EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

TRIBUTE TO THOMAS C. RUPERT

HON. GLENN M. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 3, 1972

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, when the Municipal Treasurers Association of the United States convenes in Milwaukee, Wis., on August 14, an energetic, dynamic, young man whom I am proud to call my friend, Tom Rupert of Torrance, Calif., will be presiding.

I would like to take this opportunity to trace the career of Mr. Rupert which led to his selection as president of this organization.

As city treasurer for the city of Torrance for the past 8 years, Tom Rupert has earned more than $1.5 million for the taxpayers of that community. However, only through long years of training and practical experience as a businessman did Mr. Rupert learn the money management techniques that made those earnings possible.

The national and international recognition and honors for Mr. Rupert have been high. Three years ago, he was among the finalists considered for appointment as Treasurer of the United States. The nationwide support and endorsement, from both Democrats and Republicans in positions of national importance, reflect the trust and confidence he has earned through his years of service.

The State of California, through a State assembly resolution, honored Tom Rupert with a citation commending him for his outstanding record as city treasurer.

On the international level, the nation of Guatemala awarded Mr. Rupert the Honorary Diploma de Guatemala for People-to-People Program Service in recognition of his work with the Torrance sister city committee. Guatemala City, Guatemala, is a sister city of Torrance.

In addition, Tom was selected by the International Lions Club as Outstanding New Lion of the Year in 1961.

Born in Akron, Ohio, in 1933, Tom Rupert began his elementary education in that city. However being the son of an Army master sergeant resulted in frequent moves for the family.

Consequently, his school record traces his life from Akron, Ohio, to Anniston, Ala., and the California cities of Watsonville, San Jose, and Redlands.

By May 1947, Tom was enrolled in Dana Junior High School in San Pedro, Calif., and a year later, in San Pedro High School. In 1949, the family again moved, this time to Long Beach, where he enrolled in Jordan High School, from which he graduated in February 1950.

For Mr. Rupert, these frequent moves emphasized the value of a strong family relationship, a lesson he put into practice a year later when he married his high school sweetheart, Lolita Marie Moody.

The Ruperts now have two fine children, Tom, Jr., 18, who is enrolled at Dominguez Hills State College, and Terrie, 17, who is a student at Torrance High School.

In 1953, during the Korean war, Mr. Rupert enlisted in the U.S. Air Force, where he served as an intercept controller and operations specialist, and attained the rank of staff sergeant before being honorably discharged in December 1956.

During his service career, Tom continued his education by completing enough courses through the U.S. Armed Forces Institute to complete his college level general education requirements.

Four years after returning to civilian life, Tom established his own company which had branch offices in Torrance, Hermosa Beach, and El Segundo.

In July 1964, Mr. Rupert sought new vistas and became city treasurer of Torrance. He was reelected in 1966—polling 90 percent of the votes. In 1970, Tom was unopposed for the position, thus proving public confidence in his stewardship.

Since becoming city treasurer, he has applied modern management techniques to the investment of city funds. As a result, Torrance now averages more than $50,000 per month from the investment program, while, at the same time, providing absolute security for invested dollars.

These new revenues have given Torrance taxpayers the equivalent of a 39-cent-per-$100 assessed valuation reduction in city property taxes.

In addition, Tom Rupert has managed the city's bond issues and assessment districts to assure the greatest economies by obtaining the lowest interest rates from competent bidders.

In order to establish this outstanding record as city treasurer, he has continued his professional career by taking appropriate courses in treasury cash management.

Considered an expert in his profession, Tom is the author of a text entitled "Investment Equals Profit: A Handbook for the Investment of Public Funds," which has become the standard reference for a large number of city treasurers and municipal finance officers in the United States.

Other than serving as the treasurer of Torrance and as the president of the Municipal Treasurers Association of the United States, Mr. Rupert is the legislative chairman of the California Municipal Treasurers Association, a member of the Financial Administration Committee of the League of California Cities, and a member of the Municipal Finance Officers Association of the United States and Canada.

In addition, the city council of Torrance appointed Tom Rupert to represent their interests at the State capital in Sacramento as the legislative advocate for their city.

Mr. Rupert's activities, however, are not limited to his professional field. He is past president of the Lutheran Laymen's League, past president of the Torrance National Little League, past president and director of the West Torrance Lions Club, and committee chairman of the Torrance Chamber of Commerce.

He is also a member of the Torrance YMCA, the Torrance High School PTA, and the South Bay Athletic Club.

An active sportsman, Tom enjoys fishing, boating, game hunting, and spectator sports.

His greatest asset, Mr. Speaker, is his lovely and gracious wife, Lolita, who has been recognized in her own right in the area of hospital volunteer service organization.

