

UNITED STATES



OF AMERICA

*U.S. Congress.*

# Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 93<sup>d</sup> CONGRESS  
FIRST SESSION

VOLUME 119—PART 9

APRIL 3, 1973 TO APRIL 11, 1973

(PAGES 10643 TO 12002)

7. The Department of Defense should strive vigorously to eliminate unnecessary duplication not only in weapon systems but also in its own activities.

As Chairman of the Research and Development Subcommittee, I promise you that I will continue to examine the major weapon systems developments in as much detail as time and the availability of experienced staff will permit. And I can also promise you that the recommendations which the Subcommittee will make will reflect the overriding principle of providing the most modern equipment that we can afford for the use of our fighting men if and when the need should arise.

Thank you very much for inviting me to spend this time with you.

### VETERANS: ALSO PRISONERS OF WAR

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, we have all watched with relief and joy the final return of all our prisoners of war from Indochina. But even as we have paid just tribute to these men, and have recognize the terrible burden they and their families have carried for so many years, too many Americans are forgetting the burden and sacrifice that all our men—the some 6 million Vietnam veterans—have paid and who also have returned to find jobs, recover from wounds, and rebuild their lives.

In a very real way these men, too, are prisoners of this war. This fact, Mr. President, was raised in a painfully eloquent letter I received this week from a constituent of mine from Chelmsford, Mass. His letter forcefully reminds us all that we have yet to fulfill the debt we owe these men, our returning veterans, by providing them the benefits or opportunities which have been in the past such an important part of our national tradition.

As this young veteran, a former first lieutenant in the Army, writes:

Two years ago upon my arrival from Vietnam, there was no fanfare or celebration, just tears. I had lost a leg and all of my pride. Confinement to various hospital beds for eight long and painful months, made me a prisoner of sorts also. . . .

There I sit, unemployed, trying to get a decent job. . . .

Mr. President, this is what too many of our veterans have faced when they returned home. They have found such a tight lid on spending that there is not enough "peace dividend" to demonstrate our gratitude for those who sacrificed so much to attain that peace. Instead, at almost every turn—in employment, in treatment for narcotics addiction, in aid to education, and in disability payments—this administration has cut back on Federal assistance for those who have served their country.

Mr. President, an administration that speaks of "peace with honor" owes our veterans a debt of honor, which so far has not been paid.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the letter I received from a veteran from Chelmsford, Mass., be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

MARCH 20, 1973.

DEAR SENATOR KENNEDY: Seeing the prisoners of war arrive home fills me with emotion and happiness for the men and their families. What they were subjected to, and endured, surely makes them heroes to some degree.

Two years ago upon my arrival from Viet Nam, there was no fanfare or celebration, just tears. I had lost a leg and all of my pride. Confinement to various hospital beds for eight long and painful months made me a prisoner of sorts also. (I have never been called a hero, however.)

If we truly have fairness and equality then why weren't I and all other veterans offered jobs if we didn't want any more military service? The POW's according to the news media, have been made this offer. I can't understand why we second class vets weren't offered free lifetime passes to major league baseball games. (Bowie Kuhn—please save us as you did the POW's.) What about tax breaks and other concessions the POW's have been offered? It becomes quite easy for me and many others to look upon this situation with nothing but cynicism.

So here I sit, unemployed, trying to get a decent job, holding on to the memories of my college degree and time spent as an officer in the army that was reported to have stopped the spread of communism. Since I am not looked upon as a hero, (and don't want to be) it seems the road is a bit rougher. And, to be sure, I would much rather have a job than be angry enough to write letters to Congressmen.

As I see it the government isn't being as fair as it should.

Sincerely,

FIRST LIEUTENANT JOBE  
From Chelmsford, Mass.

### VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, one of the most disappointing votes I have observed in the Senate in a long time was the failure to override the President's veto of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 last week.

If this legislation had been approved, a maximum of 2 million of the 5 to 7 million handicapped persons needing rehabilitation services would have received them. That, at least, would have been progress.

