

and status of Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary, and the Representative of the United States of America in the Security Council of the United Nations.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate January 20, 1977:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

Cyrus Vance, of New York, to be Secretary of State.

DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY

W. Michael Blumenthal, of Michigan, to be Secretary of the Treasury.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE
Harold Brown, of California, to be Secretary of Defense.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
Cecil D. Andrus, of Idaho, to be Secretary of the Interior.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE
Bob S. Bergland, of Minnesota, to be Secretary of Agriculture.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Juanita M. Kreps, of North Carolina, to be Secretary of Commerce.

DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT
Patricia Roberts Harris, of the District of Columbia, to be Secretary of Housing and Urban Development.

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
Brockman Adams, of Washington, to be Secretary of Transportation.

OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT AND BUDGET
Thomas Bertram Lance, of Georgia, to be Director of the Office of Management and Budget.

COUNCIL OF ECONOMIC ADVISERS
Charles L. Schultze, of the District of Columbia, to be a member of the Council of Economic Advisers.

The above nominations were approved subject to the nominees' commitments to respond to requests to appear and testify before any duly constituted committee of the Senate.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

OCEANIC OIL POLLUTION

HON. G. WILLIAM WHITEHURST OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 19, 1977

Mr. WHITEHURST. Mr. Speaker, I have the privilege of serving as a member of the board of directors of the Oceanic Educational Foundation, an organization which has as its goal the establishment of world ocean education, covering the many aspects of the study of the sea, at all levels in the American school system, in order to bring the seas into educational balance with the land to sustain the future prosperity, safety, and security of citizens through knowledge of the world's oceans.

In that connection I recently received a copy of *Oceans: Our Continuing Frontier*, the courses by Newspaper Reader which is a project of the University of California, San Diego, university extension program. At this point in the Record, I would like to share with my colleagues one of the articles from that excellent book. It was written by Roger Revelle, Edward Wenk, Bostwick Ketchum, and Edward Corino, and it deals with the subject of oceanic oil pollution. It is well worth reading, as is the rest of the material in this book, and it points up the need for a concerted, international effort to prevent further damage to the oceans of this world.

I have previously mentioned my bills toward this end, H.R. 711 and 712, and House Joint Resolution 134, and I earnestly hope that legislation of this kind will receive favorable consideration in this session. Criteria for tanker safety must be established, and international treaties need to be brought up to date and promptly ratified. We have very little time left.

OCEANIC OIL POLLUTION

(By Roger Revelle, Edward Wenk, Bostwick Ketchum, and Edward Corino)

(Oil pollution is not confined to coastal areas; it poses an eventual threat to the ecosystems of the oceans of the world. Furthermore, as consumption of oil increases in our ever-expanding technological society, the problem of oil pollution is also likely to increase. In the following selection, Roger Revelle and three other experts analyze the extent and character of oil pollution—in

which tanker accidents and offshore leaks play a relatively small part—and they suggest possible courses of action to control the problem. Revelle is director of the Harvard Center for Population Studies and former director of Scripps Institution of Oceanography; Wenk, a specialist in ocean engineering and public affairs, is a professor at the University of Washington; Ketchum is associate director of Woods Hole Oceanographic Institution; and Corino is with the Esso Research and Engineering Company.)

At the present time, the most conspicuously detrimental effects of oil pollution of the ocean are localized in extent and are caused by accidental spills in near-shore areas. These loci of concern, however, potentially include the coastal zones of every continent and every inhabited island so that the problem of accidental spills is of worldwide significance. Projections of future growth in ocean transport and offshore production of petroleum indicate that both the frequency and the damaging effects of local accidents are likely to increase.

Although accidental oil spills cause the most evident damage to ocean resources, they make up a small percentage of the total amount of oil entering the marine environment. At least 90 percent of this amount originates in the normal operations of oil-carrying tankers, other ships, refineries, petrochemical plants, and submarine oil wells; from disposal of spent lubricants and other industrial and automotive oils; and by fallout of airborne hydrocarbons emitted by motor vehicles and industry. The extent and character of the damage to the living resources of the sea from this "base load" of oil pollution is little known or understood. In the long run it could be more serious, because more widespread, than the localized damage from accidental spills.