Mr. Speaker, Tom Rupert will step down as president of the Municipal Treasurers Association on August 16 and relinquish the reins of this organization.

I would like to commend Tom Rupert for his outstanding service, not only to the citizens of Torrance and California, but to the Nation as well.

NATIONAL CONVENTION OF GOSPEL CHOIRS AND CHORUSES CELEBRATES 40TH BIRTHDAY

HON. JOHN CONYERS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 3, 1972

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, during the week of August 7, the National Convention of Gospel Choirs and Choruses will come to Washington to celebrate its 40th birthday and to honor its president and founder, Dr. Thomas A. Dorsey.

The objectives of the convention and its president are to perpetuate the gospel folk songs of black America and to train young people in the field of musical expression, Dr. Thomas A. Dorsey, whose immortal song "Precious Lord" was the last request of the late Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., is to be commended for his superlative contribution to the enrichment of contemporary black culture.

The gospel song is a contemporary religious expression of joy by the black American. Just as spirituals reflected the belief in God of an enslaved people, despite their oppression and suffering, the gospel song is the cry of a spiritually and physically liberated black soul. The gospel song emerged as a form distinct from the staid anthems, jubilees, hymns, and evangelistic songs of the black church. Dr. Dorsey's "Precious Lord" was itself an expression born of a tragic experience. It is the product of a seed sown down in sorrow for the tragic loss of his wife and child.

Thomas Dorsey wrote his music so that all the people could sing. He felt that it would help the services of the church as well as the individual. While preachers and ministers of music first opposed the new sound, fearing its "jazziness" would

disrupt the traditional liturgical mood, Dr. Dorsey's music soon revolutionized choir singing.

Despite accusations that he was trying to turn the church into a nightclub, Dr. Dorsey continued his crusade, relying largely on the help of Mrs. Sallie Martin who developed the national market by touring the country with choirs she herself had organized and trained. So great was the reception of the new gospel sound, that it has become an international form of artistic expression.

Today, another of Dr. Dorsey's dreams has become a reality. On the shores of Lake Michigan stands the 11-story Gospel Singers Plaza. It is the home and workshop of many students of the arts whose special talents and potential are encouraged through scholarships in the fields of science and art.

In this world of anxiety and conflict, music brings enrichment and peace to the soul. It is for this great contribution that I commend the National Convention of Gospel Choirs and Choruses, and hope that they will continue to bring a song to our hearts.

WASHINGTON'S SPANISH-SPEAKING POPULATION

HON. GILBERT GUDE

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 3, 1972

Mr. GUDE. Mr. Speaker, the Spanish-speaking population in the Washington metropolitan area is a growing one. One of the most severe problems faced by these people is the language barrier—a problem which has widespread ramifications in terms of employment, education, and general relations with the community. Clearly, there is a pressing need to provide for English language instruction, through the schools, the media, and local community groups.

The following WTOP editorial addresses itself directly to this issue:

[From a WTOP editorial, June 24 and 25, 1972]

HELP LATINS LOWER LANGUAGE BARRIER

One of the most troublesome cultural gaps in the Washington area is that between people who speak Spanish and those who don't.

Washington's Latin population is large and growing. Accurate figures are hard to come by, but the total is upwards of 50,000. Most are in the District, but surprising numbers can be found in the suburbs as well.

They came to this country and to Washington from many different places and for many different reasons. A large majority is likely to stay here. They cannot begin to cope with their basic difficulties until they have at least a working knowledge of English.

Although several public and private agencies are sponsoring English-language programs, the communications barrier still is very large. Recent contacts by WTOP with leaders in the Latin community indicate that instruction in English is the number one priority with most of them.

The inability to communicate contributes heavily to unemployment and to underemployment. When people can't explain themselves well, health care isn't likely to be adequate. Poor diagnosis and even wrong treatment reportedly have resulted in local clinics and hospitals. Unnecessary frictions with police occur when people don't speak the same language. Children enrolled in regular schools can't cope because of the language barrier and fall behind in all their studies.

Spreading the English language among the Spanish-speaking isn't easy. Many adults, ironically, can't attend language classes because a lack of English keeps them underemployed and forces them to work at two jobs.

We're not sure what buttons can be pushed to speed-up the learning process. The largest obligation falls on school systems in the various jurisdictions. Spanish-language programming and English-language instruction is available on various radio and TV stations in Washington, and individuals who could benefit from such programs should be helped and advised to tune them in.

Tens of thousands of people in the Washington area who speak only Spanish are having a very rough time, and their needs deserve greater attention from us all.

This was a WTOP Editorial . . . Norman Davis speaking for WTOP.

