

Memo of the Month

OO-73 (Rev. 1-65)

ILLINOIS DEPARTMENT OF LABOR
BUREAU OF EMPLOYMENT SECURITY

MEMORANDUM

Date: April 30, 1971

To: David Gassman
Statistician II

Office:

From: Benjamin Greenstein, Chief
Research and Statistics

Office:

Subject: Hazardous Use of Coffee Pot

The afternoon of April 29, while Mr. Arthur Haverly was on vacation, an electric coffee pot was plugged in in his office and left unattended. It spread noxious fumes through the office and scorched a table belonging to the State.

You admitted that you plugged in that coffee pot and that you did it, although Mr. Haverly had told you that I had requested that it should not be done due to previous adverse experience. When I asked you why you plugged in that coffee pot, although I had requested that it should not be done, you stated that you did not take it that seriously.

I may note also that Mr. Haverly informed me the previous day that he had not authorized you to connect the coffee pot in his office.

The following facts, therefore, emerge:

1. You had used your supervisor's office for cooking coffee without his authorization.
2. You did so, although you knew that I had requested that it should not be done.
3. You had left the coffee pot unattended. For that matter, there may have been a conflict between performing agency work and attending to the coffee pot.
4. You created a fire hazard for your fellow workers and subjected them to noxious fumes.
5. When I asked you why you plugged in the coffee pot in spite of my request to the contrary, you stated that you did not take it that seriously. This is a rejection of supervision.
6. Your disregard of my authority has resulted in discomfort to your fellow workers and damage to State property.
7. On April 30, the day following the above actions and conversation, at 8:25 in the morning, I noted that you had again plugged in the coffee pot. When I pointed out that you were aware that I had asked you not to plug it in, you replied that it is not 8:30 yet. I then told you that I am in charge of the section, even though it is not 8:30 yet.

What should be done with respect to your actions, as specified above, is under consideration. In the meantime you are emphatically requested not to repeat the hazard you created by plugging in the coffee pot.

Benjamin Greenstein
BENJAMIN GREENSTEIN, Chief
Research and Statistics

How Much Did You Give Last Year?

by Walter Shapiro

For all those who have chafed at the way Richard Nixon has tried to embrace small-town pieties it was the ultimate vindication. Buried amid the financial disclosures that marked the high point of Operation Candor was the revelation that this presidential apostle of voluntarism had contributed a grand total of \$295 to charity in 1972.

The reaction was swift and predictable. Art Buchwald had an apochryphal cab driver declaring, "From now on, when someone hits me for a donation, I'll just say I'm budgeted for charity at \$295, the same as the President of the U. S." Mary McGrory commented archly, "For someone who consistently urged that private charities should take the lead in helping the unfortunate, he set a rather miserable example." But it took an anonymous headline-writer for *The*

Philadelphia Inquirer to reduce the issue to its bare essentials: "Nixon Income: \$268,777—For Charity: \$295."

To counter this image of a presidential Scrooge, the White House made a major effort to point out that Nixon had donated \$13,000 to charity in his first three years in office. But what they neglected to mention was that this \$13,000 represented only slightly more than one per cent of the President's income. Moreover, Nixon, like most Americans, displayed a rather extreme reluctance to give directly to the poor. Instead, the bulk of the President's tax-exempt contributions went to such well-heeled institutions as organized religion, with \$4,500 alone going to Billy Graham's traveling salvation show, presumably to help defray the expenses of renting such temples of the faith as Shea Stadium. The other religious donations emanating from the White House were so ecumenical

Walter Shapiro is an editor of The Washington Monthly.