

U.S. Congress.
UNITED STATES



OF AMERICA

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 92^d CONGRESS
SECOND SESSION

VOLUME 118—PART 6

MARCH 2, 1972 TO MARCH 9, 1972

(PAGES 6497 TO 7960)

tionary" and saying that "Bell's culpability is virtually absolute," little attention has been paid to it. Such small editorial comment as has been made seems to have been jocular and mocking, words written by men who haven't read it and seen the documentation showing that the nation's largest, single employer of women—more than 400,000—believes that females should get 60 per cent pay for a full day's work. According to the commission, that's the figure: women who constitute more than half of the System's operating workers, make 60 per cent of the average wage of male employees.

Through the Bell System's elaborate recruiting, hiring and promotion practices, women are trapped and segregated into "the most stifling and repetitive jobs. Their compensation is so meager (average maximum annual wage is \$6,114 for beginners) as to make them doubt their own self worth. Their prospects for promotion are in the distant future, if at all."

Emma Nutt did get promoted—to chief operator in 1883, and that's about as far as women get today. They can make it up to the bottom level of management, but only in sexually segregated departments like operator or sales representative. The latter is the woman who takes your order for a new phone. The Bell people counter by saying that there are a large number of women in management but the commission points out that they count secretaries as managerial personnel. The real situation is revealed by a citation from an AT&T task force report on women in management quoted by the commission: "The chance that a given male first level manager will reach district level sometime in his career is about one in four or five. For an incumbent female first level manager, the odds become less than one in 300."

The commission tells us that one of the ways that phone company women are kept barefoot and humble is by preventing—and this is Bell's language in an AT&T document quoted by the Commission—the "contamination of male job classifications by females." The higher paying jobs like repairmen and phone installers are reserved for men. There's no reason for this because Bell requires no previous training or experience for any of its entry level job classification. They teach all their own people so that prior work as an electrician, for instance, doesn't give you any leg up.

Some Bell companies, but not all, use protective health legislation as a ruse for not contaminating their male jobs with women. The commission argues, however, that these laws seldom apply to telephone work and that usually wherever they are challenged, they fail.

Another way to keep the wages down is to keep the men from contaminating the female job categories. Now, since it's highly unlikely that working as an operator would impair a man's health, the phone people have had to come up with other reasons for sexually segregating their workers: "Many times operators' knees, elbows and arms brush their neighbors' bodies. To have men and women—even those with the best intentions and goodwill—working side by side under these conditions would create an intolerable situation."

You can get a copy of this report for free by writing the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, AT&T Task Force, 1800 G St. NW, Washington, D.C. Besides phone company employees, the husbands of women who work for the company ought to be interested. After all, the dough their wives don't make—estimated at almost a billion dollars a year—isn't going into that joint account, and, certainly, if Emma Nutt's great-great-granddaughter is around, she ought to read it before she goes into the family business.

EXCERPTS FROM A FEMINIST MANIFESTO (By Wilma Scott Heide, President, National Organization for Women)

NOW, let me share with you some facts and understandings about employment of women. 80% of the functional or absolute illiterates in this country are females. Twice as many girls as boys suffer from malnutrition, the greatest cause of brain damage to children. Unemployment and under-employment among women and girls of every race is greater than unemployment and under-employment among men and boys of every race and that doesn't even count the women and girls who have given up finding even the low-paying, generally deadend jobs still reserved for females. These are facts from the sexist U.S. Labor Department's and U.S. Commerce Department's own data and elsewhere. The President's Task Force on Women's Rights and Responsibilities Report called: "A Matter of Simple Justice" notes: "The testimony and published data received by the Task Force indicate that long-established policies of Federal agencies base their efforts to alleviate poverty and discrimination on the assumption that race discrimination is more inflammatory than sex discrimination."