But by sustaining the veto we have made regression, rather than progress, inevitable.

In my home State, Federal assistance has made possible an excellent vocational rehabilitation program which has served thousands of Minnesotans. Augustus Gehrke, head of the State division of vocational rehabilitation, has prepared an analysis of the effect that the veto will have on the provision of these services to the handicapped in Minnesota. I request unanimous consent to insert Mr. Gehrke's analysis in the RECORD.

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

#### IMPACT OF VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION VETO ON MINNESOTA

The short-range problems that the President's veto of the Vocational Rehabilitation Act will cause in Minnesota are obvious. The Minnesota Division of Vocational Rehabilitation would simply lose almost \$1 million (\$980,000) in federal support between now and June 30 this year. This could mean cutbacks in services to as many as 2,000 handicapped persons during the next few months.

Even if the money does become available through an override of the veto, the President's action is causing precious time to be lost. The later in the year we get the appropriation the more difficult it will be to use the money responsibly according to our agency objectives.

The long-range problems the veto causes are extremely important also, and we must not let this year's difficulties obscure the problem of next year and years following.

There are several important measures in the vetoes bill which have an important impact on the future of vocational rehabilitation in Minnesota.

#### ADVANCE FUNDING

The advance funding provision is extremely important to us because knowing how much federal money will be available to us in the coming year would give us the opportunity to plan our objectives in greater detail. The frustrating situation this year—not knowing how much money will be available to us from now until the end of the year—is a good example of the problem the advance funding provision would solve.

#### SERVICES TO THE SEVERELY DISABLED

The special provision for National Centers for Spinal Cord Injured Persons and for persons with End-Stage Renal Failure bear special importance to us in Minnesota.

Minnesota DVR is a pioneer in the area of providing vocational rehabilitation services to persons handicapped by severe kidney disease. Our work with the Hennepin County Regional Kidney Disease Center and in establishing a network of dialysis centers throughout the state has shown some successes. Persons with kidney disease have been able to maintain productive employment.

Additional support for such a project—one that is already proving itself—would be a wise use of federal dollars.

Our close association with Dr. Theodore Cole of the University of Minnesota, an acknowledged expert in the field of spinal cord injuries, has allowed us to begin planning for use of federal vocational rehabilitation money to establish a center for the spinal cord injured. The bill would make funds available to agencies and organizations having already demonstrated skill, experience and capability in providing vocational and comprehensive rehabilitation services to persons with such disabilities. It would indeed be unfortunate if we were not able to cooperate with Dr. Cole and use his expertise to help assure that persons with spinal cord injuries are able to function as independent, productive citizens of our state.

The bill's special provision for service to severely disabled persons is a much-awaited development in the field of rehabilitation. The legislation would allow for rehabilitation services to substantially improve the ability of severely handicapped persons to live independently and function normally with their families and in their communities.

Minnesota is one of few states to have already responded to the needs of the severely disabled by initiating a long-term sheltered workshop program on its own without federal money. The rehabilitation act would allow for expansion in this area as well as in the development of work activity programs for the very severely disabled. We have made a small start in the work activity area, but we need the federal funds to proceed further.

The work activity programs are for persons whose job abilities may not be readily seen, but who, with specialized support, can improve their skills and their ability to live independently. In some cases, they will be able to achieve employability—at least at the sheltered employment level.

We estimate that there are about 3,500 severely handicapped Minnesotans who could benefit from the work activity provision of this legislation. They represent just

a portion of the handicapped population of Minnesota who will suffer the long-range consequences of the President's action.

### THE BEEF ABOUT BEEF

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, we are all concerned about increasing food costs, and the high price of meat in particular. But amid the furious rhetoric, protestations and suggested solutions which have been whistling through the air lately, it might be kind of refreshing to hear from a very calm gentleman who knows quite a bit about this problem himself.