JACKSON, TENN., CELEBRATING ITS 150TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. ED JONES

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 3, 1972

Mr. JONES of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, in January of 1973, several counties will be added to my congressional district. Among these fine counties is Madison in which the city of Jackson is located. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this time to extend congratulations to this fine county and city which are now in the process of celebrating their 150th anniversary.

All Tennesseans are proud of the rapid rate of growth and expansion which Madison County and Jackson, Tenn., have experienced. This area has been an influence in development throughout the State and now faces a prosperous future which promises even further growth and development.

The Jackson Sun, a West Tennessee daily, has taken great pains in preparing a very thorough and interesting account concerning the history of Madison County and Jackson, Tenn. I would like to extend my personal compliments to the editors of this excellent newspaper, especially Mr. John Parish who directed research and the Sun State editor, Mr. Johnny Malone who directed the layout of the paper. I would also like to extend recognition to all the individuals who are responsible in any way for the publication and distribution of this paper. They have all done a fine job in helping Madison County and Jackson, Tenn., celebrate their 150th anniversary.

Mr. Speaker, I am very happy about the recent passage of the conference committee report on rural development. This is an important and significant piece of legislation and it will prove to be most beneficial to our rural communities. I would like to extend my personal thanks to the distinguished members of the committee who have worked exceptionally hard for the passage of the Rural Development Act.

I believe the vote on this bill was most significant. Since there were 339 Members voting yea and 36 Members voting nay, one can see that this piece of legislation had varied support. Not only were the rural areas interested in the passage of the Rural Development Act but the urban centers as well. Since passage of this bill will benefit both urban and rural areas alike, this accounts for the bill's wide acceptance among this great body.

By developing rural areas and making them more conducive to individuals, we are taking pressure off our urban centers where many of our rural citizens have moved due to lack of jobs and services. This bill will also be of help to cities with a population of 50,000. In all approximately 80 million out of 205 million residents in the United States will receive some help from this measure. Therefore, we can see how beneficial this piece of legislation will be.

CONGRESSMAN HOGAN'S VIEWS ON ABORTION

HON. LAWRENCE J. HOGAN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 3, 1972

Mr. HOGAN. Mr. Speaker, in my continuing efforts to stop the shocking trend toward liberalized abortion laws, I wrote an article in the Maryland Law Forum detailing some arguments against abortion, and I insert that article into the RECORD.

THE EMBATTLED MINORITY: OUT OF SIGHT, OUT OF MIND

(By Hon. LAWRENCE J. HOGAN, Member of Congress)

During the course of the 19th century, the American Medical Association asked the several states to reform their laws to prevent abortions, and, in 1859, the AMA obtained unanimous adoption of a resolution which condemned abortion at every period of gestation except as necessary for preserving the life of the mother. The reason for the resolution was stated to be the increasing frequency "of such unwarrantable destruction of human life."[1]

It's interesting that the members of the AMA in 1859 had no trouble identifying the fetus in a woman's womb as a *human* being, yet today with a century's worth of added bio-medical knowledge and the development of a science of fetology, there are some members of today's American Medical Association who would consider a human fetus, for the purposes or terminating pregnancy, as only a "cluster of cells."

I have not seen any statistics citing the numbers of abortions performed in 1859, but I wonder if the "unwarrantable destruction of human life" in that year came anywhere near the estimated 215,000 abortions which were performed in the State of New York alone in the year following the liberalization of that State's abortion statute in 1970.

To continue in this tone would cause us, however, to fall into one of two problem areas which seriously handicap a rational discussion of the abortion debate. This first area can be labeled simply "emotionalism." On the one hand, the arbortion controversy is subject to the emotionalism of what has been characterized by the pro-abortion forces

Footnotes at end of article.

as the classic Catholic, moralistic, theological view of abortion as sinful and symptomatic of a decaying society. On the other hand is the emotional argument that abortion is necessary to achieve the social good, that the world is overpopulated and abortion is a cure, and that unwanted pregnancies are a burden to the mother and to society.

The second area which hampers a forthright discussion of abortion is not so readily perceived as is the emotionalism which beclouds rationality. Here we have fallen into the 20th century trap of "specialization" of career interests that we have failed to interrelate the disciplines where such an interrelationship exists and is essential to a thorough understanding of the subject matter.

To return for a moment to my opening statement, that in 1859 the AMA was calling upon the States to pass anti-abortion legislation, if we combine the present statute and case law with our advanced knowledge in the area of fetology, it would appear that the AMA should be making a similar, and even stronger, plea to the States today. Instead, the AMA is passing resolutions to make it possible for their members to practice in accordance with the liberalized abortion laws in New York, Alaska, Hawaii, and Washington without violating the canons of the medical profession.

