

## Social Security Report

With some experts claiming that a million species - or about a quarter of those on earth - will become extinct during the next 30 years, the U.S. Endangered Species Act, up for Congressional renewal this year, has taken on a new significance for many Americans. Conservationists contend that we're losing too many species too fast, and most agree that much more is at stake than the fate of the Tecopa pupfish - the first species officially stricken from the Endangered Species List by a finding that it is extinct.

Nevertheless, the upcoming debate over the ESA will be a "very tough battle" for the act's proponents, says the current issue of National Wildlife magazine, the bi-monthly publication of the National Wildlife Federation. To win, conservationists will have to dispel some popular misconceptions about the law itself and buck the momentum behind the Reagan administration, which tried to cut the Endangered Species Program budget by some 43 per cent last year.

For one thing, says the magazine, the public needs to understand that the Act never sought to bring a halt to development. It instead established a consultation process to come up with alternatives that wouldn't affect threatened species.

Statistics bear out the contention that the law doesn't stymie development, says National Wildlife. In case to 1,000 consultations between the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and federal agencies implementing the ESA since 1979, only 150 proposed projects posed a danger to an endangered species or its habitat. In the "great majority" of cases, says the magazine, "reasonable alternatives" were developed. For example, the magazine points out, mineral exploration in Montana's Cabinet Mountains was allowed to proceed with only slight modifications to protect grizzly bears.

Other parts of the law haven't worked so well,

according to National Wildlife and that's where the legislation needs strengthening. One of the most criticized aspects of the law is the procedure for adding endangered or threatened species to the official list. When this part of the act was amended in 1978, the entire process was simply made more cumbersome and inefficient, conservationists say. The result - a mere 15 species were added to the list the year after the amendment took effect, compared to the 65 species listed the year before.

Now, under the Reagan Administration, says National Wildlife, the listing process has "ground to a complete halt." Not a single species has been proposed for the threatened or endangered list since Reagan took office, though some species that were proposed under President Carter have been added to the list.

Working against a more efficient listing procedure, says the magazine, is a slashed budget. A cut of nearly half in the current federal budget for listing activities reflects "not only the Administration's cost-trimming campaign, but also a downgraded emphasis on listing," says the magazine report. In addition, the Administration proposed a 20 per cent reduction in funding for programs that help restore a species' numbers, the recovery programs that have helped save the whooping crane and the California condor, among others.

The Endangered Species Act is being attacked on several fronts, many of which involve critical provisions of the law. Conservationists will have to remind the American people, says National Wildlife, that without the security blanket of the Endangered Species Act, many more species would have preceded the tiny Tecopa pupfish down the road to extinction.

The more that road is travelled - the more the "web of life" is broken by dropouts - the closer man himself comes to being endangered.

## Endangered Species Act

Lee E. Wallis  
Field Representative

A new Social Security study shows that very few people will be hurt by congressional action last year that eliminated the "minimum benefit".

The study shows that those who would have received the "minimum benefit" under prior law are mainly housewives who will usually get higher benefits on their husbands' records and people qualified for pensions under other government retirement programs.

The date disproved the notion that most who would have received the "minimum benefit" in the future were lifetime workers with low earnings, as feared by many.

The elimination of the "minimum benefit" by Congress last year for 3 million current recipients and for future recipients was a source of much controversy.

Congress later rescinded their earlier action, eliminating the "minimum benefit" only for people becoming eligible in 1982 and later.

The new study sampled newly eligible recipients who turned age 62 in November, 1981, and who applied for Social Security benefits at that time. All were eligible for the "minimum benefit".

Some 78 per cent were housewives, most of whom were also entitled to a wife's Social Security benefit on their husbands' work records.

Most had barely enough work under Social Security to be insured and thus qualified for the "minimum benefit".

The average benefit for those eligible on their own record and on their husband's record was \$200. Without the minimum benefit, the average would have been \$196.

Another 10 per cent were people covered under other government retirement pension programs, with only a little work under Social Security.

The "minimum benefit" - \$135.00 at the time - represented a windfall to that group.

