

the daily Collegian

Thursday, May 10, 1979
Vol. 79, No. 173 22 pages
University Park, Pa. 16802
Published by Students of The Pennsylvania State University

15¢



Day-night savings time

Although the moon appears to be hanging over Old Main at midday, it really isn't. This double exposure shot only makes it seem like Daylight Savings Time has goofed.

Carter rationing plan gets Senate approval

WASHINGTON (AP) — The Senate approved President Carter's standby gasoline rationing plan 58-39 yesterday but unanimously told him not to use the power except in dire national emergencies.

Senate acceptance sent the latest version of the often-modified plan to the House, where action was anticipated tomorrow.

The president generally agreed to go along with a unanimous Senate resolution spelling out circumstances under which he could invoke the rationing power.

At the White House, President Carter issued a statement applauding the action, saying: "We do not expect that we will ever need to use this plan, but, as with our military forces, we would be foolhardy not to be prepared should such a need ever arise."

To win Senate approval, the White

Hot stuff

Our hazy, hot, and humid weather will continue under partly cloudy skies for the next few days and all weekend long. There is just the slightest chance of a brief shower at any time though. Daytime highs will be near 87 and overnight lows near 69.

House made a number of additional last-minute concessions, including a promise not to use rationing to ease lines at gasoline stations caused by temporary shortages.

The president also promised to make more gasoline available to farmers and to industries engaged in producing energy under a compromise reached moments before the Senate showdown.

These concessions came in addition to modifications made by the president earlier — modifications which the Senate accepted on a 66-30 vote shortly before approving the overall plan.

By this vote, senators went along with the president's decision to change his plan to guarantee a larger share of rationing coupons to individuals living in states where average gasoline consumption is high.

The rationing plan is intended only as a standby program, one that would be kept on the shelf until needed in a crisis. And once Carter invoked such a plan, Congress would have 15 days in which either chamber could veto it.

"In the absence of contingency plans, including rationing, we would not be able to deal with the crisis except in anarchy," Sen. Henry M. Jackson, chairman

Continued on Page 3.

U.S. reaches SALT II agreement

WASHINGTON (UPI) — The United States and Soviet Union have wrapped up a SALT II nuclear arms accord and stand "on the threshold" of signing it after some minor finishing touches, Secretary of State Cyrus Vance announced yesterday.

"Details concerning the time and place of a summit meeting will be announced in the very near future," Vance said in announcing the break-through in negotiations that have dragged on for seven years, spluttering and surging with the fortunes of "detente."

U.S. officials said President Carter and the ailing Soviet President Leonid Brezhnev would probably meet in mid-June — for the first time — either in Geneva, Vienna or Stockholm. Brezhnev is too frail to travel to the United States.

That will give Carter another grand moment of foreign policy triumph to match his Middle East peace and Panama Canal treaties — but it will only precede a brutal, uphill battle for Senate ratification, a battle with 1980 election year overtones for all involved.

Administration officials concede they are now more 20-25 votes shy of the required two-third's Senate majority — 67 votes if all 100 senators participate — and the proof was in the muted congressional reaction yesterday.

Even among the Senate's politically-moderate leaders, no one at first came out with a flat, unqualified endorsement of SALT II, which is designed to slow the nuclear arms race by putting fixed limits on the number of missiles and bombers each side may have.

Sen. Frank Church, D-Idaho, chairman of the pivotal Foreign Relations Committee that plans to take up the treaty in July, said Senate action would depend on whether SALT II "is balanced and gives no possible advantage to the Soviet Union."

Senate Democratic leader Robert Byrd declined to speculate on the treaty's chances. Republican leader

Howard Baker said he told Carter yesterday, at a private White House briefing, he is "leaning against" the pact.

Liberal Sens. George McGovern, D-S.D., and Mark Hatfield, R-Ore., restated their threats to oppose the pact as insufficient to curb the arms race, while Sen. Henry Jackson, D-Wash., attacked it from the opposite quarter and predicted the Senate would "amend" the treaty as it pleases "to plug its many loopholes."

Joined by Defense Secretary Harold Brown, Vance appeared in the White House press room to announce he and Soviet Ambassador Anatoli Dobrynin have resolved the last remaining SALT issues and have instructed lower-level negotiators to finish up "the few remaining secondary items" in the next few weeks.

Then Vance and Brown swung into the task of whipping up public support, and converting the McGovern and Bakers,

by reviewing all the arguments in favor of this agreement and all the dangers in having no treaty.

Brown stressed the military advantages, noting that the Soviets would be able to build their formidable ground-based intercontinental missile force to far greater levels without SALT II than with it.

On the other hand, he said, the treaty will allow the United States to continue development of crucial new weapons systems such as the controversial MX mobile missile.

Vance stressed the need to create a stable framework for peace, calling SALT II "an essential step toward a safer America and a safer world."

"Our purpose in SALT II has been to strengthen our nation's security and that of our allies through sensible and dependable restraints on the nuclear arms competition," he said.

"We are now on the threshold of

signing a SALT agreement which will soundly and effectively realize this purpose."

