

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

THE 100TH ANNIVERSARY OF  
SHRINE CHURCH OF THE IMMACULATE  
CONCEPTION, ATLANTA,  
GA.—RESOLUTION OF GEORGIA  
STATE SENATE

**HON. HERMAN E. TALMADGE**

OF GEORGIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, September 10, 1971

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, there has been brought to my attention a resolution adopted by the Georgia State Senate during the last session of the legislature in Atlanta.

The resolution commends the Shrine Church of the Immaculate Conception on its 100th anniversary and also pays special tribute to the Reverend Thomas O'Reilly for influencing General Sherman to spare that church and others in the Battle of Atlanta in 1864.

I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A RESOLUTION COMMENDING THE SHRINE CHURCH OF THE IMMACULATE CONCEPTION ON THE OCCASION OF ITS 100TH ANNIVERSARY; AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

Whereas, on November 22, 1969, the Shrine Church of the Immaculate Conception of Atlanta observed its 100th Anniversary; and Whereas, during the Battle of Atlanta in 1864, its pastor, Rev. Thomas O'Reilly, influenced General Sherman to spare the five churches and the City Hall in this vicinity; and

Whereas, following the positive action of Father O'Reilly, General Sherman spared St. Phillips Episcopal Church, the Second (Central) Presbyterian Church, the Second Baptist Church, the Trinity Methodist Church, the Immaculate Conception Church and the City Hall; and

Whereas, this heroic deed, in saving these five churches and the City Hall from the torch, will forever be noted in the annals of the history of the City of Atlanta and our State; and

Whereas, the 100th Anniversary Service of Thanksgiving was cocelerated by The Most Rev. Thomas Donnellan, Archbishop; The Very Rev. Lawrence Schmuhl, S.M.; The Rev. Leonard Kelley, O.F.M.; The Rev. Arthur Murray, O.F.M., Pastor; and The Rt. Rev. Patrick O'Connor; and

Whereas, the Choral Guild of Atlanta, under the direction of Mr. Don C. Robinson, with Mr. Herb Bates as organist, provided music for the occasion; and the Altar Boys were: James Kivlan, Michael Guarber, Robert Hudlowe, Larry Hudlowe, Leo Milan, Thomas Perrian and Joseph Perrian; and

Whereas, the Centennial Committee was composed of: Mr. William Leide, Mr. Eddie Gasperini, Mrs. Fred Ajax, Mrs. Laura Clarke, Mrs. Clifford Schexnayder, Miss Eleanor Camarata, Miss Betty Palmer, Mr. Jerry Giordano, Mr. Van Buren Colley, The Rev. Charles Pfab, S.M., the Rev. Rayner Dray, O.F.M., The Rev. Kevin Farrell, O.F.M., The Rev. Aidan Gara, O.F.M., Mr. R. R. Hallman, and Mr. William Willner; and

Whereas, other assistance for the Centennial Celebration was rendered by Mr. Hughes Spalding, Mr. and Mrs. John Camarata, Mr. and Mrs. George Aseff, Mrs. Flora Graham,

Mrs. Jessie Thrasher, and members of the Altar Society, the Holy Name Society and the St. Vincent de Paul Society; and

Whereas, laymen in the procession consisted of Captain Charles A. Moran, Knight Commander of the Holy Sepulchre, grandson of a founder, and a group from the Fourth Degree, Knights of Columbus, headed by Mr. William T. Jordan; and

Whereas, Governor Lester Maddox and the First Lady of Georgia were in attendance; and

Whereas, it is most fitting and proper that the Shrine Church of the Immaculate Conception be recognized and commended on the occasion of its 100th Anniversary.

Now, therefore, be it resolved by the Senate that this Body does hereby recognize, commend and congratulate the Shrine Church of the Immaculate Conception of Atlanta on the occasion of its 100th Anniversary observance.

Be it further resolved that the Secretary of the Senate is hereby authorized and directed to transmit copies of this Resolution to the individuals named herein and to the Shrine Church of the Immaculate Conception.

COLUMBUS, IND., CITED FOR ITS  
ARCHITECTURE

**HON. LEE H. HAMILTON**

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 10, 1971

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article which appeared in the August 21 edition of the Saturday Review which deals with the impact of the unique architectural program in Columbus, Ind.:

DISCOVERING COLUMBUS

(By Katharine Kuh)

Columbus, Indiana (with a population of about 27,000), is commonly called "Athens of the Prairies," a corny misnomer for a town that boasts some of the most interesting modern architecture in the country. Were Columbus located in Europe, Americans would swarm over it in hordes. We can only be grateful that countless tourist buses, to say nothing of countless exhausted tourists, have not yet materialized for their usual hour's visit. As it is, some 10,000 Americans, possibly more, will enjoy Columbus this year on their own terms and in leisurely fashion. The Chamber of Commerce offers free guides and a helpful map.

Today it is not so much private individuals, educational institutions, or museums that act as the most stimulating patrons of art in America; it is big business. Banks, insurance companies, and industrial organizations are becoming increasingly responsible for outstanding architecture and for distinguished semi-public collections of paintings and sculpture. The impetus behind this munificence is varied. At times the aim is to humanize stark environments, to enrich nearby communities, and to expand the horizons of employees and clients. Then, too, there are publicity advantages that in a media-conscious age are scarcely bad business.

As a rule, corporate organizations, unlike museums, are not bound by cumbersome committees, money problems, and inner friction. Art specialists, when engaged by these

institutions, are given freedom to operate intelligently and to use their knowledge advantageously. A minor problem sometimes results, however, from overdoses of esthetic paternalism. Nowhere has this danger been more scrupulously avoided and yet more unavoidably present than in Columbus. Precisely because the town is small and dominated by the Cummins Engine company and by this giant's farsighted board chairman, J. Irwin Miller, citizens of Columbus are torn between pride and a kind of tolerant resentment. For, though Mr. Miller, who heads the world's largest independent producer of diesel engines, obviously plays down his role as benefactor and initiator of a modern architectural program without equal in America, he is nonetheless the spark that lit the fire and keeps it going, not only with company and personal auxiliary funds when needed but even more with leadership, know-how, persistence, and a rare sensitivity.

What then does Columbus offer that warrants a special visit? In the first place, there is probably no other small area in the world where the work of so many eminent modern architects can be considered in comfortable proximity. Buildings by Eiel and Eero Saarinen, I.M. Pei, John Carl Warnecke, Harry Weese, Edward Barnes, Kevin Roche, Eliot Noyes, and others are conceived in such intimate juxtaposition as to make comparisons inevitable. Which of these men, despite divergent projects, have succeeded in answering the needs of a particular community? How have they adapted themselves to the flat fertile prairies and the limited dimensions of an environment totally at odds with America's larger metropolitan centers? In Columbus the best buildings always seem to have been designed "con amore," and hence contribute to the surroundings without condescension, for even the ugliest Midwest towns have an honesty that shames sham.

That, to be sure, is one of the charms of Columbus. It has not entirely succumbed to "good taste." Fine architecture from both the nineteenth and twentieth centuries lives side by side with execrable banalities. Each seems to belong, to "fit in." Columbus has not become a model city nor a dead Williamsburg reconstruction; it is a vigorous melange, curiously American, alive, active, and ambivalent.

Memorable are three churches. The First Christian Church, designed by Eero Saarinen and completed in 1942, represents a landmark, for this light-filled, lucid structure was the community's earliest encounter with noteworthy modern architecture. Here nothing was left to chance. The knowing interaction of space, texture, light, and form allows each element to play against its neighbor in sympathetic harmony. The church, envisioning religion as a positive rational force, is in direct contrast to Eero Saarinen's North Christian Church, one of the most moving religious buildings in this country. How to describe its mysterious interior and pure modest exterior is a challenge, for rarely has architecture been better married to landscape than in this low, brooding church with its triumphant linear spire piercing but not disturbing a wide horizon. Of it Saarinen said, "I want to solve [this design] so that as an architect when I face Saint Peter, I am able to say that out of the buildings I did during my lifetime, one of the best was this little church . . . that speaks forth to all Christians as a witness to their faith." He finished the design only days before his unexpected death.

