

the gravely altered institutional order and economic life of the country. We recommend that the Armed Forces remember their traditional good sense, their humanistic and democratic values."

HEARINGS ON FLEXIBLE HOURS
EMPLOYMENT ACT

Hon. Yvonne Brathwaite Burke

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 26, 1973

Mrs. BURKE of California. Mr. Speaker, today Congresswoman BELLA ABZUG and I submitted testimony before the Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee on S. 2022 to provide increased employment opportunity by executive agencies of the U.S. Government for persons unable to work standard working hours. We have introduced a companion bill, H.R. 9109, which already has 19 cosponsors, and are hopeful that it will receive hearings in the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee in the near future.

I believe that these hearings and this statement are of sufficient importance of the Members of this body as to merit insertion in the RECORD. The statement follows:

JOINT STATEMENT BY CONGRESSWOMAN BELLA ABZUG AND YVONNE BRATHWAITE BURKE BEFORE THE SENATE POST OFFICE AND CIVIL SERVICE COMMITTEE ON SEPTEMBER 26, 1973, REGARDING S. 2022 TO PROVIDE INCREASED EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY BY EXECUTIVE AGENCIES OF THE U.S. GOVERNMENT FOR PERSONS UNABLE TO WORK STANDARD WORKING HOURS, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

Mr. Chairman, let me first explain that I am today presenting a joint statement not only on my own behalf but on behalf of Congresswoman Yvonne Burke of California, who has joined with me in sponsoring H.R. 9109, the Flexible Hours Employment Act. However, because of illness in her family, she can not be here. Let me also explain that I will try to be brief because of my commitments to the deliberations about to commence in the other body.

What this Committee is considering may prove in the future to be one of the most important pieces of legislation to be proposed in this or any other Congress. The concept of flexible hours employment perhaps should be defined at the outset as I and Representative Burke and the 19 cosponsors of H.R. 9109 understand it. It is basically a two-part definition.

The first involves part-time employment. That is generally understood to mean less than the normal 40 hour work week. This could mean either less hours per day for five days or less than 5 days a week employment. The second part of the definition would involve breaking the normal pattern of the 9 to 5 work day. This alone can produce some very interesting results that I will go into in a moment.

Part-time workers comprise an increasingly important proportion of the Nation's workforce, supplying trained manpower needs. In 1967, 6 million women worked part-time out of choice. Three million of them worked part-time year round. In a 16-year period (1950-66) the full-time labor force increased by 20 percent, and the part-time workforce by 69 percent. The proportion of women in the part-time labor force increased by 79 percent.

In 1967, BLS estimated that by 1980 one

worker out of every 7 would be part-time. But the rate of increase in part-time workers has been so great that the ratio of 1.7 was reached by the end of 1972, eight years ahead of the estimate. More than 12.5 million American workers were part-timers at the end of last year, 5 million more than BLS found in 1963 when it began keeping those statistics.

The need for this legislation is demonstrable on a number of grounds. First, it would increase the opportunity for the Federal government to employ the skills, resources, talent and brain power of many segments of the population that, because of the current rigid system of employment practices, are denied that opportunity.

Indeed, the President's Advisory Committee on the Economic Role of Women finds that the addition of these millions of women to the labor market contributes significantly to the national output as measured by gross national product. While most of the benefits of this additional output accrue to the women who produce it and to their families, there are direct benefits to society at large, including the taxes paid on women's earnings.

If we had a meaningful system of flexible hours, using the definitions that I have provided, more women—especially women with children, the handicapped and the elderly, would have a chance to work for the Federal government.

The problem of talented women with children who would like to return to work is great.

Skilled professional part-time workers are usually women. Those men who have part-time jobs are generally students or older men. Many more women want to work part-time but cannot find jobs. The unemployment rate in 1971 for women with young children was almost 12%, close to three times the rate of other married women, a condition which is costly to the women, their families, and the Nation.

