

The  
Economist

## Letters to the editor

Dec 5th 2015 | From the print edition

Letters are welcome via e-mail to [letters@economist.com](mailto:letters@economist.com) (mailto:letters@economist.com)

### Delivering the goods

“[How to lose \\$5 billion](http://www.economist.com/news/united-states/21678794-united-states-postal-service-has-more-troubles-long-queues-how-lose-5-billion) (http://www.economist.com/news/united-states/21678794-united-states-postal-service-has-more-troubles-long-queues-how-lose-5-billion) ” (November 21st) painted an unduly negative picture of the United States Postal Service’s finances. For example, you didn’t mention that the USPS made a \$1.2 billion operating profit in the 2015 fiscal year, the second consecutive year in which revenue earned from delivering the mail has exceeded the costs of delivery by more than \$1 billion. The combined operating profit over the past three years is \$2.9 billion. Income from delivering letters has stabilised, but rocketed from package deliveries, driven by the rise of online shopping. Moreover, much of the criticism of the postal service in your article came from an anti-tax group, which is curious, since the USPS is not funded by taxpayers.



Also remember that Congress made the postal service pre-fund 75 years’ worth of future retirement health-benefits in advance. No other American entity, public or private, is required to pre-fund even one year. That \$5.6 billion annual charge accounts for the “red ink”. If Congress fixes this fiasco, the USPS can continue to provide Americans and their businesses with the industrial world’s most-affordable delivery network.

FREDRIC ROLANDO

President

National Association of Letter Carriers

Washington, DC