For purposes of this article, I have attempted to isolate the abortion question from the emotionalism and from all moral, ethical or theological perspectives and center the discussion instead on the biological and legal aspects. These parameters can best be summarized by two questions:

(1) When does life begin?

(2) Having begun, what are the legal rights of the possessor of that life?

As long ago as 1964 (which is ancient history in the rapid developments in the medico-scientific community), Professor Ashley Montagu of Columbia University said that, "The basic fact is simple: Life begins, not at birth, but at conception."[2] It was during the 1960s also, that the biogenetic community made the startling discovery that the newly conceived fetus possesses the genetic (DNA) code, which transmits the human constitution.[3]

The new science of fetology which was brought into existence during the late 1960s by Dr. H. Liley's work on blood transfusions to the fetus has thoroughly exploded old myths, such as those which caused Justice Pound of New York's highest court to hold in a 1921 decision that "When justice or convenience requires, the child in the womb is dealt with as a human being, although physiologically it is a part of the mother."[4]

But today the experts agree that a child is a separate, living, human being from the very beginning. The fetus shows a working nervous system and brain different from his mother's in the 19th day of pregnancy, and there is no medical or scientific disagreement that his existence as an individual begins no later than the time when the cells which make up the fetus separate from those cells which later become the placenta. Even the persistent belief that the placenta is a part of the mother has been exploded.[5] Moreover, the modern technique of fertilizing human eggs in test tubes further establishes that life begins at conception.

Dr. Liley and his wife, both pioneers in new science of fetology, have observed the fetus in his watery world inside the amniotic sac by closed circuit X-ray television. Their words for what they have seen clearly establish for the layman or the lawyer, the nature of a human fetus:

". . . he is quite beautiful and perfect in his fashion, active and graceful. He is neither an acquiescent vegetable nor a witness tadpole as some have conceived him to be in the past, but rather a tiny human being as independent as though he were lying in a crib with a blanket wrapped around him instead of his mother."[6]

If a heartbeat with circulating blood can be detected at three weeks gestation, if the internal organs of a complete human being and human facial features can be determined at six weeks, and if by seven weeks gestation the nervous system of the fetus is functional to the point that it flexes its neck when its mouth is tickled, then we should be able to say with some certitude that medical developments regarding the essential humanity of the unborn fetus confirm the soundness of the law in treating the fetus as a being with rights not dependent on his parents.

At this point in time, the evolution of biogenetics favoring the recognition of the fetus as a living person within the womb is supported by the common law. The precedents of property, tort, and welfare law have long recognized the legal rights of the unborn person. The Dean of tort law—and the "wise tortfather" of first-year law students—Professor Prosser stated as early as 1964 that, "All writers who have discussed the problem have joined . . . in maintaining that the unborn child in the path of an automobile is as much a person in the street as the mother."[7]

However, it is not my purpose in this article to review the legal precedent established in tort, property, and equity cases which uphold the rights of the unborn fetus as separate and distinct from the mother in whose womb he is couched. There are numerous outstanding legal articles dealing with these rights which adhere to the child before birth.[8] Suffice it simply to reiterate Professor Maledon's statement of the inconsistencies which develop in those States with liberal or "abortion-on-demand" statutes:

"The unborn child, under the law of property in most jurisdictions, can, among other things, inherit and own an estate,[9] be a tenant-in-common with his own mother,[10] and be an actual income recipient prior to birth.[11] The new liberalized abortion laws, however, present a dilemma in this area. How can it be a crime for a woman to misappropriate the estate of her unborn child, and yet not be a crime for her to kill that child? Can a woman, who has inherited an estate as a tenant-in-common with her unborn child, increase her own estate 100% simply by killing the child? Will the law, which has recognized the unborn child as an actual income recipient prior to birth, allow the child's heir (the mother) to kill the child for her own financial gain? Will the law that has specifically said that an unborn child's estate cannot be destroyed where the child has not been represented before the court[12] allow the child himself to be destroyed without being represented before the court? These few possibilities are but a sample of the legal maze that the abortion law revisions have created."[13]

Similarly, in my own State of Maryland, in an action for the wrongful death of a stillborn child, the Maryland Court of Appeals observed: "The cause of action arose at the time of the injury, and . . . (there is) no more reason why it should be cut off because of the child's death before birth, than if it died thereafter."[14]

If the fetus can be tortiously injured,[15] can inherit and be the beneficiary of a trust, can be represented by guardian and litem seeking support payments,[16] and can be preferred to the parents' constitutionally-upheld religious liberties,[17] then it appears that there be a substantial basis for a constitutional argument favoring the unborn child's right to life.