The magnitude of oceanic oil pollution is likely to increase with the worldwide growth of petroleum production, transportation, and consumption. World crude oil production reached 2 billion tons per year in 1969, and production of 3 billion and 4.4 billion tons per year is predicted for 1975 and 1980, respectively.

SOURCES OF PETROLEUM HYDROCARBONS IN THE SEA

Petroleum hydrocarbons enter the sea:

1. Directly
 - a. in accidental spills from ships, shore facilities, offshore oil wells, and underwater pipe lines;
 - b. from tankers flushing oil tanks at sea;
 - c. from dry cargo ships cleaning fuel tanks and bilges;
 - d. from leakage during normal operation of offshore oil wells;
 - e. from operation of refineries and petrochemical plants;
 - f. in rivers and sewage outfalls carrying industrial and automotive wastes; and

2. As "fallout" from the atmosphere, probably as particles or in rain.

We shall consider all these sources except accidental spills as constituting the base load of oil pollution in the sea.

ACCIDENTAL OIL SPILLS

At present, the average annual influx to the ocean from accidental oil spills throughout the world is probably about 200,000 tons. Most of these spills are relatively small. Out of 714 recorded accidental spills in U.S. waters in 1968, approximately half were from ships and barges, most of which were docked at the time of the accident. About 300 spills occurred from shore facilities of various types, and a few resulted from ships dragging anchor across submarine pipelines in bays.

Even under carefully controlled conditions accidental oil spills in port are negligible. Milford Haven, a relatively new British oil port, is adjacent to a national park, and great efforts have been made to control and prevent oil pollution. In 1966 the annual turnover at Milford Haven was 30 million tons with losses amounting to 2,900 tons or 0.01 percent of the total amount handled.

Accidental oil spills resulting from stranding or collision of large tankers and from accidents to offshore drilling or producing wells deservedly attract much public attention because of the extensive damage done to beaches, recreational areas, and harbors. The wreck of the *Torrey Canyon*, which discharged 118,000 tons of crude oil into the sea, is the best known example although somewhat smaller tanker wrecks have occurred elsewhere, such as off Nova Scotia and Puerto Rico. All large accidental spills to date have occurred fairly near shore, and the spreading sheet of oil has drifted or has been blown by winds onto beaches and into shallow water areas. Present efforts to contain and to dispose of the oil before it does extensive damage have been singularly ineffective. Agents such as talc, clay, and carbonized sand have been used to sink the oil. Various dispersing agents have been developed which break up the oil into minute droplets that are subsequently dispersed throughout the water. Earlier versions of these chemical dispersants were more toxic than the oil, but a number of essentially nontoxic dispersants are now available. Even with a nontoxic dispersant, dispersed oil is more toxic to marine life than an oil slick on the surface, primarily because of its increased availability to the organisms. With all our vast inventory of chemical agents, the best and safest means of disposal is apparently still absorption on chopped straw, if conditions permit.

The danger of large-scale accidents is increasing with the increasing size of tankers. Four 327,000-ton ships are already in operation; vessels of 500,000 dead weight tons will soon be constructed, and 800,000-ton vessels have been projected within the next few years. These monster ships have so much

draft and inertia and are so difficult to handle that a stranding or collision is more likely to result in a destructive wreck than with smaller ships. A loss of one of the new large tankers under conditions where it would be impossible to off-load the oil would add around 20 percent to the amount of petroleum entering the oceans in a single year.

Although handling difficulties increase with size, the increase is not directly proportional to size. Moreover, larger ships means fewer ships, and, therefore, traffic can be considerably reduced. Fewer ships also means crews can be limited to highly qualified personnel, and they can be better trained. The larger tankers could also afford to install highly sophisticated navigation gear which might be prohibitively expensive for the many smaller ships.

Spectacular "blowouts" from offshore oil well drilling and production make up a surprisingly small fraction of the total influx of oil to the ocean environment. For example, the widely publicized Santa Barbara blowout has so far produced only between 3,000 and 11,000 tons of oil. Similarly, the accident to a producing well off the Louisiana coast, which began on February 10, 1970, and lasted until the end of March, released only about 4,300 tons of oil. These figures emphasize the enormous amount of damage that can be done by a relatively small amount of oil concentrated over a relatively small, previously uncontaminated area. With present drilling and production technology, accidents of this kind are nearly inexcusable. Preventing them depends on institutional changes, not technical ones.

