

returned home in August to start practice. The two have worked out a scheme whereby one day a week they take the other's office calls. That allows them to get one day all to themselves.

Smith has his office in what was an old drugstore across the street from the Court-house. He has divided the gunbarrel-shaped space into a reception room, office, drug room, examination room and delivery room. He delivers babies at homes, but prefers to have expectant mothers come to his office where he has all necessary equipment, including oxygen. He keeps them 10 to 12 hours after the delivery and sends them home in an ambulance.

Beattyville has no pharmacist, so Smith has to dispense his own pills and medicines. Neither is there an X-ray machine in town, although he hopes to install one soon.

Besides his unusual doctoring experiences, Smith has the rather unique distinction of having served as an officer in two different branches of the Navy within a five-year period.

After being graduated from the University of Kentucky in 1942, the 30-year-old Smith went into the Navy as a line officer. Upon his discharge, he entered medical school and was graduated in 1949. Then, following his intern work, along came the war in Korea and he volunteered to go back into the Navy, this time as a medical officer. He served for more than a year in Louisville at the recruiting station.

His second discharge came July 6, 1951. He opened his office 10 days later.

In the nearly seven years since the Rural Medical Fund was set up, 64 students have received \$100,450 in financial help. Twelve of those students, including Smith, have served at least one year in rural areas. Nine are still there. Of the three who left the rural field, one is in the Army, one is sick and one moved to another state.

Besides Smith, other fund-helped doctors with at least one year in rural practice are O. C. Cooper, Wickliffe; Carson E. Crabtree, Buffalo; Oscar A. Cull, Corinth; William G. Edds, Calhoun; Clyde J. Nichols, Clarkson; Benjamin C. Stigall, Livermore; William L. Taylor, Guthrie, and Loman C. Trover, Earlington.

Six other doctors who were helped by the fund completed their internship in July and now are practicing in the country.

"Rural practice gets next to a fellow," John Smith says. "You have to make a lot of changes from what they say in the books—you have to be down-to-earth and forget all about dignity and professional manners at times.

"But there's an awful lot of satisfaction in serving people who really need help."

Which pretty nearly describes the country doctor.

TRIBUTE TO WILLIAM BENJAMIN
GOULD IV

HON. ZOE LOFGREN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 7, 2001

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Speaker, I wish today to recognize the accomplishments of William Benjamin Gould IV, the Charles A. Beardsley Professor of Law at Stanford Law School. Professor Gould was Chairman of the National Labor Relations Board from 1994–1998. While awarding William Gould his fifth honorary doctorate, the Rutgers University President remarked: "perhaps more than any other living

American . . . [he has] contributed to the analysis, the practice, and the transformation of labor law and labor relations."

William Gould has been a member of the National Academy of Arbitration since 1970, and has arbitrated and mediated more than 200 labor disputes, including the 1989 wage dispute between the Detroit Federation of Teachers and the Board of Education of that city, as well as the 1992 and 1993 salary disputes between the Major League Baseball Players Association and the Major League Baseball Player Relations Committee. William Gould was named in *Ebony Magazine's* "100+ Most Influential Black Americans" List for 1996, 1997 and 1998. He is a member of the Stanford University John S. Knight Journalism Fellows Program Committee, and the Rand Institute Board of Overseers.

I commend to my colleagues the following article by Professor Gould, which appeared in the *San Francisco Chronicle* on January 17, 2001.

[From the *San Francisco Chronicle*, Jan. 17, 2001]

"BORKING"—THEN AND NOW
(By William B. Gould IV)

When Bill Clinton was inaugurated as president in January 1993, most Republicans in Congress commenced a sustained drive against the legitimacy of his election, notwithstanding the undisputed nature of his victory.

Except for the gays-in-the-military controversy, the most immediate conflicts related to confirmation of his nominees at the Cabinet and subcabinet levels.