Some 35 million women workers represent 43% of the nation's work force. These workers have 5 million pre-school age children. I don't have to go into detail with you about the grossly inadequate number of quality child-care facilities available or even the inequities in the child care deduction now allowed within the income tax system. Let me give you an example from a letter I received:

"For the past six years, I have been a civil servant and for the past four years of this time have worked for the Office of Child Development, Department of Health, Education and Welfare in Dallas, Texas. I wholeheartedly support this legislation for several reasons. But this year, I am particularly interested since I will become a mother for the first time in December.

"While the Federal regulations presently are quite liberal compared to most private industry, they are rigid. For instance, you are allowed a period of absence for maternity reasons of about 14 weeks—6 weeks before expected date of delivery and 8 weeks after actual delivery, unless an operating agency head establishes by regulation that a longer period of incapacitation is normal in his agency for types of positions of a strenuous or physically exacting nature. No provision is made for part-time work during this period—it is an 'all or nothing at all' situation.

"Many women would come back to work sooner if they were allowed to work only part-time. And this makes sense. I have observed that many women come back to work full-time only to find themselves exhausted in their new dual role of mother and worker. If they were allowed to ease back into their workday which would allow adjustment to their work schedule at home also, all sides would benefit."

But with a little help from the Federal government—with the help provided by a broad flexible hours program—we can upgrade the efficiency of current Federal employees who might opt for flexi-hours positions, attract

talented women who because they can't find child care or have some commitments at home can't work 40 hours a week from 9-5. That part-time workers are "management bargains" has been the theme of most evaluations which the increase of part-time workers has generated. Some of the advantages found were:

Greater selectivity possible by the employer; low turnover rates; lower fringe benefit rates; high productivity; greater maturity—ability to organize, to make relationships to synthesize work; stronger motivation, growing out of appreciation for maintaining skills.

The American Society for Public Administration endorsed part-time work in private business as a source of specialized, high calibre professionals. The Wall Street Journal considered the advantages of part-time workers as meriting a frontpage story in March of this year. The Russell Sage Foundation, the Radcliffe Institute, Harvard, Stanford and Princeton are among institutions finding the use of part-time women of value. John Kenneth Galbraith in his recent book *Economics and the Public Purpose* states unequivocally that there should be greater flexibility in work hours to allow more sharing by husband and wife of family chores. Finally, almost 24,000 workers responded to the survey in which 21,683 were in favor of a flexible hours program by supporting a four-day, 40 hour workweek.

Let me briefly mention at least four other segments of the working force population that could benefit from such a program. The talents of the handicapped are lost to the Federal government for a variety of reasons, including prejudice, and often architecture, but one of the problems that groups representing the handicapped have expressed to me, is the problem that the handicapped have in competing with the crush of people during the rush-hour. Adoption of this measure could add this large group to the federal work force in significant numbers.

Students could more easily work for the Federal Government and federal employees could more easily pursue advanced degrees or specialized training. People who are thinking of retiring from the Federal services might think about working longer, giving us the benefit of their experience, if they could reduce their number of hours. Another segment of the population that would benefit from this program are men. Men who are considering the responsibilities of child-rearing and would like to assume a greater share of that responsibility could opt for participation in this program.

Within the Federal Government there have been some experiments with part-time workers—mostly women in the AEC, Department of Labor, HUD, Peace Corps, National Science Foundation and the Veterans Administration. But there are inherent impediments within the Federal Government's employment policies which have retarded its development. Why hasn't the government moved ahead in this critical area?

According to a very thorough report of the HEW Women's Program: The answer seems to lie in the budget process and employment ceiling controls which have created an artificial dichotomy between full-time and part-time employment—a dichotomy which need not persist if the facts are understood.

These controls have emphasized full-time employment and given little attention to part-time. The effect has been to focus management attention on full-time with no incentive to establish and maintain an optimum employment mix.

Does it work?