SOURCES OF THE BASE LOAD OF OIL POLLUTION IN THE SEA

Most oil production occurs at some distance from processing and marketing areas and consequently much crude oil is transported in oceangoing tankers. In 1969, 1.3 billion tons, or about 65 percent of total oil production, was carried in tankers. Projections by the U.S. Department of Transportation indicate that the amount of oil moved by tankers will increase to 2.8 billion tons by 1980.

Normal tanker operations (ballasting, tank cleaning) were estimated to have introduced 530,000 tons of oil to the sea in 1969. Eighty percent of the world fleet used control measures ("Load on Top" or LOT). If LOT were practiced faithfully, these ships would contribute only 30,000 tons of the total losses compared to 500,000 tons from the 20 percent not using such measures. If LOT were used on all tankers, only 56,000 tons would be expected to be lost to the ocean through normal operations in 1975 and 75,000 tons in 1980. If 20 percent of the fleet continued to operate in the present fashion, total losses in 1975 and 1980 would be 800,000 and 1.06 million tons, respectively.

Nontankers, dry cargo ships of greater than 100 gross registered tons, are estimated to have discharged 500,000 tons to the ocean in 1969, primarily from pumping bilges and cleaning operations. This estimate is of low reliability because available data are very limited. The total amount, however, is comparable to that generated by the tanker fleet.

Offshore oil production is estimated to discharge during normal operations about 100,000 tons per year. At present, offshore production accounts for about 16 percent of total crude production. This percentage is expected to increase in the future, as new underwater fields are discovered and new technology permits extension of drilling and production into deeper water. Estimates of losses for 1975 are 160,000 to 320,000 tons and for 1980 are 230,000 to 460,000 tons. The smaller figures assume that offshore production will continue to represent 16 percent of world production, and the larger figures assume 32 percent. In both cases the assumption is made that no improvement in pollu-

tion abatement will occur. Many of the new wells will be drilled off the coast of nations that do not have the technological capabilities to enforce good drilling and production procedures or to deal with massive spills.

About 300,000 tons of oil are lost to the sea each year through normal operations of refineries and petrochemical plants. The estimate is based on extensive data from the American Petroleum Institute and private surveys by refineries and industry organizations. With present pollution control measures this figure could grow to 450,000 tons in 1975 and 650,000 tons in 1980. If some improvements in pollution control are made, as predicted by the U.S. Federal Water Quality Administration, oil lost to the sea from refineries and petrochemical plants could drop to 200,000 tons in 1975 and 440,000 tons in 1980.

Industrial and automotive waste oils and greases constitute a significant source of oil pollution in the marine environment. These include all petroleum products, except fuel, used and discarded in the operation of motor vehicles and industrial production, for example, spent lubricants, cutting and hydraulic oils, coolants, and solvents. Much of the disposal of these wastes occurs by dumping on land. An estimate of the quantity eventually finding its way into the ocean can be made from measurements of the hydrocarbon concentrations in river waters, multiplied by the total river discharge, plus the amounts contributed by sewage treatment plants which discharge directly to the oceans. . . . Rivers discharge . . . approximately 150,000 tons of hydrocarbons annually . . . to the oceans from the United States or about 450,000 tons for the entire earth. Perhaps as much as 150,000 tons of oil and grease are discharged to the ocean in municipal sewage effluents from U.S. cities and towns. A large fraction of oils and greases in sewage do not originate from petroleum. If we assume that one-third of sewage oils and greases are petroleum hydrocarbons and multiply by three to give the world total value we arrive at 100,000 tons per year from this source. Thus all industrial and automotive petroleum wastes entering the ocean may be about 550,000 tons. This amount should increase at about the same rate as total oil production, namely, to about 825,000 tons by 1975 and 1.2 million tons by 1980.

All the preceding estimated direct losses to the marine environment made up approximately 2.2 million tons per year in 1969:

[In millions of tons]

Accidental spills.....	0.2
Tanker operations.....	5
Other ships.....	.5
Offshore production.....	1
Refinery operations.....	.3
Industrial and automotive wastes.....	.6
Total	2.2

The total is expected to increase to between 3.3 and 4.8 million tons by 1980. . . . Petroleum hydrocarbons entering the sea from all the above sources are about 0.1 percent of world oil production. If the possible fallout of airborne hydrocarbons on the sea surface is added, the total amount of oil and oil products contaminating the ocean may be as much as 0.5 percent of world production.