Perhaps to make up for Columbus's lack of visual arts other than architecture, several designers have deliberately featured sculptural forms as functional elements in their

buildings. For example, Eero Saarinen, working closely with the organ-maker Walter Holtkamp, turned organ pipes into a dynamic three-dimensional relief, while Harry Weese in his beautiful First Baptist Church perforated his brick choir screen with an abstract mural-like design of noble proportions. Even a newly opened newspaper building exploits in its windows bright yellow printing presses as living sculpture. The town's paper, *The Republic* (though not surprisingly once known as *The Republican*, for Hoosier land is eminently conservative), has recently moved into its new glass enclosed quarters, the first building in Columbus designed by Skidmore, Owings and Merrill.

The only sculptural monument that can compete with the town's architecture is in front of I. M. Pei's superb library. My first reaction was "No, not another Henry Moore discreetly decorating another American public building," but I was wrong. The *Large Arch* is a masterpiece growing mechanically out of the earth, yet so subtly oriented as to seem on the move, offering the viewer innumerable varying vistas. "As a young sculptor," Moore confessed, "I saw Stonehenge, and ever since I've wanted to do work that could be walked through and around," and he might have added, work that assumes infinite guises.

As for Pei's library, it is a handsome brick pavilion where space flows in an uninterrupted sequence and where outer courtyards both extend and control the building's dimensions. The structure may at present seem overlarge for the role it plays in a small community, but it has been so sensitively geared to its milieu that size never obtrudes. Not true, alas, of Columbus's fortress-like new post office, designed by John Dinkeloo and Kevin Roche, which frankly overpowers its surroundings with unnecessary pretensions. Somehow one feels this heavy colossus was conceived as if in a vacuum. Columbus and its human scale cease to exist.

However, Kevin Roche is now at work on what promises to be a radical departure in industrial architecture. He has planned a new factory for the Cummins Engine company where some thirteen acres of work space will be under roof and yet invisible to the surrounding countryside. Already partly up, this enormous structure is located several miles out of town amid farmland and trees. Because it has been sunk into the ground and designed around large open courts, the complex will not disturb its pleasant rural setting. At the same time several thousand employees will look out on an unspoiled natural environment.

Of special importance in Columbus are several new experimental school buildings that in some instances have actually led to freer forms of education. In each case, the architect has tried to solve a specific problem. Take John Carl Warnecke's plan for a grade school situated in a large park. He conceived of the school in terms of separate pagoda-like cottages, providing each classroom with its own light-filled pavilion and its own immediate contact with the out-of-doors. Quite opposed is the downtown Lincoln Elementary School, where Gunnar Birkerts introduced a large multi-purpose gymnasium as the central core of the building, hoping thus to divert the children from playing in the streets. Surely the most controversial school and for that matter the most controversial building in Columbus is John Johansen's beramped, be-tunneled oddity that struck me as unnecessarily bizarre. I began to change my mind after reading letters in *The Republic* dedicated to the twenty-first century by a group of the school's fourth-graders. One child wrote:

"Hi, 21st Century. Do you want to know about our architecture? We have some very good architecture in Columbus.

"I am a fourth grader and go to a real unusual school. It is built on nine levels

that are connected by tunnels and ramps rather than stairs. Our classroom is as large as two rooms because it has no dividing wall. This makes it easy for more children and teachers to share ideas."

Another Indiana child, mindful of the well-tended farms ringing his hometown, hoped that "in the twenty-first century we won't have any more wars. We don't have to fight for land, we can share it. Everybody deserves land." The more I read, the more this "real unusual school" of John Johansen's made sense. It may not be satisfying for adults, but it works for children.

Columbus, now 150 years old, is, whenever possible, preserving its nineteenth-century past, the best example of which is unquestionably the county courthouse. Last May *The Republic* noted: "Today the courthouse stands much the same as it was on its completion ninety-seven years ago." Though renovated several times since then, it still retains its half-European, half-Midwest American presence. What's more, it looks like a courthouse and is successfully operating as one. But the restoration of Columbus's downtown store fronts in a bouquet of colors by Alexander Girard seemed a bit like gilding the lily. These Victorian facades scarcely need dressing up. To preserve them is enough.

The town is a maze of marvelous contradictions. A highly conservative community has backed and absorbed some of America's most advanced architecture. Old and new live together happily; so too do the commonplace and the extraordinary, the vulgar and the refined. A classic dichotomy is separated by only two blocks and forty-four years. It points up America's coming of age and the country's faith in itself as a creative force. First one should visit the now unoccupied shrine-like Irwin home and garden, the latter designed in 1910 after the Casa degli Innamorati of Pompeii. Nothing could be more deliberately alien to the sweeping prairies of Indiana than this absurdly beautiful imitation. Mr. Irwin, by the way, was co-founder of the Cummins Engine company and the great-uncle of J. Irwin Miller. Near his mansion is Eero Saarinen's Irwin Union Bank and Trust Company, a clean modern glass-sheathed structure that no longer imitates but initiates.

## SAVING THE GREAT LAKES

### HON. ROBERT P. GRIFFIN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, September 10, 1971

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. President, recently, I was privileged to address an international conference on the subject of Great Lakes pollution attended by Great Lakes Governors and Premiers of two Canadian Provinces.

This conference of Great Lakes Governors and Premiers, held August 16 and 17 on Mackinac Island, Mich., was jointly hosted by Michigan's Governor, William G. Milliken, and by the Great Lakes Basin Commission.

I ask unanimous consent that a copy of my remarks be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the remarks were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### SAVING THE GREAT LAKES

(By U.S. Senator ROBERT P. GRIFFIN)

Along with Governor Milliken, I am highly honored to be here to join in extending a

most cordial welcome to this distinguished gathering of international leaders.

It is altogether fitting that, for this historic conference, you have chosen to assemble here in our Water Wonderland . . . at Mackinac Island, which has been the focal point of so much Great Lakes history during the last three centuries.

You gather in this appropriate setting in a new era—let's call it, and make it, an era of environmental statesmanship. Looking on as you assemble here is an international constituency, concerned as never before about international pollution. They eagerly expect results from your deliberations; they impatiently look to those assembled here for coordinated leadership in a vigorous, concerted international effort to restore a balance of power in the Great Lakes—a balance between man and the nature of which he is a part.

Once again, the people of Canada and people of the U.S. are demonstrating through their representatives here at this conference those wonderful qualities of friendship, respect and togetherness which have characterized the relationship between our two countries for so many years.

This conference symbolizes the fact that our two nations have already embarked on a long journey together—a journey that we must take together if it is to be successful. The skyline of our destination is not yet in sight—even on a smog-free day—but it is important that we have begun the journey.

The task which lies ahead is not only difficult and very costly—but it will take time.

Alexander Pope once wrote, "Blessed is he who expects nothing, for he shall never be disappointed." This is no time for that kind of pessimism.

Rather, I suggest, it's time for the measured, patient optimism of a William Knudsen who, you will remember, was in charge of war production for the United States during World War II. Once, he was being subjected to anxious, intensive questioning, by a Congressional Committee about the time it would take to produce the war goods needed to meet the Nazi and Japanese threats. Finally, the embattled Knudsen responded in this way:

"Look, gentleman, it's like this. Despite all the modern hospitals, anesthetics, the obstetricians, psychiatrists and gynecologists—and despite all the advances in research, medicine and science—it still takes nine months."