"Nannygate" doomed Zoe Baird, his first choice for attorney general, but soon ideas and political philosophy were to affect the debate about Lani Guinier (whose Justice Department nomination as assistant attorney general in charge of the civil rights division was withdrawn), and Jocelyn Elders (who was confirmed as surgeon general).

Both were African American. I was the third of Clinton's black subcabinet early selections (for chairman of the National Labor Relations Board), and, although confirmed, I attracted the largest number of senatorial "no" votes of any administration appointee during that time.

Bill Lann Lee, a Chinese American lawyer from California, was put forward for assistant attorney general, but his nomination was stymied. He was forced to serve on an acting basis, without Senate confirmation.

Opposition to Clinton nominees was said by some to be Republican vengeance for the Senate's 1987 rejection of Robert Bork for the U.S. Supreme Court. The press created a verb, "Borked." The term is now attached to the pending nominations of John Ashcroft for attorney general, Gale Norton for secretary of the interior, and the now-withdrawn candidacy of Linda Chavez for secretary of labor.

The Borking of Clinton nominees differs from the Borking of the Bush triumvirate.

Formal debate about my nomination, for instance, focused on my proposals to strengthen existing labor law. This contrasts with Chavez, who opposes minimum wage, family leave and affirmative action legislation. The contention was that when I would adjudicate labor-management disputes, I would use my reform proposals aimed at fortifying the law.

Bork was attacked primarily because he had opposed most civil rights legislation affecting public accommodations and employment. The Senate rejected him because he was outside the mainstream in the race arena and also opposed the Supreme Court's *Roe vs. Wade* decision.

Ashcroft and Norton, like Senate Majority Leader Trent Lott, R-Miss., extol the virtues of the Confederacy and lament its defeat, which spelled slavery's extinction. As Missouri's attorney general, Ashcroft fought desegregation orders in that state. He was a vigorous opponent of affirmative action. As senator, he single handedly scuttled the nomination of a black Missouri judge to the federal bench—an act which President Clinton properly denounced as "disgraceful," illustrating the unequal treatment of minority and women nominees.

As senator, Ashcroft decried the cherished American principle of separation of church and state, railed against common-sense gun control legislation and, like Bork, denounced *Roe vs. Wade*. Thus, like Bork, the question is whether he can faithfully enforce and promote laws to which is so deeply opposed.

All of this is in sharp contrast to the three of us Clinton nominees whose sin was fidelity to existing law. In 1993, today's supporters of Ashcroft derailed the nomination of those of us who supported the law. Now they support those who would radically transform it.

Some deference to a new president's nomination is appropriate. This was not followed in the Clinton era. As a result, the president was obliged to nominate middle-of-the-road and sometimes downright innocuous judicial candidates and to accept Republican selections for his own administrative agencies.

No one's interests are served if the Democrats now wreak havoc for Bush in response to the Borking visited upon Clinton. But elected representatives have the right and duty to both scrutinize and reject nominees who are out of the mainstream and who would disturb precedent in the absence of a mandate. A half-million Gore plurality in the voting and the murkiness of the Florida ballot hardly supply a mandate for George W. Bush.

WASTEFUL GOVERNMENT
SPENDING

HON. JOHN J. DUNCAN, JR.

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 7, 2001

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, I believe that one of the most serious problems facing our country today is wasteful government spending. Each year our government spends billions of taxpayer dollars on things that are ineffective and simply unnecessary.

I have heard many stories from federal employees about the pressure to spend all of the money they have been appropriated for a given fiscal year. Agency administrators know that if they have a surplus at the end of the fiscal year, it is likely that their budgets will be cut the following year.

That is why I have decided to introduce legislation to address this problem. This bill will allow government agencies to keep half of any unspent administrative funds. This money can then be used to pay for employee bonuses. The remaining half would be returned to the Treasury for the purpose of reducing the national debt.

My bill rewards fiscal responsibility by giving employees a direct benefit for saving taxpayer dollars. At the same time, it will address one of the biggest problems facing our Country—the national debt. I think this is an important step toward restoring the financial security of our Nation.