The unborn child's constitutional right to life is then the avenue which I, as a Federal legislator, will explore. There are some constitutional precedents, such as the previously cited New Jersey case where the fetus was likely to be aborted if denied a blood transfusion in accordance with the parents' religious beliefs.[18]

It is noteworthy that in a unanimous per curiam opinion in the *Anderson* case, the New Jersey court found no difference between this case and an earlier New Jersey case[19] where the blood transfusion was given to a blue baby suffering from lack of oxygen after birth. Similarly, in an earlier case the same year as the *Anderson* case in New Jersey, Judge J. Skelly Wright of the U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit held that, "The State as parens patriae will not allow a parent to abandon a child and so it should not allow this most ultimate of voluntary abandonments. The mother had a responsibility to the community to care for her infant."[20] It is noteworthy that in both the *Anderson* and *Georgetown* cases, the Supreme Court denied certiorari.

We will return later to the impact of these decisions in framing the issue that the unborn child's right to life supersedes all the mother's constitutional rights except her own right to life.

In its first confrontation in April, 1971, with the abortion controversy, the Supreme Court of the United States sustained the constitutionality of the abortion statute of the District of Columbia against an attack for vagueness.[21] Although the Court upheld the right-to-life philosophy, at the same time, it so worded the decision that it has become extremely difficult to prosecute violations of the District of Columbia statute.

In upholding the constitutionality of the D. C. statute, the Court overturned the U.S. District Court decision granting a motion to dismiss the indictment, holding that the statute was so vague in its exception of abortions to protect some undefined standard of "health" that it denied defendant's due process of law and did not afford adequate standards for judgment by juries or courts.[22] Nevertheless, construing broadly the term "health" in the statute[23] and placing the burden of proof on the prosecution to show, by the criminal standard of beyond a reasonable doubt, that a particular abortion was not within the statutory exception will mean at the least that prosecution cases must be far more complex and could well approach the psychiatric complications of the typical trial in which insanity is a claimed defense.

Although concurring in the majority opinion written by the late Mr. Justice Black, Justice White indicated that he would object to any construction that permitted "abortions on request." The statute seemed clearly to him to proscribe all abortions "not dictated by health considerations."

Even more recently, Dr. Milan Vuitch, who is licensed to practice in the District of Columbia, Maryland, Virginia, and New York, was denied certiorari on October 12th on his appeal from a Maryland conviction.[24] Although a constitutional argument of due process and equal protection was made, the Court of Special Appeals affirmed the Circuit Court conviction under the newly revised Maryland abortion statute as contained in Chapter 470 of the Acts of 1968. The courts, however, never decided the merits of the constitutional question because a procedural technicality prevented the constitutional argument from being raised as a defense to the abortion charge.

There are, however, more extensive constitutional attacks presently pending on the Supreme Court's docket.[25]

For the most part, these attacks on the constitutionality of anti-abortion statutes have taken two approaches:

(1) Abortion statutes invade a woman's right to privacy and sovereignty over her own body; and

(2) Abortion statutes deny equal protection of the law to poorer citizens by discriminating in favor of richer individuals

---

Footnotes at end of article.

who can afford the trips and expenses involved in abortions.

Looked at objectively and in the light of legal precedent neither of these two arguments hold water. In the first case, if we accept the hetologist's scientific evidence that life begins at conception, then it follows that the mother's right to privacy must be subordinated to the unborn child's constitutional right to life. The blood transfusion and blue baby cases illustrate this point.

Interestingly enough, this legal recognition of the rights of the unborn is not an anomaly indigenous to the American legal system. In 1959, the United Nations adopted a "Declaration of the Rights of the Child," wherein the representatives of the member nations of the U.N. recognized that "the child, by reason of his physical and mental immaturity, needs special safeguards and care, including appropriate legal protection, before as well as after birth." [26]

The second attack focussing on the denial of equal protection to the poor is even more valid when applied to the unborn who is also entitled to equal protection of the law. As a society we should recognize that our entire system of justice sometimes denies equal protection to the poor. However, the response to this recognition should be a striving for the eradication of the root causes of poverty, not for the invalidation of lawfully enacted statutes because some segments of society find the statute easier to contravene than another.

Interestingly enough, since abortion clinics in the District of Columbia have been mushrooming after the Vuitch decision, preliminary statistics indicate that two-thirds of the users of one of these abortion clinics these clinics will make it easier and cheaper for the inner-city blacks to obtain abortions.

Statistics recently released by the Johns Hopkins University School of Medicine indicate that some 2,500 Maryland women obtained abortions outside the state during the last fiscal year.[28] Of these out-of-state abortions, 878 were performed in New York City, another 202 in other parts of New York State, and an estimated 1,500 in Washington, D.C. Again these figures don't indicate that it's the inner-city blacks who are profiting from the liberalized abortion laws.