Now, the period needed for restoration of the Great Lakes will be longer than nine months. But I am convinced that we can, and should be, optimistic about the eventual success of the effort underway to restore and preserve the Great Lakes.

It is a sad state of affairs that the new frontiers of our society must necessarily include the environmental frontier of restoration and preservation.

Earlier in this century a great American tried hard to awaken the people of the U.S. to the developing environmental crisis we confront today. Although the people were not listening, he said:

"To waste, to destroy, our natural resources to skin and exhaust the land instead of using it to increase its usefulness, will result in undermining in the days of our children, the very prosperity which we ought by right to hand down to them, amplified and developed."

Of course, the words were those of President Teddy Roosevelt. He used them in a message to Congress 63 years ago. One can only imagine what the level of Teddy's indignation might be if he were alive today and if he were aware, for example, of the pollution in our precious Great Lakes.

As a contribution to your deliberations, I should like to touch briefly on some developments on the Washington scene which have—

or will—affect the effort to restore and preserve the waters of the Great Lakes.

Some of our great grandfathers wrote—and then apparently forgot about—the legislation that the new U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, under Administrator Ruckelshaus, is now invoking against some U.S. polluters. Suddenly, new life has been breathed into these old laws—perhaps they were passed by a Congress that operated in an echo chamber; at any rate, they were somehow insulated for years from the awareness or notice of law enforcement authorities.

For example, the U.S. Coast Guard has begun to enforce a long-forgotten 1887 law relating to the transportation of toxic and hazardous materials that have long been dumped into the oceans without any controls.

The Corps of Engineers reached back to 1888 for a law to authorize surveillance of refuse dumping in three major East Coast harbors.

And now, the long-forgotten Refuse Act of 1899 is suddenly the basis for court action against polluters.

In Washington, not only have we been dusting off old laws—but we have been writing some new ones. And those charged with enforcement have been moving vigorously on a number of fronts.

Back in April of this year, when I had the opportunity to address the Fourth Annual National Pollution Control Conference sponsored by the Jaycees in Detroit, I pointed to the serious shortage of personnel available to monitor polluters along the U.S. shoreline of the Great Lakes. In April when I made that speech there were only 19 persons to perform this function. Now I can report that there are 56 such personnel.

I suppose an optimist would say the monitoring force has been tripled—but a realist would be quick to point out that this is only a good beginning—that many more enforcement people are still needed—particularly if about 1600 industries and municipalities are to make the improvements needed to meet water quality standards by 1975.

In the meantime, the EPA, under its energetic Administrator, Bill Ruckelshaus, has been enforcing that old, forgotten 1899 law which, by its terms, requires Federal permits to be issued to each industrial discharger of waste into navigable waterways and their tributaries within the continental United States.

In the months and years ahead, with more inspectors on the job and with more facts gathered, we ought to know a lot more about just what, and how much, polluters are putting into the Great Lakes.

During the coming year, many more dischargers will be placed on abatement schedules—and it is likely that some may have to be closed down. Those who closely watch the Nixon Administration in action have noticed that the hard, tough decisions have been forthcoming, particularly when pollution is the target.

Of course, the permit program, by itself, cannot do the whole job of restoring the Great Lakes. By its terms, it is effective against only one part of the problem—industrial pollution. It can serve only as an interim step until more adequate and effective legislation is finally approved by Congress.

Congress has been at work on a major multi-billion dollar program, aimed at another part of the Great Lakes pollution problem. I refer to municipal waste treatment and combined sewers. The National League of Cities' study in early 1971 indicated that cities in the Great Lakes Basin area of the U.S. alone, need \$2.3 billion over the next six years for primary, secondary, and tertiary treatment facilities and for interceptor and storm sewer improvement.

The Senate is considering a \$20 billion,

five-year program for the nation as a whole, mostly for modern, waste treatment plants and for facilities to keep raw sewage in combined sewers from reaching the lakes, rivers and oceans.

It is encouraging that the Federal Government is loosening the purse strings as far as the problem of combined sewerage overflow is concerned. Key votes on appropriations still must be taken in Congress. However, I can report that the prospects look good, in both parties and in both Houses.

EPA has placed a high priority on the combined sewer problem as it affects the Great Lakes. Eleven out of the 35 authorized demonstration projects, to determine the most effective way to deal with this problem, have been assigned to the Great Lakes.

Not long ago it was hoped that the cleaning agent, NTA, would be the pollution-free answer to phosphates. The jury, judging the safety of NTA, is still out. But whatever the verdict we cannot afford the luxury of continuing to ignore this problem.

Many believe that phosphates are the number one pollution menace to the Great Lakes.

When the Senate reconvenes in September, I have legislation to introduce—which by mid-1972 would limit the phosphate content of detergents on U.S. markets to 8.7 per cent phosphorus by weight, expressed as elemental phosphorus. In addition, the bill I shall introduce will authorize EPA to reduce the phosphorus content even further, and eventually to ban all phosphates in detergents when a safe substitute is found.

I am told that today's technology can produce a detergent of sufficient cleansing strength at the 8.7 per cent phosphorus level, which is a substantial reduction from the phosphorus content in most detergents today. I hope this legislation will provide a strong incentive for industry to develop a suitable substitute for phosphorus in detergents.

As you well know, the Canadian and United States governments are committed to conclude, by the end of this year, an agreement to reduce phosphate discharges into the Great Lakes.

In addition to the phosphorus menace, there is an increased awareness of the threat of other toxic chemicals to water quality and human safety.

Our own Governor Milliken, of Michigan, has had his bouts with mercury—and last year he proposed strong measures to deal with toxic chemicals entering the Great Lakes. Since then, the Nixon Administration has proposed legislation at the federal level to require an evaluation of chemicals in terms of their effect on water quality.

Currently in Detroit, the Corps of Engineers is beginning construction of a containment area in which to deposit dredge spoil from the Detroit River. This is a project which will help in cleaning up Lake Erie.

Along with the Environmental Protection Agency, the Army Corps of Engineers is at work examining a number of different ways to handle the wastes of large metropolitan areas. Three out of five of the studies underway for this purpose are being conducted in Great Lakes cities: at Chicago, Cleveland and at Detroit.

When these studies are completed, later this summer, there must be follow-up on the most promising solutions. And some \$700,000 has been set aside in the current year's budget to finance such follow-up projects.

Last year I urged EPA to allocate to the Great Lakes area a substantial portion of \$200 million in discretionary funds available to the Administrator of EPA for pollution control projects. Since then, EPA has provided more funds—long overdue—particular-

ly for Detroit and Cleveland. As you may recall, last December, those cities had been given 180-day notices requiring compliance by 1975 with Federal-state water quality standards—standards very similar to those adopted by the Canadian-U.S. Ministerial meeting in Washington last June.

Those two cities, working with the Federal government, have responded by undertaking a six-year \$1 billion program to meet Lake Erie Enforcement Conference recommendations.

While great emphasis is appropriately focused on programs to prevent future pollution, of course, the restoration of the Great Lakes from damage already done is an equally important goal. Two years ago, the President's Marine Council proposed initial funding of \$100 million to find effective ways to clean up the Great Lakes. Some of this money still has not been spent. The big hang-up seems to be that we don't know just what to do.

But there are current studies underway by the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA), by EPA, and by the Great Lakes Basin Commission to learn more about the hydrodynamics of the Great Lakes and its nutrients so the patient can be diagnosed and properly treated.

Back in 1961 Congress authorized establishment of a Great Lakes Water Laboratory. Ten years later, we are finally getting the project underway. Given the urgent, serious character of the problem, such a delay is inexcusable.

It now appears that the laboratory will be located on Grosse Ile in the Detroit River. A select staff has already gone to work studying the hydrodynamics and nutrients of the Great Lakes.

But a larger, better equipped, better staffed operation is needed for a central field research facility if the laboratory is truly to serve all the Great Lakes.

