obscenity passed while it was on its route through the mails. Thus, wherever sufficient and legally admissible evidence could be gathered, there the purveyor could be prosecuted. The practical advantages to such a law appear obvious, particularly if we bear in mind that most of these smut dealers are fly-by-night operators, here today, gone tomorrow, disappearing as fast as they appear, changing their names and addresses as a chameleon changes its colors, and hence, difficult to track down.

But, Mr. Speaker, as H. R. 6239 was torpedoed in the Senate, the broadened version passed by the House is absent. If insufficient evidence could be gathered to support a prosecution in the Federal district for mailing or receipt, or if an overworked grand jury could not attend to the matter in time, or if for any other reason an indictment and prosecution could not be speedily secured in one of those Federal districts, the smut dealer would be perfectly free to continue his operations, notwithstanding that other evidence in another Federal district might be readily available to support an indictment and prosecution. Furthermore, the absence of an applicable venue provision in the mailing or receipt, or if an overworked grand jury could not attend to the matter in time, or if for any other reason an indictment and prosecution could not be speedily secured in one of those Federal districts, the smut dealer would be perfectly free to continue his operations, notwithstanding that other evidence in another Federal district might be readily available to support an indictment and prosecution. Furthermore, the absence of an applicable venue provision in the Federal district of another state in which the mailing or receipt occurred. Furthermore, the absence of an applicable venue provision in the Federal district of another state in which the mailing or receipt occurred.

Thus, Mr. Speaker, it is clear that the venue provisions of our bill, which the Senate struck out completely, are of great significance. I hope my colleagues who have already spoken will understand the basis for my concern, and will not think I am merely attempting to be legalistic or pedantic.

Mr. Speaker, on July 27, 1958, I first introduced House Resolution 652, 84th Congress, 2nd session, to create a select committee "to conduct a full and complete investigation and study (1) to determine to which of the photographic materials are being furnished to members of the armed services of the United States; (2) to determine the extent to which pornographic materials are being sold into the United States from foreign countries; (3) to determine the extent of traffic in pornographic materials through the United States mails and by other transportation methods; (4) to determine the adequacy of existing laws to prevent publication, dissemination and distribution of pornographic materials; (5) to make such recommendations as the select committee shall deem advisable, and (6) to prepare such legislation as may be considered appropriate to carry out such recommendations.'"

On January 3, 1957, I reintroduced my resolution as House Resolution 38, 85th Congress, 1st session. From these resolutions, and from the efforts of some of my colleagues, there developed several bills which were referred to a select committee and subcommittee No. 1, Committee on the Judiciary, upon which I served as the senior Republican member. The testimony and the field work proved conclusively that tremendous amounts of pornography are being daily transmitted through the mails, directed mostly to boys and girls whose young minds must inevitably be corrupted as a result of their regularly reading and viewing such vile material.

Mr. Speaker, on several occasions I have gone down to the Post Office Department, and I have talked about this growing problem with the General Counsel and with attorneys and investigators on the headquarters staff of the Post Office Department. I can tell you now, Mr. Speaker, that as the father of three children I could not be more indignant when I peruse such obscenity, and I may say, as one who has served in the Army and who has traveled over a good part of the world, that I have never seen anything more shocking than some of the pictures and motion pictures which the General Counsel of the Post Office Department has shown to me.

It is no wonder, Mr. Speaker, that church groups, civic associations, and private citizens from all over California and some other States have communicated with me in support of our efforts to curb the flow of obscene materials through the United States mails. I take pride in pointing out that Post Office Department personnel, under Postmaster General Summerfield's leadership, are strongly behind our efforts. As a result of these cooperative efforts I have been able to read a resolution which was passed by chapter 4 of the National Association of Postmasters, representing postmasters in Santa Barbara, Ventura, Los Angeles, Imperial, Orange, Riverside, San Bernardino, and San Diego Counties of California:

Whereas the National Association of Postmasters of the United States has officially requested the Congress of the United States to take the strongest possible action against the growing evil of obscene mail in the country; and

Whereas Congressman Patrick J. Hillings, of Arcadia, the only Californian on the House Judiciary Committee, has courageously led the fight in his committee to develop legislation to check this dangerous growth from our society; there be it

Resolved, That we members of California Chapter No. 4, National Association of Postmasters, heartily commend and congratulate Congressman Hillings on his efforts to preserve the morals of our citizens of tomorrow by stamping out the flow of obscenity in the United States mails.