Officials stressed SALT II still needs two or three weeks of work by lower-level negotiators who must work out final wording of the mind-boggling package of documents. But they see no fatal hitches in that phase.

Two-thirds of the Senate — 67 if all 100 members vote — must approve the treaty for it to take effect. Hearings were expected to begin in June and final action on the treaty was expected by the end of the year — in time to become a central political issue in the 1980 presidential campaign.

Chief among the variety of complaints is the so-called "verification" issue — how can the United States be sure the Russians won't cheat on the treaty terms, especially now that the United States has lost two of its key electronic missile-test monitoring stations in Iran;

Major terms of SALT II treaty

WASHINGTON (UPI) — Here, at a glance, are the major provisions of the SALT II treaty:

— A ceiling of 2,250 strategic missiles or bombers for both sides by the end of 1981. Both sides must be down to 2,400 within six months of the treaty going into effect.

— Within the ceiling, no more than 1,320 missiles and bombers may be equipped with multiple warheads or cruise missiles. Within that subceiling, there will be no more than 1,200 land-based, sea-based, or air-to-surface ballistic missiles. Within that subceiling, no more than 820 land-based ICBMs with multiple warheads will be permitted.

— Soviets to dismantle some 270 strategic missiles to get down to the initial 2,400 ceiling.

— Soviets to stop production and deployment of the SS-16 strategic missile.

— Both sides may construct and deploy a single new type of strategic missile.

— Both sides accept limits on the number of warheads they can place on their new missile: no more than 10 on a land-

based strategic missile; no more than 14 on a sea-based missile.

— Cruise missiles carried on heavy bombers would not be limited in range, but other cruise missiles (launched from the ground or ships or tactical fighters) would be limited to a range of 366 miles.

— A treaty banning anti-ballistic missile systems, signed in 1972, remains in effect.

— A protocol to the main agreement restricts both sides from deploying land-based mobile ICBMs, sea-launched and ground-launched strategic cruise missiles and ICBMs carried aloft in aircraft until after Dec. 31, 1981.

— The agreement will be monitored by U.S. and Soviet spy satellites and other intelligence means.

— A "Backfire" letter in which the Soviets agree not to deploy the swing-wing Backfire bomber against the United States at Arctic bases nor increase its current current production beyond the present rate, judged by the United States to be 30 per year.

Family ties may cause conflict in mall voting

By JIM WILHELM
Daily Collegian Staff Writer

A member of the Ferguson Township Planning Commission is a cousin of the Dreibeis family, owners of the 150-acre farm where the Oxford Development Company wants to build the proposed Ferguson Mall.

Cecil Irvin, a commission member, will be among the planners who will vote on a recommendation to township supervisors about the fate of the mall. The vote will follow two days of public hearings on the mall on May 23 and 24.

It is the third possible conflict of interest to arise in connection with the mall decision.

At a meeting of the planning commission May 7, commission member Martha K. Hummel voluntarily abstained from any discussion and recommendation vote on the mall. Hummel said she had a conflict of in-

terest on mall decisions because she is employed as a sales associate by Ralph F. Brower.

Brower is a Century 21 realtor employed by the Oxford Company to secure options to buy homes near the mall site. He, too, has a possible conflict of interest.

Brower is a running unopposed for third ward supervisor in the township in the Tuesday primary elections. When contacted by The Daily Collegian last week, however, he denied any conflict and said he was running "because I'm sick and tired of some of the things I see going on in the township."

Irvin, unlike Hummel, joined Brower in denying any conflict of interest — even though he is a relative of the family.

"I don't feel there is the slightest bit of conflict if I vote on the mall recommendation," Irvin said. "I talked this

over with the township solicitor and we agreed there would be no conflict of interest. I have dozens of relatives in the township and some of them are for the mall and others are going to be badly affected if any mall is constructed. I'm right in the middle of the whole thing."

"Cecil came to me in November to see if there would be any problems involved if there was a mall vote," Ferguson Township solicitor Ronald M. Lucas said. "Since he has relatives on both sides of the issue and he is not an immediate member of the Dreibeis family, I don't see any reason why he couldn't vote."

Lucas said the two main criteria for determining conflict of interest are financial investment and the involvement of immediate family, such as father, mother, brother or sister.

"Financial involvement is the biggest thing, I think," Lucas said. "If a

member of a governing body had a direct financial investment in the decision he was going to make, he should immediately announce his involvement and abstain from voting on it."

He said Hummel's decision to abstain from voting was not a precedent in that situation. Lucas said he read in some literature that a husband-wife team in California recently was forced to abstain from voting on a decision because of a conflict of interest. Although Lucas wasn't sure of the details of the case, he said the wife was on the town's planning commission and the husband was a member of the governing body.

Benjamin Novak, attorney for the Park Hills Homeowners Association, a group opposed to the mall, said he was unaware Irvin was related to the Dreibeis family until contacted by the Collegian.

Continued on Page 14.

'Prostitution exists here, police and 'Johns' say

By BARBARA KLEIN
and PAM STEIN
Daily Collegian Staff Writers

To some, prostitution is a dirty word; to others it is a way of life. But no matter what the interpretation, prostitution is a thriving business — a business that has not bypassed Happy Valley.