I could go on and on. There is so much to be done—and there are so many ways the Federal Government could be helpful. But, as those attending this conference know so well, the states and provinces are at least as important as the national government in meeting this challenge and providing solutions.

As we move toward a better understanding of the challenge of pollution—in all its ramifications—reaching as it does across local, metropolitan, state and even national boundaries—it becomes more apparent that there is no choice but to make adjustments in some of our ideas and patterns. Farmers who face limits on the amount of fertilizers they can use, and manufacturers who must seek substitutes for phosphates in detergents, have been among the first to experience this phenomenon.

It is inevitable that local home rule, in some of its aspects, will have to give way to regional control if our environment is to be saved. Surely, we will need wisdom and tolerance to strike a proper balance between man and nature and to assign each jurisdiction of government its appropriate and proper function.

Before concluding, I want to bring you the greetings, and pledge the cooperation, of the Conference of Great Lakes Senators which, as you know, is chaired by my colleague, Senator PROXMIER of Wisconsin.

Our Senate group is relatively new; but we have been speaking up and battling for the Great Lakes. We think the group has been effective in the Senate, and we hope it will be even more effective in the future.

I conclude by saluting you for being here and by thanking you for your work and leadership in this great cause.

I thank you for our children and for their children.

STATE UNIVERSITY COLLEGE AT  
BUFFALO MARKS 100TH

## HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 10, 1971

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, September 13, the State University College at Buffalo marks its 100th anniversary.

Over the years since it was created as a normal school, the institution has been providing thousands of teachers for the Buffalo area in particular and New York State in general.

It was entirely devoted to the instruction of teachers-to-be until 1963 when the college became a multipurpose institution and now nearly half of the students are involved in programs leading to vocations other than teaching.

Originally, the school was created to provide teachers for the immediate Buffalo area, but now the college is a part of the State university system.

The 100-year history of the school offers an interesting story of the development of education. Martin B. Fried, a member of the college staff and director of centennial activities, has compiled a history of the school which I include in part as follows:

HISTORY OF THE STATE UNIVERSITY COLLEGE  
AT BUFFALO

(By Martin B. Fried)

The State University College at Buffalo, New York, a unit of the State University of New York, is observing its Centennial during the school year, 1971-1972.

Located advantageously directly opposite the Albright-Knox Art Gallery and the Buffalo and Erie County Historical Building, the College is on one hundred and twenty acres of land stretching from Elmwood Avenue almost to the Niagara River.

With approximately 10,000 students, and 750 faculty, the College offers courses in teacher education and liberal arts, leading to degrees of B.S., B.A., M.S. and M.A.

Its building program, still in progress represents a capital investment in excess of one hundred million dollars, with a new administration building, an infirmary, and a social science building due to be completed in the near future.

Recently completed were a new Student Union, Communications Center, dormitories, and an addition to the Butler Library, all designed by the architectural firm of Perkins and Will.

## ORIGINALLY TEACHERS COLLEGE

For nearly one hundred years the main objective of the College was the preparation of teachers and more than half of the students still have teaching as their goal.

The College continues to graduate more certified teachers than any school in the entire state of New York outside of New York City. It is a major source of teachers of art and of exceptional children, the largest in the United States.

But in 1963 the College became a multipurpose institution, and now almost half of its students are involved in programs leading to degrees not related to teaching.

The faculty of the College is well qualified for its task, with more than one-third having doctors' degrees from universities in the United States and foreign countries. Salaries, teaching loads, and opportunities for sabbaticals and research fellowships compare favorably with other colleges. The faculty

is organized under a set of by-laws consistent with the Personnel Policies of the State University of New York and enjoys a degree of academic freedom that is enviable.

## PART OF STATE UNIVERSITY SYSTEM

The College operates according to the Education Law of the State of New York as a part of the State University, which is governed by a Board of Trustees and a Chancellor; the present Board of Trustees includes two Buffalonians, Charles Diebold and Manly Fleischman, and the Chancellor is Dr. Ernest L. Boyer.

A local board, called the College Council, supervises the operations of the College. The present head of the Council is Mrs. James H. Righter, whose father and grandfather served in the same capacity.

The President of the College is Dr. E. K. Fretwell, Jr., a graduate of Wesleyan, Harvard, and Columbia, and the son of a famous scholar at Columbia, E. K. Fretwell, Sr.

## STUDENTS HAVE ORGANIZATION

The students of the College are organized into a United Student Government, with by-laws and officers of their own choice, wholly independent of the faculty and administration. They tax themselves and allocate their funds to various student boards without interference.

They publish their own newspaper, *The Record*, which has been in continuous publication as a newspaper for more than forty years, though it was published more than forty years ago as a magazine. The newspaper, which now appears two times a week, is entirely under student control and makes use of modern automated equipment representing a large capital investment.

It has two faculty advisors, who serve only as advisors, and there is no attempt at control or censorship. The newspaper is generally excellent, observing high standards of journalism and often winning prizes in the annual competitions conducted by the Collegiate Press Association.

In 1969 the faculty adopted new by-laws providing for student representation on faculty committees. Students are already serving on faculty committees within departments and divisions. In some departments students even have some influence on faculty promotion, retention, and tenure, and there is continuing pressure by students to enlarge their involvement in such decisions.

## ABOUT 150 FOREIGN STUDENTS

The College has about 150 foreign students who enjoy a generous tuition waiver granted by the State University to encourage foreigners to come to the College. They come from as far away as Hong Kong, Formosa, Indonesia, and Korea. A large number of Canadians, not included in the above figure, also study at the College.

The College has study-abroad programs in Costa Rica, India, and Italy. The program in Siena, Italy, begun in 1961 under the direction of Dr. Clement T. Tetkowski, has involved approximately 700 students and 15 faculty members in ten years and is highly regarded. A Siena Alumni Club is actively engaged in the program.

The Alumni Association, operating under a new program directed by an executive secretary, Miss Rosalie Turton, has increased its active membership from 1,000 to 4,000 in one year and publishes several times a year an Alumni Magazine which goes out to approximately 30,000 alumni.

## ALUMNI BUILDING LOAN FUND

Because most of these alumni are teachers with limited incomes, there has not as yet developed any major effort at a fund-raising campaign, although the Alumni Association is trying to build up a scholarship and loan fund. In 1970 the Association gave 23 scholarships of \$100. each and several loans.

All contributions to the College are made to the Alumni Foundation, which has been

granted non-profit status by the Internal Revenue Service, and are, therefore, tax-deductible. Mr. Donald L. Volz, a lawyer and a graduate of the College, has served as President of the Alumni Foundation since its inception in 1965.

There is a Development Board, which has been meeting since 1967, headed by Wilton J. Lutwack, honorary chairman of the Board of the Colad Corporation. The Development Board has as its objective the promotion of better relations between the College and the community.

In 1970 it organized a series of campus-city projects in which students, faculty, and advisors from the community worked together on projects designed to improve the community. Its most notable success was a Children's Park. The Board is now working on a plan to provide hospitality in the community for foreign students, a program that is proceeding well under the direction of Mrs. Nancy Jewett, a member of the Board.

## NO COLLEGE IS AN ISLAND

In observing its Centennial, the College adopted as its theme, "No College is an island," as an indication of its concern for the quality of life in and around it. One hundred years ago the State Normal School, as it was then named, offered its 86 students a curriculum that consisted of Ancient Languages, Mathematics, Chemistry, Natural Science, Education, Rhetoric, Elementary Methods of Instruction, Singing, Drawing, and Penmanship.

Ten years later the enrollment was 278 students; in 1891, 700; in 1901, 828. All these students were preparing to become elementary school teachers. For 92 years this was the objective of the College. In 1963 preparation of secondary school teachers began and, in the same year, a liberal arts program not related to teaching was also activated.