To give these figures perspective, we can make two historical comparisons.

Oil pollution of the marine environment existed long before the first oil well was drilled. This pollution came from natural seeps on the sea floor. There has never been any measurement of the quantity of oil entering the ocean from such natural seepage areas, but two lines of evidence indicate that it must be quite small, compared to the present amounts of oil entering the ocean because of human activities. First, if much oil had continually seeped into the ocean, all of the petroleum reserves would have long since disappeared. For example, if 100,000 tons of oil per year entered the ocean from

natural seepages, within a few million years this would exceed the total estimated oil reserves of the entire earth. Second, we know from the Santa Barbara and Louisiana well accidents that any natural oil seepage producing even a few thousand tons of oil per year would have resulted in very conspicuous slicks of oil spreading over large areas of the surface. No such large natural slicks have ever been observed. Typically, natural seeps produce quite small quantities of oil which occasionally bubble up to the surface and produce small slicks. We estimate, therefore, that oil coming into the marine environment before the human use of petroleum began must have been considerably less than 100,000 tons per year, less than 5 percent of the present 2.2 million tons a year injected directly from land and marine sources.

Another point of comparison with today's annual influx of oil comes from the sinking of tankers and ships in World War II. . . . The total quantity of oil lost in the ocean during the six years of World War II thus may have been about twice the annual direct influx to the ocean at the present time. As far as we know, no permanent damage was done to the ocean ecosystem by these rather large releases, perhaps in part because most of them occurred far from land in relatively deep water, and in part because much of the oil may have escaped into the sea very slowly, as the sunken tanks corroded away.

A great variety of hydrocarbons is produced by marine plants. . . . [It is estimated that] about 3 million tons of hydrocarbons enter the ocean from organic activity each year.

The direct influx of petroleum hydrocarbons to the ocean is small compared to the emission of petroleum products and chemically produced hydrocarbons to the atmosphere through evaporation and incomplete combustion. The emission of petroleum hydrocarbons to the air each year is about 90 million tons, roughly forty times the amounts of these substances entering the ocean directly from ships, shore installations, rivers, and the sea floor. Most of the hydrocarbons emitted to the atmosphere may be oxidized to harmless substances within a relatively short time. It is known that others are combined with nitrogen oxides and ozone to produce substances that are highly toxic to land plants. A fraction of the petroleum hydrocarbons emitted to the atmosphere exists as, or is absorbed on, very small particles, or becomes caught in rain, just as happens to DDT and other chlorinated hydrocarbon pesticides. Much of this fraction may settle out on the surface of the ocean. If 10 percent of the petroleum hydrocarbons emitted into the atmosphere eventually find their way to the sea surface in this way, the total hydrocarbon contamination of the ocean would be about five times the direct influx from ships and land sources. This quantity should be expected to increase about as rapidly as the total petroleum production, which means more than doubling by 1980.

PHYSICAL CONCENTRATION AND DISTRIBUTION OF OIL POLLUTION

Neither the base load of hydrocarbons nor the concentrated accidental sources can be expected to be distributed uniformly throughout the ocean. Obviously the intensity will be greatest near the sources and unloading points and the most heavily affected areas will be near the coasts.

It is likely that most of the oil entering the sea from ships, rivers, and the sea floor ends up in a narrow zone near shore at most only a few kilometers in width. Some of this oil will become absorbed on clay, silt, sand grains, and other particles and will settle to the bottom. The oil remaining in the water will evaporate or become oxidized. Biodegradation of the bottom-deposited oil will also gradually occur, but fractions of the bottom-deposited oil will continue to disperse into shallow overlying waters for

months or years. This inshore zone is the most sensitive to severe damage to the living resources of the sea from direct pollution by oil.

Submarine reservoirs of petroleum are likely to be found on the continental shelves of almost every continent, and the incidence of local contamination from underwater drilling and production on the continental margins will ultimately be widespread.