In a recent article entitled "The Beef About Beef," which traces the history of beef production in this country, Mr. Hilliard E. Miller, a Colorado cattle rancher who has been in the business for decades, gives us some insight into how we got where we are and where we should go from here.

He points out that in the 20-year period from 1952 to 1972, the price cattle-men received for live slaughter steers increased 30 percent, while average hourly wages increased 230 percent; and accordingly that an hour's wages buys a lot more steak now than it did 20 years ago. He concludes with the startling assertion—startling at least to those accustomed to relying on the Federal Government to solve all problems—that Federal intervention is not necessarily the answer.

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

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

#### THE BEEF ABOUT BEEF

(By Hilliard E. Miller, Cattle Rancher)

#### COWBOYS AND CONSUMERS

Hollywood's Indian attacks on the cowboys have provided entertainment for the nation over the years but the recent attacks, launched by the politicians, news media and consumers against the cowboys puts Hollywood's idols to shame.

The cattle industry's efforts to give the true story, of what happened to beef prices, and what the future holds, to the news media has fallen on deaf ears because high beef prices are not a popular subject with the public and the story about the future does not necessarily have a happy ending.

Playing the dual role of consumer and cattle rancher, I would like to tell the story of what happened to beef prices as truthfully and objectively as possible.

#### THE 1952-72 CYCLE—OR BACK HOME ON POVERTY FLATS

Let's try to look at the United States as one big ranch. The amount of feed and forage available for beef cattle production sets a practical limit on how many cattle can be run in this country. We call it carrying capacity.

At the close of World War II, technology brought major changes to the livestock industry.

Mechanization of farms and ranches with tractors and pickup trucks resulted in the declination of the horse and mule herds. They were slaughtered by the millions for pet foods.

The advent of margarine had a detrimental effect on the dairy industry. Of even greater impact were the genetic, nutritional and management advances that produced a cow that could give almost three times as much milk as before. Inevitably, about two thirds of our nation's dairy herd was liquidated.

New synthetic fibers made themselves known to the sheep and wool growers. The nation's sheep herds began to dwindle.

This slaughter and liquidation of millions of animals left a tremendous vacuum. There were millions of acres of grass and billions of pounds of feed left to be fed to something. Beef cattle offered a profit incentive so the long build up of the beef cattle population, to fill this vacuum, began.

Beef production increased rapidly until markets became glutted with the new supply and prices broke in half in 1952. The profit incentive was gone so liquidation of the beef cattle herds started, increasing supplies and driving prices to unbelievably low levels. Drought was a frequent visitor to our land in the 1950's forcing additional liquidation of beef cattle on an involuntary basis at distressed prices.

Supply and demand forces tried to align themselves but the profit incentive was gone so our nation's cow herd remained static, producing an overly ample supply of beef.

#### THE BIG "WEHAMMY"

Traditionally, the western ranges shipped their feeder cattle to the corn belt of Iowa, Illinois, Indiana, Ohio, Nebraska, etc. where individual farmers fattened the cattle to slaughter weights and grades.

In the late 1950's, with true Yankee ingenuity, the commercial feedlot was born. The theory was to mass fatten beef. No longer was it a matter of the farmer fattening a few cattle by feeding the grain he had produced; each commercial feedlot fattened them by the tens of thousands on the theory of making a smaller per head profit on many heads.

These mass production commercial feedlots demonstrated a gluttonous appetite for cattle to be fattened. They broke all bounds of tradition and brought in cattle from every nook and corner of the nation, not to mention untold thousands from Mexico. The dairy calf which had been slaughtered at 150 pounds for veal, and grass cattle that had been slaughtered at 600 to 900 pounds were finding their way from the feedlots to market as 1,100 to 1,200 pound fat cattle.

Thus, without materially changing the number of cattle in the nation, the commercial feedlots had materially increased the weights of the available cattle, greatly increasing the tonnage or pounds of beef available to the consumer. Once again, prices hit the down slide through the 1960's.