In 1909 the Normal School had a low enrollment because of a ruling of the State Department of Education that made the completion of a four-year academic course a prerequisite for admission. Apparently many of those admitted from 1871 to 1909 did not have four years of high school.

And the Normal School course was only a two-year course. Thus, many of the elementary school teachers were young and, in modern terms, rather poorly prepared for their positions. The raising of requirement for admission and the professionalizing of the normal school curriculum were attempts to improve the situation. However, we know that many of these who had so little formal education made good teachers.

## CURRICULUM MORE SPECIALIZED

In 1915 this preparation became more specialized. Students took the elementary, kindergarten, or kindergarten-primary courses. The curriculum included psychology, principles and history of education, methods of language, grammar and composition, school economy, methods of vocal music, methods of arithmetic and algebra, methods of American history, methods of drawing and elementary handwork, logic, methods of geography, methods of primary reading, spelling, and phonics, methods of nature study, methods of elementary science, methods of manual training or household arts, penmanship, methods of physical training, methods of literature (optional), methods of Latin (optional), and observation and practice.

After the first World War, there was a period of expansion in numbers of students, courses, programs, and faculty. The demand for better preparation of teachers stimulated the requirement of a college degree and in 1928 the normal school became a college which granted the B.S. in Education degree.

## AT PRESENT SITE SINCE 1931

The need for a new campus was recognized and met by the move to the present Elmwood Avenue site, where the College opened on January 23, 1931. During the De-

pression years, the total registration of the College was definitely fixed at 1,000 by the State Education Department.

The size of the College thus remained about the same until after the Second World War, when it became necessary to expand to meet demands of an expanding population and at the same time a demand for a higher standard of teacher preparation, including the requirement of a Master's degree. During these years, the College grew at a rapid rate.

In 1971, in fact, the College is a little city in itself, with all the problems of urban life, including security, traffic, and parking. Especially parking. It is the largest four-year college and the fourth largest unit in the State University of New York.

#### AID TO DISADVANTAGED

It has one of the largest state programs for the economically and educationally disadvantaged students, the largest undergraduate program in the United States for the preparation of teachers of exceptional children, and the largest program in the country for the preparation of teachers of art.

It prepares more certified teachers each year than any other upstate institution. Its students come from every segment of American society, its faculty from every part of the country, so that it truly represents the rich variety of the American population.

The College opened its doors on September 13, 1871, one hundred years ago, as a State Normal School with only 86 students and a faculty of 16, of whom five were teachers in the practice school and one was the principal.

The purpose of the Normal School was to train teachers for the public schools of the County and City. This remained the sole purpose of the institution for 92 of its first 100 years, during which period it seemed to go through many metamorphoses, changing its title from Normal School to Teachers College, then to College for Teachers, then to College of Education, and finally to State University College.

#### STILL "STATE TEACHERS" TO MANY

In spite of the changes in title, and in spite of the change in the purpose of the college when it became a multi-purpose institution, the College is still known to many in the community as State Teachers, partly no doubt to avoid confusion with other institutions, but partly also as a tribute to the fact that training teachers is still a major goal of the College.

The original idea for a normal school in Buffalo was, ironically, advanced by opponents of the free high school who proposed a normal school as a substitute for a high school that was badly needed at the time.

They failed in their attempt to prevent the building of a high school, but they planted in the minds of some of the leading citizens of the community the desirability of establishing in the city a state normal school to train teachers. One citizen, in particular, Jesse Ketchum, was later given the title of Father Ketchum, for without his aid, it was said, the Buffalo Normal School would never have come into existence.

In 1866 the State Legislature authorized the establishment of four additional normal schools to be located in different parts of the State. At the annual festival of the teachers of the City of Buffalo, Mr. Oliver G. Steele made the principal address, urging the adoption of suitable measures to secure the location of one of the normal schools in Buffalo.

#### ROLE OF JESSE KETCHUM

Judge George W. Clinton presented a formal petition asking the Common Council to act on the matter, and on May 21, 1866, Superintendent of Schools John S. Fosdick, urging the Common Council to act promptly, noted that Jesse Ketchum had proposed to donate the block bounded by York, Jersey, Thirteenth, and Fourteenth Streets, for educational purposes.

All Mr. Ketchum asked was the erection by the City of suitable buildings for the Normal School and the payment of three hundred dollars annually for the purchase of books or prizes to be distributed among the scholars of the public schools as rewards for good conduct. (These Jesse Ketchum awards are still being presented each year.)

On November 1, 1866, the County of Erie adopted a resolution offering to contribute a sum not to exceed \$45,000 for the erection of a building to house the Normal School. Thus the City of Buffalo and the County of Erie both indicated their genuine interest in, and their intention to support, the establishment of a normal school in Buffalo.

In April, 1867, the State Legislature passed a bill authorizing the establishment of a normal school in Buffalo, and on May 4, 1867, the Common Council of the City appointed commissioners of the Normal School. In August a Building Committee received \$45,000 from the Erie County Board of Supervisors, and on April 6, 1868, the Common Council of the City ordered the issuance of bonds to the amount of \$45,000 to match the Erie County contribution.

#### GROVER CLEVELAND ON BOARD

In June, 1868, the architect, J. H. Selkirk, submitted plans for the building, and on July 16, 1868, the contract was awarded to Henry Rumrill for \$70,000. The cornerstone of the building was laid with appropriate ceremony on April 15, 1869.

On September 16, 1870, the State Superintendent of Public Instruction, appointed the first local Board of Managers (now called the College Council.) One of the members of this first local board was Grover Cleveland.

The first Principal of the Normal School was Professor Henry B. Buckham and he served for fifteen years.

Some idea of the character of the Normal School at its opening may be derived from the requirements for admission and graduation. Candidates for admission had to be not less than sixteen years of age and to take an entrance examination covering the same ground as that for admission to the Central High School. The time required for graduation was not less than one full year and could be two years or more, according to the attainment of the pupil on entering.

Many of the students who entered the Normal School required instruction in the very subjects they were planning to teach, such as arithmetic, and on a very elementary level. It was not until 1922 that the Normal curriculum was extended to three years, but six years later the Normal School became a college and graduated its first degree class.

#### INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE ON URBAN TRANSPORTATION OPENS IN PITTSBURGH: VOLPE ANNOUNCES \$60 MILLION GRANT TO PITTSBURGH MASS TRANSIT PROGRAM

#### HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 10, 1971

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, Pittsburgh is the scene this week of the Fifth International Conference on Urban Transportation. And it is fitting that my city should be one of the first in the Nation to begin a truly far reaching and futuristic mass transit system to serve the entire Allegheny County.

A \$60 million grant for this purpose was announced by John Volpe, the Sec-

retary of Transportation, in a speech to the conference on Wednesday.

The people of Pittsburgh, public and community officials, and numerous civic groups have worked long and hard to bring a viable mass transit system to our county. And that day has officially arrived.

Our city, which has been the host to four of these highly instructive and illuminating conferences, has been a leader—with its many corporate giants—in pioneering new mass transit techniques. And we are looking forward to the accommodation, well being, and transportation ease that will be provided by this new system.

REMARKS BY U.S. SECRETARY OF TRANSPORTATION JOHN A. VOLPE

I am indeed honored and privileged to have been invited to open this distinguished international conference here this morning. Let me be quick to welcome the many visitors here from throughout the world. As our globe undergoes increased urbanization the vital information we share in conferences such as this is truly invaluable. We learn much from all of you, and we are delighted to share information developed here.

Let me also express appreciation to the hard-working organizers of this conference who have helped so much in calling public attention to the great needs in urban transportation.

I am delighted to announce this morning the largest single grant ever made by the Department's Urban Mass Transportation Administration; \$60 million to the Port Authority of Allegheny County for a rapid transit system here in Pittsburgh.

