspectors did not succeed in discovering the thief.

Under these circumstances, since it is evident that the clerk did not personally benefit by any portion of the lost money, and as he suffered hardship and inconvenience by the requirement that he make good the whole amount of the remittance, I am convinced that this employee is entitled to the relief asked and that the bill should be carried into law. The Director, Bureau of the Budget, has advised that the report herein made in this case will not conflict with the financial program of the President.

Sincerely yours,

HARRY S. NEW, Postmaster General.