Yes. It has been successful in private industry where it is being used. Let me give you a few examples. In a recent (September 10) article in Newsweek a Vice-President of Hewlett-Packard, which recently converted

its 15,000 employees to flexible hours said, "I now have people from 7 am to 5:30 pm." Still quoting from Newsweek, "Executives say the system virtually eliminates tardiness, cuts absenteeism and boosts morale. . . ." Let me just cite some other American companies that have adopted this system: Nestle, Occidental Life of California, Lufthansa German Airlines, and Metropolitan Life.

There is a subsidiary point that should be raised at this time. I am sure that in your considerations of the Civil Service in general you have come across the problem of getting the civil service to serve the people. Complaints about government agencies, especially those that deal with the public, being opened only from 9-5, 5 days a week. People complain about having to miss their own work to take care of some problem with the government. If we had a flexible hours program it is possible that we can open the doors of the agencies before 9 and keep them open after 5.

With the adoption of this proposal we can increase productivity and efficiency in government, open the work force to groups that are excluded and increase the government's contact with the people it serves.

ONE-STOP ITC CHARTER LEGISLATION, S. 1739 AND H.R. 8570

HON. JOHN E. MOSS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 26, 1973

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Speaker, on September 11, 1973, the Senate Committee on Commerce reported out S. 1739, a bill to amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 to provide a definition for inclusive tour charters, and for other purposes, together with minority views; Report No. 93-387, 93d Congress, 23 pages. This piece of legislation is identical to a bill, H.R. 8570, which I and my colleagues Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. ECKHARDT, Mr. LEGGETT, Mr. LONG of Louisiana, Mr. NEDZI, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. ROSENTHAL, Mr. STARK, Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON of California, Mr. WRIGHT, and Mr. VAN DEERLIN, introduced in the House of Representative on June 11, 1973.

Recently a number of my colleagues have informed me that they are beginning to receive a large amount of mail in opposition to these two bills, besides those letters favoring the legislation. Upon examination, it turns out that most of the letters in opposition to these two bills were written by scheduled airline employees. In addition, as the Wall Street Journal reported yesterday, September 25, 1973, on its front page, the letters are not spontaneous, but rather part of a well-financed public relations drive by the Air Transport Association of America and the airlines to defeat this legislation.

LABOR LETTER

Companies push employe support for legislation affecting their firm.

The president of Continental and Western Airlines sends all employes letters urging they write their Senators protesting a bill that would ease curbs on nonscheduled carriers. Employes at United get a similar appeal along with their paychecks.

* * * * *
The degree of pressure varies. Continental President Robert Six asks employes to give

him a copy of their letters; over 80% of the carrier's managers have responded.

In this regard, I understand the presidents of the various scheduled airlines are also writing every member of their VIP clubs, and having their sales representatives approach city officials and travel agents, in an effort to generate even more support for their cause.

Now, Mr. Speaker, every Member of the House and the Senate has been subjected to a mail campaign of this type at one time or another. It is part of our democratic process. That is not what troubles me. What bothers me is the factual inaccuracy of the information being distributed by the Air Transport Association and the airlines in their efforts to defeat this piece of legislation.

Accordingly, when my colleagues ask for background material, I have referred them to the Senate's Committee on Commerce report, and Senator CANNON's statement in the September 11, 1973, issue of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at pages S16226-S16228, since our own Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce has not yet had an opportunity to consider our bill, H.R. 8750. I hope that anyone who is interested in these two bills will take time to read Senator CANNON's remarks.

In addition, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD for the further information and interest of my colleagues two letters recently exchanged between Mr. F. C. (Bud) Wiser, Jr., president of Trans World Airlines, Inc., and Senator CANNON which have now been made part of the public record.

TRANS WORLD AIRLINES,

New York, N.Y., September 13, 1973.

