

used to properly compensate a volunteer army, which would attract more skillful persons if the pay scale were better.

Draft proponents employ some arguments that would be acceptable if they had purchased every male aged 18 to 35. However, the United States of America has not bought—bought off, tricked and fooled, yes—any of her citizens at this time. Some of the stentorian arguments side-step the question of rights and look at other issues, such as mobility, emergency readiness, and social outcome.

Former Senator Sam Nunn of Georgia, a Democrat, said in a 1980 U.S. News and World Report article that “Middle and upper-class America are not sufficiently participating in the defense of the country today except in the officer corp. That’s one of the tragedies of the volunteer force . . .”

Nunn’s provocative statement is not only designed to evoke resentment towards the “privileged” upper classes, it is also not sound from a practical point of view. Certainly, the classes with a statistically higher amount of college education should be involved in positions in which education can be put to best use. It is apparent that the Nunn argument involves some sort of “duty” the upper classes have to live the life of the foot soldier, and amounts to no less than a feeble attempt at egalitarian blurring of class distinction.

Proponents of the draft continue to ignore their weakest point: namely, that wars which had the support of the American public would not require conscription but instead would have a full supply of eager volunteers. People not only own their own bodies, but a free society also grants people final say over government policy. War is an area where the voice of the people is very important, as their security is at stake. And where else can the people exercise their voice than in the decision on registering to serve? Denying this decision is in effect creating a government that does not respect the people’s wishes, and instead dictates to them.

AMERICORPS

There was an effort in June 1997 by President Clinton to use the Selective Service System to recruit potential volunteers in his AmeriCorps program. Such a move is a two-fold intrusion on civil liberties: it violates the right of those who were forced to register for the draft to avoid having their addresses and other private information released to another agency; and, of course, it is costly to the taxpayer to pay for a joint system that serves two unconstitutional agencies. Ultimately, though, the administration deferred its plans. This issue has not gone away, as national service plans have considerable support from those people who think that everyone has a duty to the government.

Free people can resist the draft easily. They need not register at all, or they can flee the country when they are called to serve. After all, they still own their bodies regardless of what the law says. But the change of life necessary to avoid the government allows the government some control of one’s life, even when one does not openly submit. One does not need to recognize the right of the government to conscript its citizens for any purpose in order to be disrupted by the institution. If one pays income taxes and expects to get that money back in the form of college aid, he must register for Selective Service. If one wishes to collect the money stolen through the payroll tax for so-called “Social Security,” he must register. Most people are not able to forgo paying taxes if they wish to work, so if they hope to see

their tax dollars again they must register for the draft.

As a young man of draft age, I could sleep easier if I knew that my life would never have to be disrupted by a government which has given itself the legal ground on which it may attempt to violate my right to own myself. Even as I refuse to recognize the government’s powers, the Selective Service System/AmeriCorps/Department of Education bloc does not care. To them I am their property, regardless of my feelings. The military and charity draft is indeed one of the most evil institutions in the United States government.

HONORING MRS. BARBARA L. BAILEY OF CONNECTICUT

HON. JOHN B. LARSON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 13, 2001

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor and pay tribute to Barbara Bailey of Connecticut, who died yesterday at the age of 93. Mrs. Bailey was the wife of the late John M. Bailey, who was the legendary Democratic Party chairman of Connecticut, and was also the chairman of the national Democratic Party in the 1960s. Mrs. Bailey’s passing marks the end of an era in Democratic politics in the State of Connecticut.

Mrs. Bailey will long be remembered as the matriarch of the Democratic Party during its golden years, not only for her public service, but also for providing the state with two outstanding public servants—Chief State’s Attorney John M. Bailey, Jr. and my distinguished predecessor, former U.S. Representative Barbara B. Kennelly.

All her life, Mrs. Bailey was intensely devoted to her family, to Connecticut, and to the Democratic Party. She and her husband led the state, and the national party, with class and distinction. In all her years her interest and love of people willing to serve in public office never wavered.

Throughout her life, Mrs. Bailey never held public office, yet she was indeed a public servant. She served the public through her immeasurable commitment to her family and the causes she truly believed in—including the rights of women and the struggle of the disadvantaged. She served on the board of Trustees for the University of Connecticut for 10 years and received numerous honors and accolades for her civic work. Over the years, the Bailey’s hosted presidential candidates, ambassadors, and dignitaries from all over the world. Mrs. Bailey’s trademark was her grace, her dignity, and the way she made everyone around her feel welcome and at home.

She was part of an age in Democratic politics that saw the first Catholic elected President of the United States. She was the co-recipient, along with U.S. Senator Abraham Ribicoff, of the “Keepers of the Flame” award in 1988, which honored those who kept alive the memory and legacy of President John Kennedy.

