

1893

October 4, 1993

GOOD EVENING :

JUST GOT A CALL FROM A FRIEND, THAT WORKS IN A PUBLIC PLACE, MANY PEOPLE IN AND OUT ALL DAY. THE FRIEND SAID; PEOPLE ARE VERY ANGRY WHEN THEY SEE OUR PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES, USING OUR TAX MONEY, FLYING ALL OVER THE UNITED STATES (VACATIONING) OR CAMPAIGNING, (WHEN THERE IS T.V. AND RADIO TO GET THE HEALTH CARE PROGRAM ON THE AIR, AND CAN STAY IN WASHINGTON, AND TAKE CARE OF BUSINESS!

THE MAN IN THE DOCTORS OFFICE, THIS MORNING SAID; IS JUST A EXCUSE FOR THE PRESIDENT TO SEE ALL AMERICA, AND ALL PAID EXPENSES! (LIVE IT UP WHILE HE CAN AT THE TAX PAYERS EXPENSE!)

ONE LADY THAT WORKS IN COMMUNICATION, SAID; THEY HAVE HAD HUNDREDS OF PHONE CALLS, AND ABOUT THE MILITARY OF AMERICA, IN (SOMALIA) GETTING KILLED, LIVING UNDER TERRIBLE CONDITIONS, AND IN FEAR FOR THEIR LIFE, AND DON'T SERVE ANY PURPOSE! JUST KEEP SENDING MORE MILITARY TROOPS OVER TO SOMALIA TO GET KILLED.

ADID COULD HAVE BEEN CAUGHT LONG AGO, BUT WAS A PUPOSE IN NOT WANTING ADID CAUGHT. (SO THE WAR IN SOMALIA COULD KEEP GOING. (TOO MANY PEOPLE HERE IN AMERICA TO FEED, SO JUST KEEP THE MILITARY TROOPS IN SOMALIA).

THEN WE SEE PRESIDENT CLINTON IN S.F. CALIFORNIA, LIVING IT UP, AND THE BEST OF EVERYTHING, WHILE OUR TROOPS DIE IN SOMALIA.

THE LADY IN COMMUNICATION SAID; PEOPLE OUT HERE SEE PRESIDENT CLINTON JOGGING, LIKE NOT A CARE IN THE WORLD, AND GOING FROM STATE TO STATE (LIKE CAMPAIGNING) AND COSTING THE TAX PAYERS MILLIONS OF DOLLARS; (NEVER STAYS IN WASHINGTON) LIKE WHOM IS RUNNING THE WHITE HOUSE ?

SOME PEOPLE HAVE SAID; THE PRESIDENTS POSITION IS TOO MUCH FOR HIM, TOO MUCH STRESS AND CANNOT TAKE, SO HAVE TO JOG OFF TO VACATION OR CAMPAIGNING !

BY THE TIME THE HEALTH CARE PLAN IS DONE, JOGGING ALL OVER THE COUNTRY, THE NATIONAL DEBT WILL BE TRIPPLE. (THE MAN SAID;)

CUSTOMERS OUT HERE ARE DEEPLY CONCERNED ABOUT OUR COUNTRY, AND VERY MUCH UN-REST AND DON'T SEE ANY NEW CHANGE COMMING.

THE MAN SAID; WHEN THE HEAT IS ON IN WASHINGTON, AND PRESIDENT CLINTON CANNOT FACE HE JOGS OFF ON VACATION, USING THE HEALTH PROGRAM TO HAVE EXCUSE TO VACATION.

WE HAVE NOT HAD A PRESIDENT THAT VACATIONS SO MUCH, LONG AS HE CAN REMEMBER, AND HE IS PRETTY OLD.

THE MAN SAID; PRESIDENT COMMING UP FROM (\$ 34,000 YR, AND SO MUCH POWER WENT TO HIS HEAD.) THE ONLY WAY PRESIDENT CLINTON CAN SEE THE UNITED STATES IS WHILE HE IS IN POWER, THE MAN SAID; AT THE TAX PAYERS EXPENSE. LOOKS THAT WAY ANYHOW! TO SOME!

(SOMETHING PEOPLE MIGHT KEEP IN MIND, ABOUT THE HEALTH INSURANCE) MORE WOMENDIE EACH YEAR, LIKE 40,000 FROM (ABORTION-BREAST CANCER), THAN THE SMOKERS OF AMERICA.!

THANK YOU SINCERELY

COPY

Abortion, Breast Cancer Link Reported

TO THE EDITOR:

"There is a clear relationship documented in medical journals showing that women aborting their first pregnancy are at a much higher risk of developing breast cancer than women who carry their pregnancy to full term." This quote by Joel Brind, Ph.D. of Baruch College, City University of New York, is just one of many voices linking the epidemic of breast cancer to abortion.

According to a study by Dr. Macolm

Pike of the University of Southern California in 1981, women who had either induced or spontaneous abortions before the first child were 2.4 times more likely to get breast cancer than women who had no abortions.

With the prevailing silence of the media and the medical profession at large in this crucial area, representing over 140,000 new cases of breast cancer in 1992 alone, and over 40,000 women dying each year, it won't be long before their silence is broken by

the screams of the masses of women who have been seduced into thinking that their abortion was just a harmless minor procedure to remove a little mass of tissue and have waken up to the facts.

All the figures represented in this article are well documented in a publication titled "A Painful Choice" published and distributed by Concerned Women for America, Washington, D.C.

Stephen C. Bacon, City

High living on the U.S. government

A Jacksonville, Fla., woman seeking to rent an apartment had a bad credit rating but a good income, so the landlord, Benton Bradberry, took a chance.