These funds supplement an initial \$8.7 million grant made to the Port Authority in June of 1970. They are part of a total five-pronged \$228 million project that will see a new-type rapid transit line, two rapid transit busways and the rehabilitation of two existing rail transit lines.

We intend to help Pittsburgh help itself. We are working with the city—and the county port authority—to bring this area first-class mass transit service for all their residents.

And let me be quick to point out that we are not investing this sizeable allocation of funds simply because we happen to like Pittsburgh, or for some whimsical, theoretical, experimental purpose. This area has shown the need, has done the planning, has enlisted solid community support and confidence, and has come to us with a program that was ready for funding.

This area came to us with the strong support of two very dedicated and hard-working United States Senators—Minority Leader Hugh Scott, who has been with us at every turn as we developed expanded public transportation legislation—and Senator Richard Schweiker who knows full well that we will not unbind the crisis of the cities without effective alternative transportation facilities for all the people. Indeed, the entire Pennsylvania congressional delegation has given us solid backing—and Representatives Jim Fulton, Joe Gaydos and Bill Moorhead from this area have been in the forefront.

So while I came to Pittsburgh bearing good news, I make the distinction between that and bearing gifts. This is not a gift. This is not Federal largesse. This is a reflection of our very sincere obligation at the Federal level—in the Executive and Legislative Branch—to improve the quality of life throughout the Nation. We can do this only by working with the States, working with the cities, working with the Port Authorities and transit authorities across the land.

While this grant to the Allegheny County Port Authority does hold the distinction of

being the largest single grant ever to come from the Urban Mass Transportation Administration, we do not intend for that to be a long-standing record. This Administration has made a commitment to the cities of America. We are committed to balanced transportation. We are committed to the basic multi-modal transportation philosophy that is the only way to provide mobility to 200 million people spread (in varying densities) over a million square miles of land.

And that brings me to the theme of this conference—to the very vital question you ask here—"Is mobility the fifth freedom?" How vital is the ability to move freely from point "A" to point "B"—for people and for their goods?

The catch-point of all this is that without the fifth freedom of mobility, the first four—freedom of speech, freedom of worship, freedom from want, and freedom from fear—don't exist either. Our's is a distribution society, a widespread, far-flung society, a highway-oriented society, and nothing is close to home anymore. Yet nothing is so far away we can't get to it one way or another.

Most transportation builders and planners now agree that balanced transportation is the key to urban mobility. Those same planners, however, have shown us how difficult it is to agree on the mix of modes that should comprise that balance. We have had no lack of technology, no limited supply of ideas and proposals, no shortage of reports, studies or summaries. What we have needed is action. We have needed the no-nonsense attitude of people like my good friend Mayor Jean Drapeau of Montreal, who has told us that the best way to build a mass transit system is to "stop talking and start digging."

So we are doing that—in Pittsburgh, Chicago, New York, Boston, San Francisco, Washington, Philadelphia, and Cleveland, and soon in Baltimore, Atlanta, Seattle, Kansas City, Los Angeles, and many other places I could mention as I stand here with my fingers crossed.

But we have a tremendous catch-up job to do. Our emphasis on public transportation—in high gear only since 1969—had lagged far behind other world cities. Since the end of the Second World War, new rapid transit systems have been opened in Stockholm, Oslo, Frankfurt, Cologne, Milan, Rotterdam, Lisbon and Rome.

And the systems in those cities have been built with the full recognition that transit does more than just move people. Rather, it plays a major role in re-structuring our cities to improve the quality of urban life.

We must use this approach here in the United States. Indeed, we have solid indications that this can be the case.

Since announcement of the BART System in San Francisco, the value of new commercial construction started in the downtown area has exceeded one billion dollars. And all of the big new buildings will be within five minutes of a transit station. I might add that in the five to six year period prior to passage of the BART Bond Issue in 1962, new high rise office construction in San Francisco averaged \$10 million a year. Since 1962, the total dollar outlay has been averaging \$50 million a year. It's clear that the BART System will change the living and working patterns of the entire city. This is a very great responsibility for urban transportation planners. It is also our most exciting challenge. And that's the attitude we've taken at the Department of Transportation and in the Urban Mass Transportation Administration.

The largest annual Federal investment in urban mass transportation prior to Fiscal Year 1970 was \$175 million. Now we have \$3.1 billion authorized for the five year period ending in Fiscal Year 1975, with a total promise of \$10 billion for expenditure by 1982, thanks to the solid co-operation between the Administration and the Congress.

And thanks, of course, to the concerned and dedicated individuals and groups of the transit industry—many of you who are here in this room today—who did so much to assure passage of the landmark Public Transportation Act of 1970.

Passage of that legislation has brought us to the point where we will have obligated more money—during the 18 months beginning last January 1—than was obligated for public transportation in all of the previous 6 years. That's what I call action. That's the kind of progress we like to see.

We are making a solid beginning, and none is more promising than the new mass transit undertaking right here in Pittsburgh. Pittsburgh, of course, is one of those urban areas in America where fixed-facility rapid transit is both technically and economically feasible. But this Administration, and the Department of Transportation, are not locked into the position that the only kind of transit is rail—or exclusive, fixed right-of-way—transit systems.

Our policy, of course, is that the decision as to what type of public transportation to utilize is a local decision. We make available technical studies money. We seek a close planning relationship. But in the final analysis, it is up to the local community to decide what sort of public transportation will work best.

And I don't need to tell this group that in the vast majority of cases, the best solution—based on local decisions—has been to optimize existing bus systems all over the country. We are tremendously delighted with the phenomenal success (and "phenomenal" is a conservative word) of exclusive reversible bus lanes in Washington on Shirley Highway, in Boston on the Southeast Expressway, in New Jersey on the Lincoln Tunnel approaches, and in San Juan, Puerto Rico. These innovations save time for commuters, save money for taxpayers, and save trouble for the cities. Utilizing the newest generation of buses available, such projects provide the commuter with air-conditioning, comfortable seats, carpeting, low-pollution engines, flexible routings and courteous service. Not only do fleets of buses in exclusive lanes cut trip times by as much as one-half, they cut into the total number of vehicles on the highway thereby lessening congestion on overcrowded freeways.

And even in smaller cities—where exclusive busways are not yet needed or practical—a simple upgrading of rolling stock has made urban bus travel more attractive and better utilized.

We are especially proud of the 6,500 new buses we have helped purchase in recent years, and the 45 bus systems that have been revitalized with Federal funds. In Pittsburgh, for instance, Urban Mass Transit Administration funds have already helped buy 380 new buses, with 200 more on the way. In a typical smaller city—Erie, Pennsylvania—a fleet of 50 new buses was purchased with Federal assistance. Since then, passenger totals have increased 8½ percent, reversing a 20-year pattern of decline and resulting in the first addition of a new route in 15 years. In Cleveland we provided study funds in order to scientifically plan an entire new bus routing system. The bus routes were based on trolley car routes from decades before, and hadn't been altered to take into account shifting population and land use patterns. Now the buses go where the people are, and they go where the people want to go.

This is the sort of intelligent imaginative and aggressive traffic management that takes advantage of existing knowledge and technology. And it paves the way for further expansion and sophistication as our cities grow and become worthy candidates for efficient, economically sensible fixed right-of-way systems. And—as the Pittsburgh grant today points out—when a city is ready for that sort of system, we are ready to help.

Pittsburgh's approach is both evolutionary and revolutionary—as ambitious as it is promising. It is perhaps not surprising that the progress that has been made thus far has come hard, and not without disagreement and debate. Few of man's great achievements have come without honest doubt; the exploring of new frontiers has often led to dead ends before discovery—detours before destinations. Our freedoms were honed on the edges of adversities. Establishing the fifth freedom of mobility will require sizeable quantities of that pioneering spirit: in selling new ideas, in solving jurisdictional problems, and in developing new technology. We are trying to make a start in each of these areas at the Federal level.