Finally, one learned writer has come to the conclusion that abortion is in complete contradiction to the civil rights movement of the 1960s. For more than a decade, Americans have fought in the courts and on the streets for the civil rights of our minority groups. And now, some of those same civil rights advocates fail to see that abortion abrogates the most important civil right—the right to life itself. Let's not forget that every one of the individuals in the pro-abortion movement has already enjoyed that civil right to life which they are refusing to the unborn child in the womb.

For my own part, I'm hopeful that the Supreme Court, in deciding the cases on its docket this Term, will recognize the essential humanity of the unborn child and will not seek to reverse the established precedent that the right to life supersedes all other rights which are bequeathed to all Americans.

If the Supreme Court were to decide otherwise, it would be clear then that our constitutional safeguards will have given away to the era of convenience. For in reading the test cases on the constitutionality of abortion statutes, one cannot help but think that due process and equal protection are but legalese for insuring the convenience of the living. Because this is a time of concentration on making life as easy as possible, by holding the abortion statutes unconstitutional, the Supreme Court would insure that thousands of lives would be made much simpler and more convenient by not allowing a child to be born.

In that event, I have every intention of introducing a resolution to amend the Constitution in the following manner:

"The right of the unborn to life shall not be abridged, and unborn persons shall have the same rights as others to the equal protection of the law."

If one of the purposes of a Constitutional amendment is to clarify the language of the fundamental principles upon which the United States was founded, then in the words of that 1859 AMA resolution, "such unwarrantable destruction of human life" would certainly call for a clarification of the meaning of our inalienable right to life.

Unfortunately, this clarification is no longer necessary only for the unborn. The anti-life movement has already been extended as in the case of the mongoloid babies which have been allowed to die after birth and in the case of the aged and infirm who would be allowed to die if a euthanasia bill presently pending in the Florida State Legislature is passed by that body.

Just as we are now witnessing the attemped extension of the abortion mentality on constitutional grounds, so also will the constitutionality of killing the unborn be extended to the constitutionality of killing the living without due process of law.

FOOTNOTES

[1] American Medical Association, Minutes of the Annual Meeting 1859, Tenth Annual Medical Gazette 409 (1859).

[2] A. Montagu, "Life Before Birth 2" (1964).

[3] F. Gottlieb, "Developmental Genetics 17" (1966).

[4] Drobner v. Peters, 232 N.Y. 220, 222, 133 N.E. 567, 568 (1921).

[5] H. Liley, "Modern Motherhood 28" (1967).

[6] *Id.* at 26–27.

[7] W. Prosser, "Handbook of the Law of Torts" § 56, at 355 (3d ed. 1964).

[8] Maledon, *The Law and the Unborn Child: The Legal and Logical Inconsistencies*, 46 N.D. LAWYER 349 (1971); Noonan, *The Constitutionality of the Regulation of Abortion*, 21 HAST. L. J. 51 (1969); Noonan, *Amendment of the Abortion Law: Relevant Data and Judicial Opinion*, 15 CATH. LAW, 124 (1969); Means, *The Law of New York Concerning Abortion and the Status of the Fetus, 1664–1968: A Case of Cessation of Constitutionality*, 14 N.Y. L. F. 411 (1968).

[9] Hall v. Hancock, 32 Mass. (15 Pick.) 255 (1834).

[10] Biggs v. McCarty, 86 Ind. 352 (1882).

[11] Industrial Trust Co. v. Wilson, 60 R.I. 169, 200 A. 467 (1938).

[12] Deal v. Sexton, 144 N.C. 157, 56 S.E. 691 (1907).

[13] Maledon, *supra* note 8, at 369.

[14] State ex. rel. Odham v. Sherman, 234 Md. 179, 183, 198 A. 2d 71, 73 (1964).

[15] Bonbrest v. Kotz, 65 F. Supp. 138 (D.R.C. 1946).

[16] Kyne v. Kyne, 38 Cal. App. 2d 122, 100 P. 2d 806 (1940).

[17] Raleigh Fitkin-Paul Memorial Hospital v. Anderson, 42 N. J. 421, 201 A. 2d 537, *cert. denied*, 377 U.S. 985 (1964).

[18] *Id.*

[19] State v. Perricone, 37 N.J. 463, 181 A. 2d 751 (1962).

[20] In re Application of President of Georgetown University Hospital, 331 F. 2d 1000, 1008, (D.C. Cir.) *cert. denied*, 337 U.S. 978 (1964).

[21] U.S. v. Vuitch, 402 U.S. 62 (1971).