The well-dressed woman paid one month advance rent plus a security deposit — a total of \$1,130.

She paid in cash.

This 36-year-old mother of four teen-age children also has an elderly disabled mother living with her. (One of the teen-agers is retarded; another is pregnant.)

The income listed on the family's rental application is entirely from government and welfare programs.

It totals \$46,000 a year.

When Bradberry telephoned the Florida department of Health and Rehabilitative Services, he was told, "It's all entirely legal."

The family's monthly welfare income includes: two welfare



By
Paul Harvey

checks totaling \$1,510; Aid to Families with Dependent Children, \$214; Housing and Urban Development rent check, \$550; food stamps, \$440. The family is also eligible for monthly Medicaid benefits worth \$550.

And when the daughter's new baby arrives, there will be an additional government check in the amount of \$426 a month.

The elderly, disabled mother gets a monthly Social Security check of \$513 and is eligible to have a housekeeper come in twice a week at a cost of \$242 a month as well as regular visits

from a public nurse.

HRS confirms the retarded teen-ager is eligible for programs that could cost up to \$70,000 a year.

There are other federal, state and local programs available to this family, but they are already receiving \$3,469 of your dollars every month, and that will increase to \$3,895 after the teen-ager has her baby.

This family's income will be \$46,740 per year!

It beats working.

The average working American makes much less.

World Almanac confirms that the average taxable income of Americans last year was \$16,000, on which that average American paid \$2,400 in taxes.

This means IT TAKES 19 TAXPAYERS TO SUPPORT THIS ONE WELFARE FAMILY in Florida.

New York City is running into

an avalanche of organized opposition as it seeks to cull the rolls of the homeless.

As is, New York is sheltering 5,700 families at a cost of \$3,200 per family per month. And 950 additional families want in on this deal every month.

As the Clinton administration sets out to "reform the welfare system," it will be challenged by organizations of welfare recipients — people who for three generations have come to think of their handouts as "entitlements."

If we'd get the government out of the charity business and return charity to the Salvation Army where it belongs, we would separate the needy from the greedy and also save the salaries of all those bureaucrats.

Copyright 1993 Paul Harvey Products, Inc.

Opinion

Presidential pensions are out of sight

Take out a piece of paper and a pencil, and number from 1 to 2. We're going to have a quiz. Subject: the presidency.

Question No. 1: What former president was the first to receive a pension? Question No. 2: Why were presidents given retirement benefits?

If you wrote down George Washington, Grover Cleveland or Herbert Hoover in answer to the Question No. 1, you are wrong. The first president to receive post-tenure support from the taxpayers was Harry Truman. Every one of his predecessors retired to private life and made do as best they could. Some of them — Thomas Jefferson and James Monroe come quickly to mind — died paupers. They refused to exploit their position in order to maintain the dignity of the office in which they had served.

Therein lies the answer to Question No. 2. Pensions were provided for in the Former Presidents Act of 1958 so that retiring chief executives would not have to sell their souls to make a living. According to biographer David McCullough, the only income Harry Truman had when he returned to



By Joseph Spear

Missouri was a \$112.56-a-month army pension. But he resisted six-figure offers from major corporations and asked Congress to help him out with a modest allowance. The lawmakers gave him \$22,500 a year.

Guess what George Bush's pension and perks come to?

He was given \$1.5 million to get his papers and personal effects to Texas and to set up his office. His office rent will be completely paid for. He will get \$150,000 a year for staff salaries. He will get the standard presidential pension — now \$143,800 a year — plus additional monies for his service as a congressman, diplomat, CIA chief and vice president. All told, he will have to get along on an income of \$187,800 a year.

Bush will also get free health care, free travel, free telephone service, free stationery. He will

be surrounded by Secret Service agents around the clock.

The grand total to keep George Bush in the style to which we accustomed him: well over \$4 million, not counting his one-time transition expenses.

But at least we are keeping Mr. Bush out of penury, right?

Well, no. He is already a millionaire.

OK, so we are preserving the dignity of the office, right?

Well, no. Earlier this month, Bush flew to Atlanta to give a speech to a convention of Amway distributors. His reported fee for those words of wisdom: \$100,000. In May, he was paid another \$100,000 for a two-day trip to Brazil.

Am I the only person in this putative democracy who thinks this is outrageous and that we ought to ask affluent chief executives to pay more of their own bills when they retire? For the first time in 131 years, we now have five living ex-presidents. All of them are wealthy, and three are very rich. Yet the taxpayers are forking over more than \$20 million a year to support their baronial lifestyles — and the fattest of the cats still prostitute themselves to any-

body who can afford them.

Gerald Ford, for example, has served on dozens of corporate boards, endorsed real estate developments, huckstered commemorative medals, lectured for a minimum of \$15,000 per talk. He reportedly pulls down \$2 million a year. Ronald Reagan will deliver one of his platitudinous orations for about \$75,000. He got \$5 million for his memoirs and pocketed \$2 million for a trip to Japan.

The only two of our ex-chief executives who conduct their affairs with any sense of dignity are Richard Nixon and Jimmy Carter. Nixon actually refuses Secret Service protection, and he never takes fees for his lectures.

I would not be so callous as to argue that former presidents who need pensions shouldn't have them. But what is the point of rewarding millionaires who exploit their station anyway? Ordinary citizens on Social Security pensions are "means tested" and the well-to-do get fewer benefits. Why not apply a similar test to retired chief executives?

(C)1993 Newspaper Enterprise Assn.

[Redacted]
Ardmore, Oklahoma 73401



Brian Lamb
C-Span Suite 650
400 N. Capital Street N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20001