HON. HOWARD W. CANNON,

U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR CANNON: As the president of an air carrier serving your state, I would like to bring to your attention S. 1739 which may well be on the Senate Floor by the end of this month. We at TWA view this as the most detrimental piece of airline legislation to appear in Congress in the last decade. Passage of this legislation would permit supplemental carriers to fly, for all practical purposes, scheduled service when they so desire. To state it another way, individual members of the public would be permitted to purchase a reserved seat on a flight between any two points the supplemental carrier wishes to fly. Although at first blush this may not appear to be catastrophic, a close perusal of the facts will prove otherwise.

If this legislation becomes law, the supplemental carriers will naturally fly the highly profitable routes and, as usual, omit those whose money-making capabilities are in any way questionable. Moreover, they will fly those preferred routes only during the prime seasons of the year. It is most unlikely, for instance, that there would be any supplemental carriers flying from New York to London in January. The result of this "cream skimming" technique will be to drive the regularly scheduled carriers into an even more precarious financial position than presently exists and some, perhaps, into bankruptcy. It is important to realize that the ability of most scheduled carriers to fly non-profitable routes is dependent upon offsetting losses with earnings on their prime routes during peak seasons of the year.

I would urge you then to consider very carefully what the adoption of this legislation would do in the long run to the regu-

larly scheduled airline service of this country. Do not be taken in by the proposition that all Americans would be able to travel more cheaply on tours both domestic and international as is done in Europe. As a result of this type of flying authority in Europe, scheduled service is 50-100% more costly than similar U.S. service. In addition, the service is not nearly as frequent or reliable or extensive. Even so, the only way scheduled service is possible in Europe under this system is because most of the scheduled airlines operate in controlled pools.

Senator, there is far more at stake than an increase in low cost air transportation. I strongly urge you to oppose this legislation.

Sincerely,

F. C. WISER, Jr.

U.S. SENATE,

COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE,

Washington, D.C., Sept. 21, 1973.

Mr. F. C. WISER, Jr.,
President, Trans World Airlines,
New York, N.Y.

DEAR MR. WISER: This will acknowledge your letter of September 13 regarding S. 1739.

I am deeply disappointed by the kind of tactics your letter represents because it implies that I, as a sponsor of and the manager for the bill, do not have any concern for a strong, healthy scheduled airline industry. As the president of one of the largest airlines you should know that is not true.

I am amazed at how the scheduled airlines continue to compete vigorously over the twenty percent or so of Americans who can afford to use air transportation but ignore the other eighty percent whose economic means presently make them unable to take advantage of air travel. I am interested in the development of an air transport system that can meet the needs and the economic realities of most Americans—and the marvelous technology of high performance, high density aircraft coupled with modern regulations makes that possible.

Eliminating outmoded and antiquated restrictions will make it possible for most American families to take advantage of vacations by air at a fraction of the present cost and will create a vast new market for air travel that has never even been explored much less tapped by the airline industry. With the tremendous business and financial opportunity such a system offers, it is difficult to comprehend how you continue to fight for the status quo.

As the price goes down, more people will fly. People who would not have flown at higher fares. The air service experience between North America and Europe over the past five years seems to offer concrete evidence in support of this proposition. And I do not believe the scheduled airlines have seen their traffic and passengers diverted to the supplementals.

The figures show that as charter transportation has flourished in the market, scheduled service has also grown at a vigorous rate; a rate far better than the domestic growth within the United States.

The increasing availability of low-cost charters in the market has stimulated new business, it has put more people into the air and the traffic growth of both scheduled and supplemental carriers has been robust. The scheduled airline marketing people have not lost sight of this fact either, I note that your major competitor's charter business over the North Atlantic has increased over 60 percent in 1973. During hearings on this bill I repeatedly asked the scheduled airlines to provide data or statistics to back up the claim that scheduled service would be imperiled by liberalized ITC operations. You may not know that not one shred of evidence was presented to support the allegations. I suspect that none exists.

With these facts in mind, I am troubled by the zeal and vehemence with which you