[22] *Id.*, 305 F. Supp. 1032 (D.D.C. 1969).

[23] D.C. Code § 201, provides *inter alia:*

"Whoever, by means of any instrument, medicine, drug, or other means whatever, procures or produces or attempts to procure or produce an abortion of miscarriage on any woman, unless the same were done as necessary for the preservation of the mother's life or health and under the direction of a competent licensed practitioner of medicine, shall be imprisoned in the penitentiary not less than one year or not more than ten years. . . ."

[24] State v. Vuitch, 10 Md. App. 389, 271 A. 2d 371 (1970).

[25] Roe v. Wade, 314 F. Supp. 1217 (N.D. Tex. 1970), *Jurisdiction Postponed*, 39 U.S.L.W. 3486 (U.S. May 3, 1971) (No. 70–18); Rosen v. Louisiana State Board of Medical Examiners, 318 F. Supp. 1217 (E.D. La. 1970), *appeal docketed*, No. 70–42, U.S., Nov. 27, 1970; Doe v. Bolton, 319 F. Supp. 1048 (N.D. Ga. 1970); *Jurisdiction Postponed*, 39 U.S.L.W. 3486 (U.S. May 5, 1971) (No. 70–40).

[26] General Assembly of the U.N., *Declaration of the Rights of the Child*, adopted unanimously in the plenary meeting of Nov. 20, 1959 OFFICIAL RECORDS OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY, 14th Session, at 19–20.

[27] Auerbach, *2/3 of Users of Abortion Clinic White*, The Washington Post, August 26, 1971, at B–1.

[28] *Maryland Women Abort Elsewhere*, The Evening Capital, November 12, 1971.

TO HELP YOUNG PEOPLE TO LEARN ABOUT GOVERNMENT

HON. CLAUDE PEPPER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 3, 1972

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, the youth of this Nation have demonstrated many times in many ways that they have a deep interest in the workings of government on all levels. On the whole, they are willing students of the principles and procedures of democratic government, and I firmly believe it is in the interest of the entire Nation if our young people are encouraged in that direction.

Recently, I received a critical analysis of a student-in-government program in my home State of Florida from a 15-year-old boy named Kevin Richardson. Kevin is an observant and extremely articulate young man who has definite ideas on how that program may be improved. I believe Kevin's advice may be valuable to all who are interested in helping our young people learn and appreciate the American system of government, and I commend his essay to my colleagues and to all who read this RECORD.

EVALUATION OF EDUCATIONAL OBJECTIVES TO QUALIFY 15- TO 18-YEAR-OLDS TO GIVE THEM AN OBJECTIVE BASE FOR EXERCISING THE 18-YEAR-OLD VOTING PRIVILEGE

(By Kevin Richardson)

The first objective I will present is one which I would like to attend and one which my brother has participated in and enjoyed.

In most states there is an institution called Boy's State or Girl's State for each sex. It is a learning experience in the summer for a period of time which tries to orient a student on the fundamentals of Government. Only students with good educational aptitude are considered to go. They must get a sponsor who will pay for their week's stay at the school. Once there they will participate in many activities with the primary influence on the study of government. The students choose their own party and meet like a Congress. Under the supervision of instructors they go about deciding the business at hand. They will debate, vote, and decide on these matters in a democratic way. In this way they will become familiar with how the government operates. In that aspect, going to this institute is very beneficial to the coming of voting age students. But I would like to comment on a couple of unfavorable aspects of going there.

Firstly, only good grade students are allowed to go, not the average student who has just as much or even more interest in going but may not have good enough grades. If these people were allowed to attend maybe too many people for the facilities will go, and this brings up my next point.

If there was any way possible to have something like this in every county, instead of just one in the whole state, it would be much more beneficial to all concerned. This would eliminate much of the cost of accommodations as most of the students who go will probably have their own transportation and will be able to sleep and eat at home just like during regular school days.

The "school" could be held at one of the area's schools and there would be no use for finding a place big enough to accommodate kids from all over the state.

About the only cost involved would be for materials and the payroll of qualified instructors to assist the students in whatever help they may need.[1] These contributions could be made by the former sponsors who had to pay a lump sum before. I'm sure that they cooperate fully.

● If what I just proposed could become a reality, it would most likely increase the number of students who attend. It would also help them in making a thoughtful decision when they step into that voter's booth to cast their vote.

The second objective I will propose should be easier accomplished than the first.

Courses may be offered at schools that would deal in modern "history" with qualified personnel to teach them. The history of 100 years ago is helpful to us in learning how our ancestors dealt with their problems, but the issues of now and then are very different. I think that it is more important to understand the politics of 10 years ago or even 25 years ago than those of 100. These classes would show the student some of the major problems that are important to the world of today.[2] It could also explain how a politician operates—how to look behind the TV ads, etc. You could learn how to know about all the issues objectively, without taking someone else's word for it.