Sources from ships as a result of tank cleaning, bilge pumping, and accidents will be expected to follow the pattern of tanker and other cargo routes, with the highest concentrations near ports and harbors and in semienlosed seas such as the Mediterranean, the Black and North Seas, the Persian Gulf, and the Gulf of Mexico. The total area of these water bodies is slightly over 2 percent of the area of the ocean, but perhaps one-fourth of the total oil pollution from ships and land sources may occur in them. The future development of oil production in the Alaskan North Slope and the Canadian Northern Archipelago may produce serious contamination in the Arctic Ocean. Regional international agreements may be the most effective way to deal with the concentration of pollution in such semienclosed seas.

On the high seas, winds and ocean currents will bring about a convergence and retention of concentrations of hydrocarbons in the subarctic and equatorial convergence zones such as the Sargasso Sea. Workers from the Woods Hole Oceanographic Institution have found that oil globules and tar balls are more abundant in the Sargasso Sea than the Sargassum weed for which the sea is named.

Probably most of the hydrocarbon fallout from the air onto the sea surface occurs in the mid-latitudes of the Northern Hemisphere. These latitudes contain the trajectories of the winds blowing from the industrialized countries. If hydrocarbons deposited from the air formed a surface film over most of the North Atlantic, its thickness might be about 1,000 angstroms.¹ Such a film should be detectable by suitable optical methods and might have physical as well as biological effects. It is more likely than most if the oil is in small particles, droplets, or tarry lumps, [. . .] and that much of it settles quickly below the surface. As we shall see, oil films and droplets near the surface and DDT and other oil-soluble chlorinated hydrocarbons may have combined effects on the high seas which may do serious damage to open ocean ecosystems.

MODES OF HYDROCARBON REMOVAL FROM THE OCEANS

Hydrocarbons in the sea are diluted and dispersed by natural mixing and eventually disappear by microbial or physical oxidation, evaporation, and burial in the bottom sediments.

Hydrocarbons dissolved or suspended in the water column are eventually destroyed by bacteria, fungi, and other microorganisms. Some workers have found that the most toxic compounds are also the most refractory to microbial destruction, though the evidence is somewhat conflicting on this point.

No single microbial species will degrade any whole crude oil. Bacteria are highly selective and complete degradation requires numerous different bacterial species. Bacterial oxidation of hydrocarbons produces many intermediates which may be more toxic than the hydrocarbons; therefore, organisms are also required that will further attack hydrocarbon decomposition products.

The oxygen requirement in marine bacterial oil degradation is served. Complete oxidation of one gallon of crude oil requires all of the dissolved oxygen in 400,000 gallons of air-saturated seawater at 60°F. (This is equivalent to a layer of water one foot deep

covering 1.2 acres.) Oxidation may be inhibited in areas where the oxygen content has been lowered by previous pollution, and the bacterial degradation may cause additional damage through oxygen depletion.

The rate of oxidation is strongly affected by the temperature of the water, being at least ten times slower at 40°F than at 80°, and much slower still when the water is near freezing temperature.

SORENSEN EVADES ISSUES OF SUBSTANCE

HON. LARRY McDONALD

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 20, 1977

Mr. McDONALD. Mr. Speaker, in an overwrought, highly emotional statement made before the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence Monday, Theodore C. Sorensen complained of "personal attacks on my integrity." However, Mr. Sorensen was appearing to make his statement before any witnesses were heard either on his behalf or in opposition to his nomination as Director of the Central Intelligence Agency and had not been the subject of any personal attack. But he was by then well aware of the evidence developed from his public acts and statements which proved his unsuitability for the post.

On Tuesday, January 18, Mr. Sorensen appeared on a national television program, and in the course of an interview said that those who opposed his nomination were "able to seize upon events in my life, which were totally innocent, and to distort them and to lie about them and spread these false accusations."

Making no attempt at refutation, Mr. Sorensen continued by making an attack on unnamed Members of the Senate saying,

There is a different standard for Senators who are permitted to leak, permitted to have conflicts of interest, permitted to utter the most hypocritical statements, regardless of truth, and dissemble in other ways.

As one who respects our Senate, and also as one who vocally opposed the nomination of Mr. Sorensen, I believe that the record should be set straight, and his statement, a well-crafted exercise in evasion and innuendo, briefly analyzed.