"Sex bias takes a greater economic toll than racial bias. The median earnings of white men employed year-round full-time is \$7,396, of Negro men \$4,777, of white women \$4,279, of Negro women \$3,194. Women with some college education both white and Negro, earn less than Negro men with 8 years of education."

Women are the economic support of 1,723,000 impoverished families, Negro males are the economic support of 820,000 families in poverty. One quarter of all families dependent on white women are in poverty; more than one half of families dependent on Negro women are in poverty. Less than one quarter of those families dependent on Negro men are in poverty. Seven percent of those dependent on white men are impoverished. The Women's "Action" Program report from the U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare dated January, 1972 notes on page 86 that, according to the 1970 census, the median income of women 65 and over is less than half (\$1,397) the median income of men of this group (\$2,828). Aged single women and widows are among those with the lowest income position; half the females 65 and over, living alone or with nonrelatives, had income below the poverty level in 1970, and another 13% were considered "near-poor." These are the women living in gentile and not so gentile poverty.

Anywhere from 65 to 85% of the people requiring public assistance (which is their right) and referred to by degrading connotation of "on welfare" are women and their dependent children. First, everyone of us is on public welfare, we just don't call it that. Public transportation including airlines, public higher education, public parks, public highways, public tax benefits, oil depletion allowances are all forms of public welfare. It is grossly insensitive to further insult those poor who need public assistance for survival and can't even afford access to benefits of other forms of public welfare.

THE PRESIDENT'S VISIT TO CHINA

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, President Nixon's trip to China is to have far-reaching consequences on the future of American foreign policy. It is still early

¹ U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census: CPR-60, No. 60, Table 11 and Table 4 in Task Force Report, April, 1970 p. 18.

to judge its impact but I recommend to the Senate a recent analysis by Charles Bailey, Washington bureau chief of the Minneapolis Tribune.

Mr. Bailey, who accompanied the President on his journey, presents a thoughtful perspective on this historic development.

I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Bailey's article be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the Minneapolis Tribune, Feb. 29, 1972]

UNITED STATES APPARENTLY PAID BIG PRICE FOR CHINA AGREEMENT

(By Charles W. Bailey)

ANCHORAGE, ALASKA.—A first reading of the scorecard on President Nixon's encounter with the leaders of Communist China suggests that the American leader gave a lot—and that how much he got in return remains to be seen.

It is impossible to measure at this point the long-range impact of Mr. Nixon's trip on either U.S.-China relations or the larger world political balance. That kind of assessment, as the President said before he went to Peking, will require months and even years.

In the short run, however, Mr. Nixon appears to have paid a substantial price for a limited number of concessions by Mao Tse-tung and Chou En-lai.

On the plus side, the President does come home with the one specific thing he has said all along he wanted: Chinese agreement to establish continuing diplomatic contact, including periodic trips to Peking by high-level officials, and a continuing diplomatic "contact point" for routine business.

In addition, Chou agreed to abandon his previously adamant ban on trade with the United States. While Chinese-American trade won't amount to much in dollar terms in the foreseeable future, the political implications of even a modest commerce are considerable—particularly in China, where Mao has made economic self-sufficiency a cardinal political virtue.

Another significant, if limited, Chinese move was Chou's agreement to set up a program of cultural exchanges—involving reciprocal visits by journalists, scientists, performing artists and others.

Those who accompanied the President to China disagreed on many things, but almost all came away feeling that the mere presence of the Americans had a substantial impact inside China. This was not merely a matter of personal contacts—though even the most skeptical were impressed by the warmth and sincerity of Chinese of all sorts, especially in cosmopolitan Shanghai.

More important, perhaps, is the fact that every Chinese citizen got a loud and clear signal—thanks to the efficient Communist propaganda apparatus—that their leaders from Mao on down regarded increased contact with the U.S. government as a good thing.

But when all of this is said, the other side of the balance sheet remains to be read, and it still weighs heavily. In effect, Mr. Nixon gave Chou everything the Chinese premier could reasonably have expected to extract from him on the one issue Chou regards as the most important between the two nations—the status of Formosa.

