

## made strides

Concerning the column by War-Brookes on the Republican Party I would like to make several points.

There is no doubt that the Republican Party in Massachusetts is suffering from internal problems. But the survival of the Party is not in question. In a country where the President is entitled to his own political philosophy, we of the Republican Party should not be ashamed but proud of the fact that all scopes of thought are represented under the umbrella of the Republican Party.

Only 17 percent of the registered voters of the Republican Party voted in the recent election. On the grass roots level, we defeated six incumbent Democrats and elected seven freshmen Republican State Representatives. These gains are not dramatic when you consider that the Republicans held only 30 seats in the State Legislature out of 160, but this represents the largest percentage gain for Republicans in the last 12 years.

I claim that Frank Hatch had a "flimsy coalition of political liberals from the Democratic liberals . . ." is totally unfair. It is a coalition that 48 percent of the voters voted for, which Mr. Hatch received, is not a "flimsy coalition" but a voice comprised of Independent, Democrat, and Republican voters. The Republican Party with its "Independent" voters has the same principles of the Democrats. We will bring victories to Republican candidates. As a party of fiscal conservatism, with its concern toward social problems, we have a belief in a limited government. The Republican Party gives the choice to voters from both sides of life in coming elections. We have a belief that the Republican Party will enjoy a resurgence in the future.

William G. Robinson  
Republican Floor Leader  
Boston

## veling mayor

Isn't Mayor White starting to take some fiscal responsibility for the number of tax-payers in the city of Boston and elsewhere, and the money? Once again, in the city of Boston, together with many other big cities, seeking to spend millions of dollars. He tells us he is a "fiscally responsible" man. He says that President Carter's policies are "fiscally responsible" and that he is not going to raise taxes or reduce

to sleep by a soft-spoken guy describing the action.

In closing I'm going to have to exert myself.

William Migetz  
Lynn

## The senator's sincerity

On Monday, February 12, Senator Edward Kennedy testified in the Gardner Auditorium on behalf of a Constitutional Amendment granting full Congressional representation to the District of Columbia. The merits or demerits of the argument are less at issue to my mind than the senator's sincerity.

Before the basic Supreme Court abortion decision, Roe v. Wade, Ted Kennedy wrote a magnificent letter to me and many others stating his emphatic opposition to the legalization of abortion-on-demand. Just after that tragic decision was rendered, he wrote a mealy-mouthed letter urging caution as to the much-needed passage of a Human Life Amendment. "Go slow" he warned in 1973.

In 1979, Mr. Kennedy urges a swift amendment of the Constitution as a matter of "simple justice" to the 700,000 residents of the District of Columbia. In 1978 and 1979, Kennedy stated to the pro-life demonstrators calling on him in Washington that he no longer knows when Human life begins. For the last few years, Kennedy has not only not supported a Human Life Amendment but has consistently voted for tax funding of elective abortions.

Voting rights for those eligible among 700,000 is "simple justice." The right to life of the 5,000,000 unborn children legally killed in the United States from January 22, 1973 through December, 1978 is not even more elemental justice? Not to Mr. Kennedy, it seems, because unborn children can't vote and are therefore unimportant in his scheme to fulfill his vaunting ambition to be President.

Mr. Kennedy would be well advised to remember, however, that the multimillions of Americans who continue to be committed to the legal protection of unborn children do vote and will not ignore his abandonment of their cause.

Joseph J. Reilly  
Andover.

## Survival of fittest

At least we have found out what is wrong with our youth.

It is not the generation gap. They have been cyclamated, fluoridated, Spockeyed, smogged, adulterated and subjected to the D.D.T.s. In other words we slowly poisoned them . . . and they are now doing a better job themselves with drugs and other experimental

## Protests Moakley

I would like to register a protest against my own Congressman, J. Joseph Moakley of Boston. I won't quarrel with his decision to vote his conscience (if he does), but I believe that the busing and quota issue in his district, which includes South Boston, is so heavily a watershed issue that Rep. Moakley should stand or fall on it in the 1980 election.

Last June 13, by vote of 232 to 177, the House agreed to an amendment to the Labor-HEW appropriations bill (#HR 12929) to prohibit the use of funds to issue or enforce any "ratio, quota, or other numerical requirement related to race, creed, color, national origin, or sex, with respect to hiring, promotion, and admission policies." In short, the House voted to prohibit funds for racial quotas. Moakley voted against that amendment.

I know Mr. Moakley's reputation as a liberal, and I assume he is proud of it. But it seems to me that the liberal posture on the question of racial quotas, or any artificial quotas, for that matter, is to oppose them consistently. Mr. Moakley has been given one advisory mandate after another by the voters of his district. It is incredible to me that he could so callously disregard his constituency on this important issue.

If Rep. Moakley believes that quota-ism has any place or any justification in American society, then he has no place representing the 9th Congressional District in Massachusetts.

Andrew J. Donovan  
South Boston

## Donations for murder

There is nothing like getting a good return on an investment. A short time ago, the World Council of Churches (WCC) donated a large sum of money to the Patriotic Front of Rhodesia, which is engaged in guerrilla warfare. As a protest, the Salvation Army suspended its membership in the WCC.

After this donation, the Patriotic Front purchased weapons and shot down two commercial airliners which resulted in the deaths of 109 non-participant passengers.

If my church (Roman Catholic) were a member of the WCC, I would discontinue contributing money for the senseless murdering of innocent persons.

Angus J. Walker  
Boston

## Bella: No surprise

The front-page news relative to the Bella Abzug firing as chairwoman of the National Advisory

bill is the most... waster in America, and not... use of automobiles... interstate highway system... At the same time, Secretary of Transportation Brock Adams proposed the amputation of 43 percent of the energy-efficient rail passenger system operated by Amtrak. His short-sighted aim is to save payers \$1.4 billion over five years (just under \$300 million a year) in federal subsidies; never mind the cost in scarce, high-price fuel wasted in private auto travel.

Adams's meat-ax assault on Amtrak is all the more weird because he himself said recently that transportation decisions would be studied for their impact on energy usage. Worse, he demanded payers of Amtrak that would drive riders from the poor bleeding side of a system he would permit to operate.

Notably, Adams demanded lower fares — when the record shows that after Amtrak in November 1978 tried to match cut-rate air fares with its own discount airfares, ridership rose by 16 percent (that of November 1977). Indeed, of his own department's reports demonstrates that, the largest deficit per passenger mile.

Adams has got the caboose before the engine. The task of Amtrak is to increase ridership and reduce the nation's energy consumption while making intercity travel as convenient as possible. Amtrak's job is not to turn a profit, as Adams seems to think, or to hold down its operating deficit at the expense of its real objectives. (President Carter proposed an operating subsidy for next year of only \$552 million against that \$8.6 billion for highway obligations.)

Amtrak critics try to make two major cases — that people just won't ride trains, and that trains aren't all that much more energy-efficient anyway. The first point is debatable and the second nonsense.

Actually, evidence is substantial that people WILL be attracted to trains with modern equipment, decent on-board service, competitive fares and on-time performance. That attraction will grow as gasoline inevitably becomes scarcer and dearer. Thus, a well-developed rail service could again become a highly useful part of a national transportation system.

As for energy efficiency, it's misleading to base comparisons on the few lightly patronized trains running today. It's quite another thing to calculate energy efficiency on the basis of the potential ridership of a good railroad system in an