The study noted that even without the "minimum benefit" - using the regular benefit formula - this group of people will get back a disproportionately large benefit because the benefit tables are weighted in favor of people who have paid small amounts into the Social Security system.

## Promoted

Floyd Jordan, son of Madeline H Jordan, Route 1, Tyner, has been promoted in the U.S. Army to the rank of private first class.

Jordan is a storage specialist at Fort Campbell, Ky.

## Board Of Education To Meet

The Edenton - Chowan Board of Education will hold a monthly meeting at 7:30 P.M. November 1st in the third floor conference room of the County Office Building.

In ancient Egypt, nail color indicated a woman's social rank. Only the palest shades were permitted lower class women, and was the woman who painted her talons brighter than the Queen's.



# DON'T BE FOOLED BY CLAIMS OF "LOWEST FOOD PRICES"!

WINN-DIXIE URGES YOU TO JUDGE FOR YOURSELF!

Week After Week After Week, We Beat The Stores That Claim To Be "LOWEST" In Head-To-Head Price Comparisons.

Items Listed Below Were Purchased On The Same Day At Each Store And Are Shown On Each Receipt In The Same Order As Listed.

WINN-DIXIE THE BEEF PEOPLE THANK YOU 10/18/82	
16 OZ COKE	1.49E
BT DEP	.80D
GROCERY	.99E
AST COCKTAIL	.55E
INST COFFEE	3.79E
POT PIE MORT	.33E
182/79	
PRODUC	.89E
CHEE DOGS	1.99E
WD BOLONA	1.19E
BEEF FRANKS	.99E
DIXIE TEA	1.39E
HS BACON	2.97E
A 1 SAUCE	.82E
SHORTENING	1.29E
SCHLITZ LITE	2.09A
DORITOS	1.29E
PRODUC	.79E
SB GLI CHESE	.99E
PRODUC	.79E
TAX	.99H
TOTAL	26.42

WINN-DIXIE TOTAL \$26.42

- 8-pak 16-oz. Cokes
- Bottle Deposit
- 32-oz. Miracle Whip
- 16-oz. Store Brand Fruit Cocktail
- 10-oz. Nescafe Instant Coffee
- 8-oz. Morton Pot Pie
- 5-lb. Apples
- 1-lb. Oscar Mayer Cheese Franks
- 12-oz. Store Brand Beef Bologna
- 12-oz. Store Brand Beef Franks
- 100-ct. Store Brand Tea Bags
- 2-lb. Store Brand Bacon
- 5-oz. A-1 Sauce
- 42-oz. Store Brand Shortening
- 6-pak 12-oz. Schlitz Lite Beer
- 8-oz. Doritos
- 3-lb. Onions
- 16-slice Store Brand Cheese Singles
- Lettuce

FOOD TOWN 10/18/82	
COKE PRODUCT	1.99 L
BOTL DEP	.80 H
GROCERY	1.49 L
GROCERY	.59 L
GROCERY	3.79 L
PERISHBL	.34 L
GROCERY	1.29 L
MEAT	2.19 L
MEAT	1.49 L
PERISHBL	.99 L
MEAT	1.29 L
GROCERY	3.98 L
GROCERY	.82 L
NON-FOOD	1.37 L
GROCERY	2.09 D
PRODUCE	1.09 L
PRODUCE	.99 L
PRODUCE	1.29 L
SUBTOTAL	.89 L
SUBTOTAL	28.77
4% TAX	28.77
TOTAL	29.89

FOOD TOWN TOTAL \$29.89

Winn-Dixie's Combination Of EVERYDAY LOW PRICEBREAKERS, And DEEP-CUT PRICE BREAKER SPECIALS Offer You Unbeatable Savings.

Make your own comparison and you'll discover what hundreds of thousands of Winn-Dixie Shoppers already know.....

## NOBODY SAVES YOU MORE THAN WINN-DIXIE!

\*PRICE SURVEY DONE ON 10-18-82. SOME PRICES MAY HAVE CHANGED SINCE THAT TIME.