The President did not renounce the long-standing U.S. treaty commitment to defend if necessary Chiang Kai-shek's island fortress, nor did he, at least publicly, agree to sever his diplomatic ties with Taiwan, but as a

practical matter he seemed to come close to doing something very much like that.

He pledged the eventual removal of all U.S. military forces from the island—something Chou has vehemently demanded—and he publicly espoused Peking's claim that Taiwan is a province of China—a statement that appeared to rule out any future American support for an independent Taiwan.

A gradual American withdrawal from support of Taiwan has been inevitable since Mr. Nixon began his long courtship of Peking three years ago. But Sunday's Nixon-Chou statement, with its explicit abandonment of the "one-China, one-Taiwan" policy that the United States pushed at the United Nations vote last fall, seems likely to signal a much more abrupt abandonment of Chiang than Mr. Nixon would have liked.

Unmentioned by the communique was the matter of Americans now being held in prison by the Chinese. Mr. Nixon is known however, to have brought up the matter with Chou. If the Chinese decide to release one or more of the U.S. prisoners, that would be another entry on the plus side of the meeting ledger for the United States.

All of this plus-and-minus exercise, however, leaves the root questions raised by Mr. Nixon's visit to China unanswered. Those answers can only come over a long period of time; they will depend much more on subsequent events than on what Mr. Nixon and Chou said to each other; and they will be affected by the domestic Chinese political struggle which even during this past week of ceremony was still visible to the careful eye.

Chou was clearly in charge in Peking, but it was equally clear, from the propaganda display given Mr. Nixon's brief call on Mao, that Chou cannot move closer to the United States without Mao's explicit approval.

Even with that there were signals of possible dissent, Chang Chunchao, a leader of the Communist party's left wing and the top man in Shanghai, pointedly suggested in his banquet toast Sunday that China would continue "along the road of maintaining independence and keeping the initiative in our hands and relying on our own efforts." Chou, with his long record of survival in the tortuous corridors of Chinese Communist power, could hardly fail to get the message.

Chou, Mao and most other top members of the current Chinese ruling group are old men. For all his intellectual force and sprightliness of demeanor, Chou is obviously physically frail at 73, and neither Mr. Nixon nor anyone else either in Washington or Peking can be sure who will be next at the top in China—or what he will do when he gets there.

Thus the new road which Richard Nixon and Chou En-lai started to travel last week is almost uncharted, by circumstance if not by intention, and whether the Shanghai statement will lead on to true long-range rapprochement is very much in question.

For all its politically self-serving hyperbole, Mr. Nixon's statement Sunday that "this was the week that changed the world" is probably true. The problem is that at this point neither he nor the rest of the world can tell just where we go from here.

RULES FOR LETTERS

Mr. SCHWEIKER. Mr. President, the Reading, Pa., Sunday Eagle has long performed a valuable public service by periodically urging its readers to write to their elected officials. Each Sunday the Eagle prints the names and addresses of the U.S. Senators, Representatives, and State legislators who represent the people of Berks County and vicinity.

Recently, the Eagle expanded on this worthwhile feature by printing "Rules

for Letters," a list of guidelines to help its readers write more effective letters to their legislators. These guidelines urge constituents to "be reasonable," to include exact return addresses, and to let their legislators know when they are pleased with their votes on an issue.

In my office, personal responses to mail from the people of my State is a No. 1 priority, as I know it is in the offices of other Senators. I believe the Reading Eagle's "Rules for Letters" would be of great interest to Senators and their constituents; therefore, I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the RECORD.

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

RULES FOR LETTERS

Each Sunday, the Eagle encourages its readers to communicate with their representatives in Congress in Washington and the General Assembly in Harrisburg with publication of the correct address to which such letters should be addressed.