"Prostitution is certainly a crime you don't see a lot of arrests for," a former State College police officer said. "But that doesn't mean it doesn't exist; it does. Just frequent the Sheraton and the Holiday Inn and you can see it."

Much of the Sheraton Penn State Inn's and Holiday Inn's business comes from convention business, according to representatives of the inns.

"We do not get many off-the-street or walk-in customers," Barbara Zier, Sheraton general manager, said. "Usually companies will reserve blocks of rooms for their conventions."

However, according to Sheraton bar manager Cubby Bair, the rise of conventions does not necessarily result in the rise of prostitution.

"A motel always gets accused of that (prostitution), especially a busy one," Bair said. "We have the busiest bar in Centre County without a doubt; that's why we get the reputation."

Yet other motel managers do not view the problem so simply. In fact, many see prostitution as a problem that needs to be dealt with.

Jamie Stiteler, assistant manager of the Holiday Inn, is aware of the talk about prostitution. But she quickly notes the management is attempting to deal with the problem.

"Since I started working here in October '77, the manager and I have been throwing those types out of here; we don't want them in our bar," Stiteler said. "First we politely ask them to leave; then if they don't, we bodily throw them out. I've heard that most of them have moved to the Sheraton."

However, Zier denied prostitutes operate out of the Sheraton lounge. "I've never heard of anything here," she said. "I don't know of anyone particularly coming into this lounge."

But prostitutes are available downtown, according to an employee of one downtown motel. And he said a specific procedure is followed for arranging meetings between men and prostitutes. The head of the bar lines up the men, goes to the desk, takes a room key and then signs the register "Rip Van Winkle," he said.

The State College Police Department is aware of prostitution in the borough, but, according to Investigator Robert Abernethy, there have only been three arrests in the past three or four years. One incident resulted in the conviction of two women working out of the Holiday Inn on charges of disorderly conduct.

Prostitution is not limited to the downtown area, for it can also be found on the University campus, according to Stuart. A man who has been spending time and money with prostitutes since fall 1977, he said the problem is more widespread than most people believe.

"Girls are in it for the money," he said. "They're doing what they know how to do best. One girl I had said she was making \$250 a week."

Another "john" knows co-eds in the dorms and in apartments who perform oral sex for \$5. The former are said to spend the night and perform additional acts for \$25. These girls advertise by "knocking on doors" and other methods, he added.

"You can just tell," Stuart said, "even by the way they dress. Bars and bartenders are contacts and the 'wall' isn't too bad if you're sober and looking."

Although Stuart said he hasn't had any trouble with the police, he warned, "You have to be cautious."

According to David Stormer, director of University Police Services, there have never been any arrests made for prostitution on campus.

"Most investigations," he said, "have stemmed from co-eds who have been solicited for prostitution by individuals downtown."

Stormer, who has been on major college campuses for 20 years and on Penn State's for six, said he's "always heard of it (campus prostitution)." However, he added, "I've never substantiated it. And, of course, no one is willing to go to court."

Stormer said "Contacts are made along the 'wall' or on the streets, in pizza places or outside bars." But the girls who make these contacts are in the 13- to 17-year-old age bracket, he said. "For the older women downtown, it's a business," Stormer said. "For the younger ones, it's a weekend activity."

Like many others, Abernethy said the problem existed only in town and said he doubts "if any prostitution exists on campus." He believes prostitution is



Illustration by Tom Mosser

more prevalent in the better motels and hotels, "especially ones that handle conventions. In these situations girls charge \$50 to \$200 a night."

In Pennsylvania, prostitution is a misdemeanor and those convicted can be fined as much as \$2,500. But arrests are hard to come by and the women will usually plead to lesser charges, Abernethy said. "If there isn't a commotion, there isn't too much we can do about prostitution," he noted.

The former officer said the public does not want to be involved with prostitution. "The people of the borough don't see it as a problem," she said. "There has not been much research conducted or interest expressed in it, but it's still there."

District Magistrate Clifford Yorks doesn't believe prostitution exists here.

"When 75 percent of the population is between 18-23, there's no need to pay when you can get it free," Yorks said. "You can go to the Sheraton any night between 4:45 and 6:45 and see at least four to six girls coming in and going out every half hour, but I don't think they're getting paid for it."

Abernethy said some prostitutes are fairly well known. For example, he said one is a secretary at the University, and another is often seen in her red Cadillac driving around town.

Except for rumors, Rev. Robert Blair of the United Campus Ministries, said, "Neither in my social welfare work, nor in my role in the Choice counseling

program, have I encountered any problems with prostitution."

Yet Blair, who called himself "so far removed from the 'real world' that it's hard to know much about such things," said he has heard many rumors.

"I have heard rumors," he said, "that on big weekends, a relatively well-organized crime ring brings in anywhere from five to 10 girls from Pittsburgh and around."

But women who are prostitutes cannot be placed in one category:

"There is no typical profile of a prostitute," the former officer said. "There are many reasons women turn to it — money to support a drug habit, or simply because they enjoy it and don't mind being compensated."