COMMITTEE ON MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries may be permitted to sit during the session of the House during general debate today.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking and Currency may sit this afternoon during general debate.
period of limitations for claiming a refund had expired in 1949, 2 years after the taxes were paid, last, in connection with the bill just passed to increase insurance for taxicabs, I did so as a matter of information. Members of the committee were unable to provide information which is more substantial and important in consideration of the bill. I have, subsequently, carefully examined the hearings on this legislation, and although extensive hearings were held on the overall problems relating to taxicabs in the District of Columbia, very little time was devoted specifically to the insurance problem.

With respect to information relating to insurance obtained by the committee I have found that our colleague, Congressman Teague, on several occasions requested and sought the very information which the committee was unable to secure this information: namely, the cost of insurance under the present law and the increased cost and payments to the insurance company that would result from the pending legislation.

It seems to me that a knowledge of the cost and rates is certainly pertinent. Especially so, since I find that insurance in this field is not competitive. The major taxicab fleets here in the District carry their own insurance as self-insurers. Other companies, namely, the Amalgamated Casualty Insurance Company of Washington, carries the insurance for 5,691 taxicabs, representing 47 taxicab companies. There are approximately 9,000 cabs in the District, and this one insurance company carries insurance for approximately 60 percent of all the taxicabs in the District. So, Mr. Speaker, this bill does, in fact, offer the possibility that a substantial bonus may accrue to this one insurance company, which, in effect, has a monopoly on the taxicab-insurance business in the Nation's Capital.

I have made some inquiries concerning the probable increase in the costs under this bill. I am informed that the cost could very well be doubled. At present the insurance companies are collecting about $1,750,000 annually on this type of insurance. That could be increased to more than $3 million annually, and almost two-thirds of this amount could go to the one company mentioned. General counsel during the hearings that raising the limit of coverage would increase rates by about 35 percent. Since cabdrivers pay premiums on a weekly basis, this would require a probable yearly premium increase of $1.25 a week—with the total number of cabs this would amount to more than a half million dollars annually—a rather substantial benefit to this company.

In addition, I want to call to the attention of my colleagues the fact that, while raising the amount of coverage, this bill provides that the liability of the insured will be increased to the state of the state for the amount of coverage, when an accident occurs. This is a technical point, but I am advised by insurance experts that this would have two effects. In the first place, it would place every cabdriver in the position of having to buy the kind of insurance that only those who have been found guilty of serious crimes, such as driving while intoxicated, committing a homicide with a motor vehicle, leaving the scene of the accident, reckless driving involving a personal injury, and any felony involving a motor vehicle, are forced to buy under the present law. Under the terms of this bill, each and every taxicab driver would be required to take out the most expensive kind of insurance, thus creating an undesirable precedent.

In the case of insurance for private vehicles, that type of insurance calls for an extra premium of 50 percent. If that were the case here in Washington, it would mean another additional cost of $2.50 a week. In that event, the cost per week to all operators could be as high as $7.25, which is more than twice as much as the present insurance premiums. The accident experience does not justify such a tremendous increase in cost.

In the case of the one insurance company mentioned that would mean an additional benefit of more than a million dollars a year. It certainly would be pertinent to consider whether we are justified in asking the public to pay so large an increase in cost to justify these increases in coverage.

The bill passed by the other house on this subject opens the possibility of breaking this near monopoly in insurance. It might be possible under its terms for drivers to secure insurance from any of the 300 companies qualified to sell insurance to private owners. Under the bill just passed, the present near monopoly would be maintained.

While we may all agree with the desirability of having an increased protection to the public, my concern was with respect to the amount of benefit going to the insurance companies. It seems to me that the companies have not developed these facts fully. It was pointed out during debate by our colleague, Congressman Teague, that there are a number of studies underway at the present time with respect to the overall taxicab problems in the District. These include studies by the National Capital Planning Commission, the Capital Regional Planning Council, and the Washington Metropolitan Regional Park Law 24 of the 85th Congress appropriated funds to enable these studies to be made. It certainly seems unwise to proceed on this matter prior to the time these studies have been complete. It is particularly in view of the fact that Congress has appropriated money to secure this information.

I want to state that I have the highest regard and affection for our esteemed colleague, the gentleman from Texas, Congressman Teague. We all know he is a man of the highest character and integrity. He is a hard worker. However, his committee has, in this bill, touched upon only one part of the overall problem. This one places an additional cost and expense upon the taxicab operators and public without solving the overall cab transportation problems in the Nation's Capital.

ACQUISITION OF REMAINING PROPERTY IN SQUARE 725, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, AND CONSTRUCTION THEREON OF ADDITIONAL FACILITIES FOR THE UNITED STATES SENATE

The SPEAKER: The further unfinished business before the House is the question on the passage of the bill S.