Experience also has shown that letters are more effective if they incorporate certain courtesies. Here are guidelines as compiled by the National Assn. of Mutual Insurance Agents:

1. Write on your personal or business letterhead, if possible and sign your name over your typed signature at the end of your message.
2. Be sure your exact return address is on the letter, not just the envelope. Envelopes sometimes get thrown away before the letter is answered.
3. Identify your subject, clearly. State the name of the piece of legislation you're writing about. Give the House or Senate bill number, if you know it.
4. State your reason for writing. Your personal experience is your best supporting evidence. Explain how the issue will affect you, your family, your business—or what effect it could have on your state or community.
5. Avoid stereotyped phrases and sentences that give the appearance of "form" letters. They tend to identify your message as part of an organized pressure campaign—and produce little or no impact.
6. Be reasonable. Don't ask for the impossible. Don't threaten. Don't say, "I'll never vote for you unless you do such and such." Your congressman and assemblymen probably wouldn't want a vote of that kind, anyway.
7. After you've told your legislator where you stand, ask him to state his position in his reply. As his constituent, you're entitled to know.
8. Timing is important. Begin to encourage approval or disapproval of a bill or to recommend that it be revised favorably, while it still is in committee. Your legislators can be more responsive to an appeal at that time than after the bill already has been approved by the committee.
9. If your legislator pleases you with his vote on an issue, thank him. Everyone appreciates a complimentary letter and remembers it. National and state legislators are no exception.

THE EEOC CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, yesterday the Senate passed, by a vote of 62 to 10 the conference report (No. 92-681) for the Equal Employment Opportunity Act of 1972. The report represents substantially the same bill which finally passed the Senate on February 22, by a vote of 73 to 16 after 5 weeks of spirited

floor debate. As a long-time proponent of equitable equal employment enforcement and as an active participant in the issue this Congress since the introduction of my original bill, S. 2617, on September 30, 1971, I am most happy to be able to endorse a bill which combines strong enforcement machinery against job discrimination on the basis of race, color, sex, religion, or national origin with due process protections afforded to the respondent employers, labor organizations, and employment agencies. In what is now history, the Senate, after several hesitations, wisely decided that our Federal court system provided the best enforcement machinery available. In so doing, the Senate rejected a Commission-held cease-and-desist mechanism which I validly characterized as promoting "star chamber" tactics and opted instead for the impartial deliberation of a lifetime-tenured Federal judge guided by judicial precedent. Once this major decision was made and the rights of all parties to the dispute thus assured of protection, the remaining issues were more easily resolved. Because this bill does contain the Federal court enforcement procedure which I labored so long and hard for, despite minor irritations with the bill, I wholeheartedly support it as a fair, expedient, and necessary piece of legislation.

Additionally, I am pleased that several other minor contributions I made to the legislation survived conference, thus making the process somewhat fairer and more efficacious. Together with the Senator from California (Mr. CRANSTON), I authored an amendment in committee executive session which for the first time provided Federal court redress of Federal Government employees' employment grievances. This amendment prevailed, thus providing the 2.6 million employees of the Nation's single largest employer—the Federal Government—with the benefits of a completely impartial determination of their alleged job discrimination allegations.

Although the actual procedure was not adopted in toto, the report contains the realization of the need for and the concept of expedited court hearings similar to language contained in my amendments 871 and 884. The impaneling of a three-judge circuit court in cases of "general public importance" was discarded by the conference but equal employment cases were generally acknowledged as important enough to deserve an expedited district court hearing at the earliest practicable date. This priority serves to overcome Federal court backlogs which might have frustrated the quick determination of job discrimination disputes.

To reduce the Commission's workload, eliminate duplication of effort, and to recognize the substantial efforts of State fair employment practice commissions, I introduced in committee an amendment which requires the Commission, in determining whether reasonable cause exists to file a charge, to accord substantial weight to final State commission determinations. Fortunately this language prevailed in conference so that the Commission will now not waste its efforts on disposed of State cases.