Next summer, at Transpo 72—the International Transportation Exposition to be held at Dulles Airport—we are going to put some of these ideas and systems on display. And I invite every city and nation represented here today to join with us in exhibiting the promises and potentials of transportation.

I am personally making every effort to insure that Transpo 72 will provide the kind of exciting showcase for progress that the world's transportation industry deserves. Just today we are announcing the appointment of one of the top organizers in the country—Bill Bird, Vice President of Kaiser Industries—to be my Special Assistant for Transpo's development. I am confident that Bill's special expertise together with Managing Director Chet Spurgeon's dedication will insure the success of Transpo 72. And I am looking forward to seeing a great many of you—the transportation leaders of the world—at Transpo in 1972.

The United States—and the world—is developing a new awareness for the importance of transportation.

The four freedoms as we know them may have been enunciated by an American president—but they are basic to all citizens of the world. This conference—and every nation—can set no higher goal than to erase that question mark—to help establish the fifth freedom: The freedom of mobility. The greatness to accomplish this task is before us this morning. It's time to get on with the job.

#### CBS NEWS POINTS TO GROWING CRISIS IN RURAL AMERICA

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 10, 1971

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I include the CBS News broadcasts, which were aired last month, dealing with the growing problems of rural America, in the RECORD at this point:

CBS NEWS ON RURAL AMERICA—PART I—  
AUGUST 8, 1971

KURALT. For years now, the politicians and problem-solvers have been absorbed with the troubles of America's big cities. But now, after all this attention on the urban crisis, a new problem area has been discovered outside the big cities and their suburbs—rural America. Fifty-four million Americans still live in rural America—26 percent of the nation's population. In the cities, one of every eight people is poor. In rural America, one out of four. Infant mortality is higher, doctors are fewer, schools and housing conditions are worse. You name it—it's a problem. Since World War II, twenty million Americans have moved out of rural America to the cities. The major reason—no way to make a living. Tony Sargent talked about that with Democratic Congressman Lee Hamilton, who represents a rural district in Indiana.

HAMILTON. The rate of unemployment in jobs today for the rural poor is two and sometimes three times that as high as unemployment in the cities.

SARGENT. To a certain extent, hasn't a sort of law of the jungle been operative in rural America? Haven't big farmers gotten a lot bigger and displaced a lot of what are now the urban poor in America?

HAMILTON. Oh, I think that's true. You do have commercial agriculture growing larger and larger, but not supplying more jobs. And this has been a significant factor, of course, in the entire picture.

KURALT. Hamilton adds quickly that the disappearing farm is only one aspect of rural America's problems. Most of the people who live in rural America aren't farmers—only a fifth of them are. So what's really needed to revitalize the countryside is new industry, new business opportunities. How to get that is being discussed in Washington, where it's now recognized that rural and urban problems are closely linked. The central issue in the growing debate is whether this country must have a new national growth policy. And also whether—as Hubert Humphrey puts it—people should be guaranteed the opportunity to live where they want to live.

HUMPHREY. Many people today would like to live in what we call rural America. And they ought to be able to stay there and be able to earn a living, to have good schools and good health services, to have cultural and recreational activities. Without those things being available, there really isn't any freedom of choice of residence because it's freedom only in theory. In fact, you have to go someplace else to get those things that mean so much to the full life and the enrichment of life.

KURALT. Until that freedom of residence gets translated into law, however, the exodus from rural America to the cities will continue. A look at what it's meant for one small town in our next report.

This is Charles Kuralt, CBS News.

CBS NEWS ON RURAL AMERICA—PART 2—  
AUGUST 9, 1971

KURALT. There's nothing quite so melancholy as an empty old house. Travel around rural America and you see thousands of them, once lovely old homesteads, abandoned by families who couldn't make it in the country. One out of every thirteen of the houses still occupied in rural America is officially classified as unfit to live in. The ratio of doctors to population is one-fourth that of the cities. School children graduate with roughly 80 percent of the skills city and suburban children acquire. But such statistics only tell part of the story. Murray Fromson visited one small town in Illinois to get the rest.

FROMSON. The speed limit on State Highway 3 is 55 miles an hour. You can't go any faster or you'll miss the village of Thebes. It's not much of a place anymore, just a spur off the main highway, but like much of rural America, forgotten. It was different once. A lawyer named A. Lincoln once argued a case in the Thebes courthouse. Dred Scott, the runaway slave, spent a night in the local jail. Edna Ferber got some of her inspiration for the novel *Shoebat* here in Thebes. But there's not much left to show what the bustling little river town of Thebes used to be like. Thebes, like so many small towns across the nation, is simply stagnating. Population, 445. It has no industry, no jobs, no schools, no doctor, clinic, restaurant, gas station, no up-to-date housing to speak of, no sanitary water system, and even no jail. Young people are leaving here just as soon as they graduate high school, all in search of work. Some of Thebes' citizens talked about their town. Harry Brown came to Thebes in 1905. He ran a general store here for many years.

BROWN. There was times here that this town had been. . . Back during the World War II days, one week I'd order a ton—now that's just one item—a ton of bacon. I'd divide with the fellow across the street. Then the next week he'd order a ton and divide it with me. The two of us sold a ton of bacon a week. (FROMSON: And nowadays?) Nowadays you wouldn't sell a hundred pound a week.

FROMSON. Mrs. Geneva G. Schaefer has been the postmaster since 1943. Mrs. Schaefer, what would it really take to change Thebes' fortunes around now, do you think?

SCHAEFER. Not much really. A small plant that would employ as many as a hundred people would actually be all we'd need, because with that we would get the things that would follow, with filling stations and restaurants and facilities that you need, and perhaps a doctor, that we need desperately.

FROMSON. Old timers say Thebes is a nice place in which to live, but what is only too plain to them is that unless they get some help from the state or the federal government, or from private industry soon, it'll just be a nice place in which to die. Murray Fromson, CBS News, Thebes, Illinois.

KURALT. Between towns like Thebes and America's big cities—the Chicagos, and Detroit, and Cleavelands—you might think there's no relationship. That's wrong. There is. A look at the links between rural and urban America in our next report.

This is Charles Kuralt, CBS News.

CBS NEWS ON RURAL AMERICA—PART 3—  
AUGUST 10, 1971

KURALT. A lot of people in Washington have stopped thinking about the cities and the countryside as if they were two different Americas. Hubert Humphrey is chairman of a Senate Subcommittee on Rural Development, and no stranger to city problems, either. In his words: "Rural and urban America are inseparable. If one goes under, both go under."

HUMPHREY. If there is rural poverty, people leave rural America to go to the city—they think it's going to be better. At least for them, it is better. Therefore you've had a tremendous out-migration from rural America into the cities, and the cities become over-populated. The pressure upon municipal services is almost unbearable.

KURALT. There's almost unanimous agreement on that theme, from liberals, conservatives, Democrats, Republicans. Jack Miller, Senator from Iowa, a conservative Republican.

MILLER. For the first time, I think, many people living in the metropolitan areas are beginning to realize that the problems that they face in the urban areas are the result in large part from this exodus from the rural areas, and that the only way they're going to whip those problems is to do what should have been done a long time ago, and that is to get more economic development in the rural areas to hold the population there and to provide the people in the rural areas with a fair shake as far as the sharing in the good living of this country is concerned.

KURALT. What it gets down to, then, is spreading the people out a bit more evenly. Today, three-fourths of the American people live on less than two percent of the land. Democratic Congressman Lee Hamilton of Indiana.

HAMILTON. We cannot in this country continue to go down the path of crowding 70, 80, 90 percent of our people on one, two, three, four percent of the land in the nation. That is the path of chaos, it's a foolish pattern, and we have to reverse it in this country if we're going to be able to live the kind of life that most Americans want to live.