First, Mr. Sorensen said that it was "totally false" that he had leaked classified information for political purposes. He then admitted that he had leaked classified materials to the press when directed to do so by the President. He admitted that he had removed classified material from the White House while he worked there and had taken it home. This is an exceedingly lax practice, yet Mr. Sorensen did not say whether in reflection he now considered that improper. It is not only improper, but indicative of those who feel that by virtue of high office they are above the law.

This arrogance is further demonstrated in Mr. Sorensen's sworn statement filed in 1971 in the case *United States against The New York Times Co.* in which he said:

A determination by the Government or anyone else as to whether our nation's security requires the withholding from public view of any particular document or documents is not a matter requiring military or other highly specialized expertise.

Mr. Sorensen went on to say that his affidavits in the Pentagon Papers cases "accurately described the practices then prevalent in Washington." He also said he never "approved of anyone" who "compromised the national security of this country." Yet his affidavits were in support of the theft and dissemination of top secret Defense Department documents by Ellsberg and Russo, and his affidavits implied his own actions were somewhat similar.

Sorensen denied he improperly took classified and other Government documents with him when he left White House employment in 1964, but he went on to admit that although some of the documents had been produced by him, many of them had been produced by other people or had been made available to him only because of his White House employment. In the recent controversy over Secretary Kissinger's files, Mr. Kissinger had only claimed ownership of material he had produced.

Sorensen then went on to an involved attempt to justify his removal of an admitted 76 cartons of documents which indicates his double standard of public morality. He specifically stated that no "communications intelligence" documents were among the 76 cartons he removed from the White House. Yet among the documents in the two volumes among very many of the Pentagon papers which Sorensen specifically declared to be "innocuous" were communications which had been transmitted in our top codes marked "Top Secret—for the eyes of the President only." A foreign intelligence agency, by comparing the clear text with the coded transmission, can be aided greatly in breaking our cryptographic techniques. By his specific denial that he had removed communications intelligence documents for his own use, Sorensen shows clearly that he does understand the significance of communications intelligence documents to an enemy intelligence service: Why then did he defend Ellsberg's theft of the same sort of classified material?

When questioned by the press in a news conference immediately following his statement, Sorensen was asked as to whether he would condemn Ellsberg's actions now. He refused to answer saying that it was irrelevant in 1977 even though his support of Ellsberg was a major factor in his own unsuitability for high office.

In his attempt to shift his personal responsibility for the removal of White House and classified documents onto others, Sorensen stated that a General Services Administration official had informed him that the documents Sorensen had created and accumulated were his personal property. This appears to be a brandnew function for GSA, whose authority over building maintenance Mr. Sorensen would increase to include declassification of documents classified by

¹ Ed. note: One hundred-millionth (10⁻⁸) centimeter.

other and duly authorized Government agencies.

Mr. Sorensen admitted that after using those documents to write a book for his personal profit, he donated them to the National Archives and took a tax deduction reported in the New York Times as being \$231,000.

Sorensen stated with regard to his two affidavits for the defense in the Pentagon papers cases:

I make no apology for having responded to the requests of counsel in both cases to attest to the inconsistencies and anomalies of government classification practices.

But Mr. Sorensen was not testifying about Government classification procedures.

Mr. Sorensen was testifying about the wanton violation of those classification procedures by persons taking advantage of their closeness to the President to avoid punishment for their actions. These people demonstrated they had no respect for the procedures instituted to protect our country's secrets. And in the New York Times Pentagon papers publication case, Sorensen testified he felt the release of the secret documents a benefit to the United States.

Further, as most of my colleagues who are lawyers by profession well know, in defending a criminal trial, the defense counsel is particularly careful as to what questions are asked of a friendly witness and how they are asked. In the Ellsberg case, Mr. Sorensen was cooperating with Leonard Boudin, for decades a member of the Communist Party's foremost legal bulwark, the National Lawyers Guild, whose firm has been the representative of the brutally repressive Communist regime of Fidel Castro in Cuba since 1961.

Both in his statement to the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence and on television, Mr. Sorensen made reference to his pacifist views and his former conscientious objector status as reasons for anonymous attacks on him.

