in purchasing, working as a buyer for Hurley Medical Center, which led three years later to his becoming Chief Buyer for the City of Flint, a position he held for nine years. Michael then made the transition from city to county, as he became Purchasing Director for Genesee County in 1986.

As Purchasing Director, Michael helped usher his department into the modern age with the development of new purchasing regulations, the automation of the purchasing process, and the streamlining of the entire department. Under his leadership, the department set a new standard of efficiency and effectiveness.

Michael serves his peers and colleagues as a member and past president of the Michigan Public Purchasing Officers Association, is a Certified Instructor with the National Institute for Governmental Purchasing, and he has also served as an Instructor at Ferris State University and Detroit College of Business. In 1996, he was recognized by the Michigan Public Purchasing Officers Association and awarded the Klang Award for outstanding contributions to government purchasing.

Mr. Speaker, Michael Glasson has been a positive influence on Genesee County government for the last 15 years. The many people he has come in contact with during that time have benefited from his dedication, his attention to detail, and his ability to work with people from all walks of life. I ask my colleagues in the 107th Congress to please join me in congratulating him on his retirement, and wishing him the best of luck in his future endeavors.

CONSCRIPTION POLICIES

HON. RON PAUL

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 13, 2001

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Speaker, I highly recommend to my colleagues the attached article ''Turning Eighteen in America: Thoughts on Conscription'' by Michael Allen. This article was published in the Internet news magazine Laissez Faire Times. Mr. Allen forcefully makes the point that coercing all young men to register with the federal government so they may be conscripted into military service at the will of politicians is fundamentally inconsistent with the American philosophy of limited government and personal freedom. After all, the unstated premise of a draft is that individuals are owned by the state. Obviously this belief is more consistent with totalitarian systems, such as those found in the Soviet Union, Nazi Germany, Red China or Castro's Cuba, than with a system based on the idea that all individuals have inalienable rights. No wonder prominent Americans from across the political spectrum such as Ronald Reagan, Milton Friedman, Gary Hart, and Jesse Ventura oppose the draft.

Selective Service is not even a good way of providing an effective military fighting force. As Mr. Allen points out (paraphrasing former Senator Mark Hatfield), the needs of the modem military require career professionals with long-term commitments to the service, not short-term draftees eager to ''serve their time'' and return to civilian life. The military itself recognizes that Selective Service serves no useful military function. In 1993), the Department of Defense issued a report stating that registration could be stopped ''with no effect on military mobilization, no measurable effect on the time it would take to mobilize, and no measurable effect on military recruitment.'' Yet the American taxpayer has been forced to spend over $500 million dollars on a system ''with no measurable effect on military mobilization!''

I have introduced legislation, H.R. 1597, which repeals the Selective Service Act, thus ending a system which violates the rights of millions of young Americans and wastes taxpayer dollars for no legitimate military reason. I urge my colleagues to read Mr. Allen's article then cosponsor HR 1597 and join me in ending a system which is an affront to the principles of liberty our nation was founded upon.

TURNING EIGHTEEN IN AMERICA: THOUGHTS ON CONSCRIPTION

(By Michael R. Allen)

In March of 1967, Senator Mark Hatfield (R–Oregon) proposed legislation that would abolish the practice of military conscription, or the drafting of men who are between 18 and 35 years old. Despite its initial failure, it has been reintroduced in nearly every Congress that has met since then, and has been voted upon as an amendment at least once.

This bill was an excellent proposal that should have never been needed. The dovish Hatfield's arguments in promotion of the bill constituted what is actually the conservative position on the item. In its defense, Hatfield asserted that we need career military men who can adapt to system changes within the context of weaponry. Short-term draftees, maintained Hatfield, would not be particularly adept at utilizing modern technology. More recent efforts to overturn the Selective Service Act have similarly stressed efficiency.

This basic logic is the driving force behind the political anti-draft movement. Others oppose the draft because it represents another governmental intrusion into the lives of America's young adults. Those lacking skill or ambition to serve will be greatly humiliated once drafted, and those without developed skill in search of an alternative career will be denied an opportunity to choose that direction. The draft also is a blatant attack on the Thirteenth Amendment, which prohibits involuntary servitude. If the federal government fought individual states over the legalization of private-sector slavery, then should it not also be equally compelled to decry public-sector servitude? Of course it should, but an elastically interpreted ''living Constitution'' makes all sorts of public schemes safe from legal reproach.

Recruiting students and vagrants is of no use to a competitive military, since both groups are uninterested in active duty. By contrast, a volunteer army—assuming the country needs any army at all—will yield those with an interest in serving their country and those who seek the military as a place to get that necessary step up into a better life. A primary partner to draft reform would be to offer an alternative for those who request not to serve militarily. Non-combatant positions, such as field doctors and radio operators, might be made civilian positions. Then, those who wish not to engage in battle will be able to serve the nation for as long as they need.

Additionally, the government can save some money, albeit not much, by not having to buy uniforms for these civilians.

Yet the most compelling reason for having volunteer military forces is the right of a person to own his or her body. The right to self-ownership must be supreme in a free nation, since without it there is no justification for government or laws at all. If one does not own his body, then why should murder be a crime? Why should there be money for the individual to spend? The self must own itself for there to be any liberty. And clearly one does have self-ownership. A man controls his own actions, and efforts to force him to do what he desires not to do are nugatory. The best the State can do is arrest him after he has disobeyed the law. It cannot prevent a willful person from committing illegal acts. The draft ignores the concept of self-ownership and proceeds to diminish the available benefits of a free society for young men.

Issues of cost and unfairness can sway those not seeing a moral reason to oppose conscription. The government spends a lot of money that might be used in armory for war in order to draft a number of men that would be similar to the number who might otherwise volunteer. In this way, the draft is a redundant method that consumes entirely too much money.

It is unfair because those who do not get called remain free while those called into duty must serve or face charges that will haunt them for the rest of their lives. This practice, while through chance, is unjust because it targets those Americans with low draft numbers. Through the archaic, unjust draft process America once more is embracing authoritarianism. If the government chose, National Guard forces could be utilized to alleviate the costs of draft, recruitment, and salary. The savings could then be 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 US 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 twofold 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 ones 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 superceded 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