KURALT. So, the demand really is for a new national growth policy. The Congressman has at least one influential supporter.

NIXON. Between now and the year 2000, over 100 million children will be born in the United States. Where they grow up and how will more than any one thing measure the quality of American life in these years ahead. I propose that before these problems become insoluble, the nation develop a national growth policy. In the future, government decisions as to where to build highways, locate airports, acquire land or sell land should be made with the clear objective of aiding a balanced growth for America.

KURALT. President Nixon's 1970 State of the Union message. In our next report, a look at some of the proposals that have accompanied the words.

This is Charles Kuralt, CBS News.

CBS NEWS ON RURAL AMERICA—PART 4—  
AUGUST 11, 1971

KURALT. Many a small town is dead. Many more are dying. The American countryside is in trouble. Democrats and Republicans agree that rural America needs some legislative help. It's now a matter of agreeing on the proper form that help should take. Democratic Senators Talmadge and Humphrey last month introduced a bill they call the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act. It would provide credit to small towns and rural businesses seeking to expand rural America's industrial base. On the Republican side, Senator James Pearson of Kansas has a bill which would provide tax incentives to attract industry into rural areas, and Senator Jack Miller of Iowa is pushing the Administration approach—a billion-dollar revenue-sharing program for rural development. Arkansas Democrat John McClellan has yet another bill which would give preference in the awarding of federal contracts to businesses that relocate in rural areas. In interviews with several of these Senators, Tony Sargent found general agreement that there may not be any one best way to solve the problems, that ultimately the best points of each proposal may have to be merged. However, Sargent also found that, for all the expressed concern about the problems of the countryside, one major proposal advanced by President Nixon has yet to receive much attention in the Democratic-controlled Congress.

SARGENT. Part of President Nixon's sweeping proposal to reorganize the federal government would set up an organization aimed at stimulating and aiding community development. This proposal is virtually dormant now, largely because Congress balked initially at the President's huge overall reorganization plan. Still, the bill has been examined in a series of House Government Operations Committee hearings. A Committee spokesman says Chairman Chet Holifield of California may start detailed hearings on the community development phase of the package this fall after the August recess. The Senate Government Operations Committee has held hearings on another Nixon reorganization proposal that would set up a Department of Natural Resources, and a spokesman for that Committee indicates some chance the community development plan might get the Committee's attention also, after the summer holiday.

KURALT. It's happened more than once in Washington. There's a problem. The Democrats propose one solution. The Republicans come up with another. They can't work out their differences. And the result is no solution—the problem just gets bigger. Is that to be the fate of rural America? A look, in our final report.

This is Charles Kuralt, CBS News.

CBS NEWS ON RURAL AMERICA—PART 5—  
AUGUST 12, 1971

KURALT. There are many proposals to help rural America. The question is, are there too many? One powerful Senator, John McClellan

ian, Chairman of the Senate Government Operations Committee, doesn't think that's necessarily the case. He says he has an open mind about his own rural development proposals, as well as those of Senators Pearson and Talmadge and Humphrey and others.

MCCLELLAN. There is merit in those proposals. It's just a question of how far the government wants to go in these matters. I'm not opposing their measures. I don't see that there's any conflict. I don't see that what they propose to do would be anything other than a further implementation of what I seek to do.

KURALT. Hubert Humphrey also adopts a generous attitude about his rural development rivals.

HUMPHREY. I've been a legislator a long time and I know that the sections and the subsections that one writes in his own bill are not always—do not always come out intact. In fact, we have Senator McClellan, we

have Senator Pearson, they have a number of co-sponsors—these are all very good bills. We'll want to take those bills and bring them into concert, and I believe that out of it we will come forth with a proposal that the Administration cannot afford to oppose.

KURALT. Humphrey never has been known for his pessimism. However, Republican Senator Jack Miller, who favors a rural revenue-sharing approach, told Mike Stanley he's afraid help for the countryside may not be quite so automatic.

MILLER. I regret that there seems to be a proclivity for a certain amount of politics—partisan politics. As a matter of tactics, I'm afraid some of them feel that they don't like to have the party in control of the Executive branch get credit for some of these new ideas which are long overdue.

STANLEY. You feel that while there is a broad consensus on the importance, partisan politics may so completely muddy the waters

that there will not be a bill in the 92nd Congress?

MILLER. Well, there's a danger, when you have seven or eight people out here in the Senate all vying to be President of the United States, it's going to be pretty difficult.

KURALT. Senator James Pearson of Kansas has had little luck with his Rural Job Development Act for two years now. He's also pessimistic.

PEARSON. I think this is a low-priority item, not only on the Administration's agenda of public business, but on the Congress's too.

KURALT. As Senator Pearson sees it, the President and the Congress are overwhelmed by many problems. Rural America is only one, and not the most dramatic one. The country has problems, and the countryside's troubles, urgent as they are—and for all the new concern about them—may have to wait for any genuine solutions.

This is Charles Kuralt, CBS News.

## SENATE—Monday, September 13, 1971

The Senate met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the President pro tempore (Mr. ELLENDER).

### PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Edward L. R. Elson, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Eternal Father, in whom we live and move and have our being, we thank Thee for the life and work of our fallen comrade, WINSTON L. PROUTY.

We give thanks to Thee for his selfless service to his State, to the Nation, and to the world.

For his dedication to human betterment, the care of the aged, help for the needy, and instruction to the young, we give Thee thanks. For his fidelity to high trust, for his elevated patriotism, and his devotion to the cause of justice and peace at home and abroad, we give Thee thanks. For his gentle manner, his quiet demeanor, and his steadfast faith in Thee, we give Thee thanks. May the memory of his great and good life speak to us of the higher qualities which abide all time and move us to a deeper commitment to be Thy faithful servants all our days.

And now we beseech Thee to be with all who serve in this Chamber, that we may have wisdom and grace to do justly, to love mercy, and to walk humbly with Thee.

In the Redeemer's name we pray. Amen.

### THE JOURNAL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Friday, September 10, 1971, be dispensed with.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

### WAIVER OF THE CALL OF THE CALENDAR

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the call of the legislative calendar, under rule VIII, be dispensed with.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

### COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that all committees be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

### EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate go into executive session to consider nominations on the Executive Calendar, beginning with New Reports.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The nominations on the Executive Calendar, beginning with New Reports, will be stated.

### U.S. AIR FORCE

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the U.S. Air Force.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the nominations be considered en bloc.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nominations are considered and confirmed en bloc.

### U.S. ARMY

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the U.S. Army.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the nominations be considered en bloc.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nominations are considered and confirmed en bloc.

### U.S. NAVY

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the U.S. Navy.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the nominations be considered en bloc.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nominations are considered and confirmed en bloc.

### NOMINATIONS PLACED ON THE SECRETARY'S DESK—IN THE ARMY AND IN THE NAVY

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Army and in the Navy, which had been placed on the Secretary's desk.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nominations are considered and confirmed en bloc.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of these nominations.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

### LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

### ANNOUNCEMENT ON SENATE PROCEEDINGS TODAY AND TOMORROW

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, for the information of the Senate, and after discussing the matter with the distinguished minority leader, the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. SCOTT), we wish to announce that tomorrow the Senate will be in session from 10 o'clock in the morning until 1 o'clock in the afternoon. At that time, we will adjourn and the membership will then have the opportunity to attend the funeral services for our late departed and beloved colleague, Senator WINSTON L. PROUTY. The funeral services will be held at 2 p.m. in Georgetown.

On Wednesday, September 15, the Senate will meet and any votes which might be considered that day will be postponed until Thursday, so that Senators who wish to attend the funeral in Vermont will be able to do so on that basis.