[1] Instructors might also want to work for free, as a community minded service. Instructors should be interested, not just doing it for the money. They need to be qualified and know what they are doing and talking about. They should supervise the "meetings" and suggest on things to be done and show students what to do.

[2] These courses should be given credit like regular courses. The knowledge you receive in these courses will stay with you as long as you exercise your right to vote. Some other course, like Geometry or Chemistry may not stay with you, as you may take an occupation that does not deal with these subjects at all.

Students could do projects on what the issues are and what the candidates have to say about the issue. Then the class may have a mock election to see who they would vote for.

Again, the importance of having a qualified instructor is great as you would want the students to know how to interpret everything right.

The third objective I will propose is similar to the second but could be accomplished in a shorter amount of time.

Seminars or "mini" classes could be offered to the student at school so he could understand what the issues are and understand the candidates better.

The "Teacher" may vary from week to week so as to give the student all aspects of the government. These people may vary from people representing a candidate to a real teacher who may explain how the government operates. The students should ask questions when they don't understand something because they will use this information whenever they vote.

The next statement I will make has two ways of looking at it, which I will present the best way I can. It seems a little paradoxical, and in a way it is.

The person who "teaches" the students should be interested in helping the students so they will get the impression that the system really does care about how they feel about things that are happening in the world today. This kind of teacher would probably increase the number of students who would sign up to vote.

Now for the other part of the statement. If the "teacher" were just someone who doesn't really care at all about how the students feel and is just there because someone asked him a special favor to do it might dim the student's feeling about the government. They might get to feeling that this is what the government is like—just a bunch of people in for the glory of it. But on the other hand some of the more astute students might get alienated by this person and realize that this is what the government feels about us and decide to register to vote when they were on the borderline before. They would realize that there are a great many people who, if they got together, could dispose of these people and vote into office someone who feels for their cause. So, if you had this kind of person talk to you, there would be two kinds of reactions come out of it. I just hope that the students take the latter course of action.

SUMMARY

In this report I think that I achieved my objectives even though I may not have put them in the clearest sense. I hope that the reader will try to understand my thoughts from the way I have written them.

I hope that you enjoy this report as much as I did in preparing it. The work is entirely mine, with help from no one.

THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF U.S. RECOGNITION OF BALTIC STATES

HON. GILBERT GUDE

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 3, 1972

Mr. GUDE. Mr. Speaker, Friday, July 28, 1972, marked the 50th anniversary of the de jure recognition of the three Baltic Republics of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania by the United States.

During World War I, the freedom-loving peoples of these states asserted their national independence, and enjoyed two decades thereafter of self-government. In June 1940, however, the Soviet Union seized power over these states, and proceeded to pursue a vicious policy of mass deportations to Siberia, and Russian colonization of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania. Soviet policy to date has been one of continued repression of cultural and religious activities.

The United States extended full recognition to Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania on July 28, 1922, and has never recognized the incorporation of the Baltic States into the Soviet Union.

Deprived of their independence, the Baltic peoples remain strong and dedicated in their ethnic and cultural pursuits. In our common devotion to the principles of freedom, it is fitting that we reaffirm our friendship with the peoples of the Baltic States, and reiterate our grave concern that their basic human rights be restored at this time.

MAN'S INHUMANITY TO MAN—HOW LONG?

HON. WILLIAM J. SCHERLE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 3, 1972

Mr. SCHERLE. Mr. Speaker, a child asks: "Where is daddy?" A mother asks: "How is my son?" A wife asks: "Is my husband alive or dead?"

Communist North Vietnam is sadistically practicing spiritual and mental genocide on over 1,757 American prisoners of war and their families.

How long?

SENATE—*Monday, August 7, 1972*

The Senate met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the President pro tempore (Mr. EASTLAND).

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Edward L. R. Elson, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, in whose providence we live and move and have our being, we beseech Thee so to enlighten our minds and lift our spirits that we may create those measures which meet the needs of this age. Keep us ever faithful to all that is holiest in our heritage and all that is healthiest in that which is new. Give us courage to do the hard right against the easy wrong. In all that we think or say or do, may we sincerely endeavor "to insure domestic tranquillity, provide for the common defense, promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity." As we work may we bear witness to our kinship with the Master whose purpose was to do Thy will. Grant us so to walk and work with Thee that we may have that joy and peace which the world cannot give or take away.

We pray in the Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Friday, August 4, 1972, be dispensed with.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.