Her love for the people of Connecticut and politics was superseded only by the devotion she had to her family. The legacy Mrs. Bailey leaves is everlasting and is carried on through

her children and grandchildren who continue to serve the state with distinction.

Mrs. Bailey was an exceptional person whose humanity, class and grace touched everyone she came in contact with. The nation, the State of Connecticut, and most of all her family, will truly miss her.

HONORING THE DISTINGUISHED CAREER OF DICK QUINLIN UPON HIS RETIREMENT

HON. ROBERT W. NEY

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 13, 2001

Mr. NEY. Mr. Speaker, I commend the following article to my colleagues:

Whereas, Dick Quinlin has spent his life serving the people of Belmont County; and

Whereas, He began his career with the Emergency Management Agency in 1985 as EMA Coordinator, and was named full time coordinator in 1994; and,

Whereas, during his tenure in office, Belmont County repeatedly benefitted from his expertise as nature saw fit to test his skill with the 1990 Flood of Wegee and Pike Creeks, the snow emergency of 1994, and the flash flood of June 1998; and,

Whereas, Dick Quinlin was ever present to guide our community out of disaster, and was duly recognized by the Governor of Ohio as he was presented with the Ohio Commendation Medal, by the Ohio National Guard, and by the Belmont County Bar Association with the Liberty Bell Award; and

Whereas, I desire to add my voice to the chorus of well wishers who have repeatedly expressed admiration, respect and friendship, for Dick Quinlin;

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I ask that my colleagues join me in honoring the career of Dick Quinlin. His lifelong service and commitment to Belmont County is to be commended.

HONORING CAMERON VETERANS’ HOME

HON. SAM GRAVES

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 13, 2001

Mr. GRAVES. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the importance of the Missouri Veterans’ Home located in Cameron, Missouri. A landmark in the community, the Cameron Veterans’ Home provides a healing hand to those honored Americans that have fought to preserve the privileges of freedom we all enjoy today.

In April of 2000, Missouri’s sixth veterans home admitted its first resident. The Cameron Veterans’ Home today is a 200-bed facility committed to providing a service to Missouri’s Veterans.

Cameron Veterans’ Home is dedicated to providing quality healthcare to veterans and assists them in achieving their maximum level of independence. The Cameron Veterans’ Home works to ensure a safe, comfortable environment to its residents conducive to personal dignity and happiness in a community living setting.

In recognition to the staff of the Cameron Veterans' Home and the City of Cameron which supports our Veterans so well, I commend the Cameron Veterans' Home for the unconditioned level of support and compassion they extend to those brave Americans that have sacrificed their lives for this great nation.

TRIBUTE TO DR. CLARENCE STRAHAM

HON. DALE E. KILDEE

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 13, 2001

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, as a former teacher, I am happy to rise before you today on behalf of the school district of my hometown, Flint, Michigan. On July 13, members of Flint Community Schools will join family and friends to honor the career of Dr. Clarence Straham, who is retiring after 35 productive years.

Originally from Moffett, Oklahoma, Clarence Straham's path to greatness began in 1956, when he joined the United States Air Force, where he served as an Academic and Drill Instructor/Counselor in San Antonio. Honorably discharged in 1962, Clarence attended the University of Arkansas at Fayetteville, where he received a Bachelors Degree in Mathematics and Science in 1964. In 1971 he received a Masters Degree from Eastern Michigan University, and furthered his education with a Doctorate from the University of Michigan.

Clarence's career as a teacher began following his graduation from the University of Arkansas, where he became a mathematics teacher at Merrill Junior/Senior High in Pine Bluff. After moving to Michigan, he taught at Bryant Community Junior High and later moved to Northwestern Community High, where he remained from 1968 to 1976. During that time, Clarence also taught at C.S. Mott Adult High School and Mott Community College. In 1976, Clarence moved to Flint Southwestern Academy, where he has remained to this day. In addition to his tenure at Southwestern, he spent two years as a member of the part-time faculty at the University of Michigan-Flint.

For more than four decades, Clarence has selflessly worked to improve Flint Community Schools. An 11-year member of the Four North Central Evaluation Team in mathematics, he saw to it that the curriculum for high schools in four different cities was kept to a high quality of standards. He has also been the co-chairperson of the Flint NAACP Scholarship Committee, and a member of the Flint Multi-Cultural Community Education Task Force, among many other accomplishments. Clarence is a member of the National Council of Teachers of Mathematics, Urban League, and is a Life Member of the NAACP.