#### HOW MUCH IS ENOUGH?

One cannot criticize the cattle industry for not producing beef. In 1952 with a human population of about 155 million, the beef industry turned out 56 pounds per person. It was too much! Cattle prices dropped 50%. However, in 1972 with a human population of some 210 million, the industry provided 116 pounds per person. It was not enough! Prices started up. The 230% increase in consumers wages during this period and, the prosperity which the consumers were enjoying, was the one thing that brought on the high meat prices that they are fighting. Too many people had too much money to spend on the available supply of beef. So don't blame the cowman. It has been brought upon you by the blessings of prosperity.

In those twenty years from 1952 to 1972, the beef industry increased output 285%. During those twenty years live cattle sold for less than they had brought in 1948, 1949, 1950 and 1951. I am very proud to say, that before, during and after those bleak years, the cattlemen refused to take government handouts and subsidies. Instead, they stood fast, determined to eat their way out of the over supply and work out their own problems without bureaucratic magic. It was not until the spring of 1971 that live cattle prices got back up to the levels at which they had been twenty years before. Today, April 2, 1973, live slaughter steers sold for 30% more

than they brought in 1952. Would you roll back your wages to 30% more than you made 20 years ago? Do you want to pay taxes for the Federal Government to subsidize the beef industry or wouldn't you prefer to allow us to run our own business on the basis of a fair profit on our investment and our labors?

This brings the full cycle up to date, as we stand today with government imposed ceilings on beef prices and consumer boycotts.

#### FROM WHENCE ALL BLESSINGS COME

Food does not come from the super market. It comes in its many and diverse forms from agriculture through a highly complex marketing and transportation system.

Agriculture is big! Agriculture, of which beef is the largest segment, is America's largest industry. Agriculture's assets of 335 billion dollars is equal to 60% of all corporations in the United States. Agriculture generates 78 billion dollars a year to be spent on goods, services, taxes, investments and all the things that city people buy. Agriculture buys more petroleum products than any other single industry and enough rubber, every year, to put tires on 7 million cars and more electricity than all the people and industries in Chicago, Detroit, Boston, Baltimore, Houston and Washington, D.C. put together.

Yes, agriculture is big. It is a big job to feed our nation every day, not to mention food exports to many deprived nations of the world. Why shouldn't agriculture participate in the prosperity that has blessed our nation? Especially, since food, today, is still a better value than it was thirty years ago. In 1940, one hour of a factory workers wages would buy 1.8 pounds of round steak. In 1971, the same hours work would buy 2.6 pounds of round steak.

Don't forget that profit incentive, alone, keeps the wheels of agriculture turning.

#### WHAT ABOUT THE FUTURE?

The average age of the farmer-rancher, today, is 59. Our young people have left the country for the big cities. They have written off farming and ranching as a poor business. The investment is too high, the risks too great, the work too hard and the return too little. If the price structure doesn't allow for profitable operation, just who do you suppose is going to produce beef and food in the years to come? We must attract young people into the industry and we must have the profit incentive to encourage them to come back and get the job done. Otherwise, there will be no beef at any price.

#### WHAT ABOUT INCREASES IN PRODUCTION?

Let's go back to the concept that our nation is one big ranch. Given the profit incentive, there is definitely room for expansion of beef production. If the cotton farmer or corn farmer sees more profit in raising beef, he will switch to beef, thereby, increasing production. Technological and improved management techniques will also increase production. But, a big bulge in the production of beef such as occurred during the last twenty years is not in the cards. Every year, some 2 million acres of prime farm and ranch land is covered up with new freeways and city expansion. The wide open frontier is long since fenced and gone. There is no vacuum left from the slaughter of the horse, mule, sheep and dairy herds. Everything that will make choice beef is being fed to heavier weights so there is little or no additional tonnage to be expected from that source.

The simple, plain, unadulterated fact is that with an expanding human population demanding 115 to 120 pounds of beef per person, there is not enough beef to go around at cheap prices. Furthermore, regardless of what the commentators and politicians tell you, this situation is not going to change over night.