Mr. Speaker, Dr. Clarence Straham is a tremendously respected individual. Thousands of his students, past and present, have greatly benefited from his insight, as has the entire Flint community over the course of the last 35 years. He has always been a fighter for edu-

cation for he believes that a strong educational background is the basis toward improving the quality of life. I ask my colleagues to please join me in congratulating him on his retirement, and wishing him the very best in his future endeavors.

FAITH-BASED INITIATIVES

HON. RON PAUL

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 13, 2001

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Speaker, I recommend to my colleagues the attached article, "The Real Threat of the Faith-Based Initiative" by Star Parker, founder and president of the Coalition on Urban Renewal and Education (CURE). Miss Parker eloquently explains how providing federal monies to faith-based institutions undermines the very qualities that make them effective in addressing social problems. As Miss Parker points out, religious programs are successful because they are staffed and funded by people motivated to help others by their religious beliefs. Government funding of religious organizations will transform them into adjuncts of the federal welfare state, more concerned about obeying federal rules and regulations than fulfilling the obligations of their faith.

If religious organizations receive taxpayer monies, they will have an incentive to make obedience to the dictates of federal bureaucrats their number-one priority. Religious entities may even change the religious character of their programs in order to avoid displeasing their new federal paymaster. This will occur in large part because people who currently voluntarily support religious organizations will assume they "gave at the (tax) office" and thus will reduce their level of private giving. Thus, religious charities will become increasingly dependent on federal funds for support. Since "he who pays the piper calls the tune" federal bureaucrats and Congress will then control the content of "faith-based" programs.

Those who dismiss these concerns should consider that funding religious organizations will increase federal control of religious programs; in fact the current proposal explicitly forbids proselytizing in federally-funded "faith-based" programs. While religious organizations will not have to remove religious icons from their premises in order to receive federal funds, I fail to see the point in allowing a Catholic soup kitchen to hang a cross on its wall or a Jewish day center to hang a Star of David on its' door if federal law forbids believers from explaining the meaning of those symbols.

Miss Parker points out that the founding fathers recognized the danger that church-state entanglement poses to religious liberty, which is why the First Amendment to the United States Constitution protects the free exercise of religion and forbids the federal government from establishing a national church. As Miss Parker points out, the most effective and constitutional means for Congress to help those in poverty is to cut taxes on the American people so that they may devote more of their resources to effective, locally-controlled, charitable programs.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I hope all my colleagues will read Miss Parker's article and join her in supporting a return to a constitutional policy that does not put faith in federal programs but instead in the voluntary actions of a free and compassionate people.

[From GOPUSA.COM, May 25, 2001]

THE REAL THREAT OF THE FAITH-BASED INITIATIVE

(By Star Parker)

The faith-based initiative is our latest proof that politicians are great entrepreneurs in finding ways to expand the scope of government, their own power and control over our lives. This particular initiative should be of concern to all because, in the best scenario, it will only waste money. In the worst case, however, it will be destructive to our nation.

Although for President Bush this initiative is a crusade to reach minorities, welfare programs have already done enough damage in black America. Government dependency has created an environment in which black illegitimacy rates have soared seventy percent. This time the victim of government intervention will be the black church.

However, there is an even deeper concern facing us than this.

Those who claim that the faith-based initiative merely saves charitable programs of religious organizations from discrimination miss the most basic point. The main reason faith-based programs are successful is the fact that free people choose to fund them and that free people choose to participate in them.

The truth is that we all are already participating in a great faith-based initiative. It is called the United States of America and its principles and rules are in the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution.

When we examine these great documents, we see that the founders referenced our most fundamental rights to our Creator and then defined the role of government to secure these rights. Our great and blessed country, has been a story of unprecedented success because of the crucial premise that man is and must be free to exercise his God-given rights.

It is worth noting that although the founders declared this; they then prohibited, in the very first amendment to the Constitution, the establishment of religion by government. Clearly, they did not make haste to keep government out of religion because they were not religious men or because they were opposed to religion or religious activity. They did this because they understood that faith, freedom, and choice cannot be separated and that it is critical to preserve and protect these core elements of our society.

Our goal should be to eliminate government from those aspects of our society that have been politicized: not to politicize the very faith and freedom that have made our country great. The very idea of welfare is the antithesis of both faith and freedom.

A true faith-based initiative is one defined by freedom and not one defined by politics. Humankind already has a tragic history of incidents where governments and politicians have gotten into the business of defining faith and religion.

I respect our President, but he is dead wrong on this one. We still have billions of unused dollars in our welfare budgets. Let us return these funds to our citizens and exercise true faith that they will make the right decisions regarding charitable giving. Let us remember the simple wisdom of Ronald