Mr. Speaker, my statements regarding Mr. Sorensen's conscientious objector status and its implications were certainly not anonymous, and were clearly identified in the press and on the wire services as being made by me. Let me reiterate, I do not believe that the Director of the CIA, some of whose employees daily risk their lives in the service of their country, should be a conscientious objector. Mr. Sorensen registered as such 4 years before the outbreak of the Korean war; he made sure that he was not compelled to serve when that war broke out. Mr. Sorensen spoke of preferring service on the battlefield as a medical corpsman saving lives instead of taking lives but he performed no such service.

Mr. Sorensen also said that while he sought conscientious objector status for himself, he was quite prepared to advise the President to use his military options, in other words the lives of other men, in the furtherance of U.S. foreign policy. I maintain that it is the height of hypocrisy to be willing to send other men to do what you say you find personally repugnant.

With regard to Mr. Sorensen's work for

foreign principals, Mr. Sorensen stated on December 22, 1976, at a Plains, Ga., press conference that he had never registered as a foreign agent because there is an exemption for legal services under the Foreign Agent Registration Act. Yet in his Senate Intelligence Committee statement, Mr. Sorensen admitted that he had represented Iran, Zaire, Sierra Leone, and the Canadian province of Newfoundland in commercial disputes or negotiations. Under the law and as a matter of professional ethics, Theodore Sorensen should have registered as a foreign agent.

After asserting that all of these points about his past public activities—which contrary to logic, Mr. Sorensen insisted were private, Mr. Sorensen said there were only two legitimate questions which could be raised about his qualifications: "my experience in intelligence" and "the question of my views."

Mr. Sorensen stated in his Ellsberg affidavit that he had, during his employment by President Kennedy as White House Special Counsel, participated in National Security meetings. In his testimony for the defense in the trial of Daniel Ellsberg and Anthony Russo, Mr. Sorensen further stated:

I attended, after the Bay of Pigs [April 17, 1961], virtually all of the formal meetings of the National Security Council. I was not a statutory member, but was asked by the President to sit in and observe.

President Kennedy, very frankly, regarded the National Security Council formal meetings as something of a formal bore. He preferred to make real decisions on foreign policy in smaller sessions with those officials whom he regarded as being particularly informed and particularly concerned.

Mr. Speaker, it should be noted that I am only referring to the Russo/Ellsberg trial, a matter on which Mr. Sorensen complained at the Senate Intelligence Committee hearing, because Mr. Sorensen himself made no mention of any association with the National Security Council in his New York Times Pentagon Papers publication affidavit.

The transcript of a Plains, Ga., press conference on December 22, 1976, quotes Mr. Sorensen as saying:

I did serve on the Executive Committee of the National Security Council under President Kennedy.

Again, under oath, Mr. Sorensen spoke to the Senate Intelligence Committee of my service on the Executive Committee of the National Security Council.

The difference between being a non-participating observer and service on the Executive Committee is considerable; and this play with words was, I believe, indicative of Mr. Sorensen's imaginative skill to which I made reference in the testimony I prepared on his nomination. See CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Jan. 17, 1977, pages 1341-42.

As he made clear in his Ellsberg testimony, Mr. Sorensen was not involved in setting policy. He was a White House speechwriter, responsible for articulating policies developed by others and explaining them to the press and public. Speechwriter to the President is an honorable position, but in no way can the reading of the daily CIA summaries and back-

grounders provided to the White House be considered experience in intelligence.

Mr. Sorensen stated as part of his qualifications that he has written and lectured widely on international affairs. Again, that does not make Mr. Sorensen an expert in the principles of intelligence gathering. I would also note that among his lectures were speeches in 1967 and 1968 before businessmen's associations in which he advocated increased trade with the Soviet Union despite Russian equipping and sponsoring the North Vietnamese Communists who were killing U.S. servicemen in Vietnam. Mr. Sorensen stated he had met with Soviet Foreign Trade Minister Nikolai S. Patolichev who also, of course, supported U.S. sales of high technology items to the U.S.S.R. But Mr. Sorensen did not tell his audience that he was then representing American business interests seeking to expand their sales to the Soviet Union, and that an increase in such trade would be of direct financial benefit to him and his firm.

With regard to his views, a topic he feels is legitimate, Mr. Sorensen stated that he is not a pacifist. But I believe I have already sufficiently discussed the hypocrisy of a man who states he has been ready to risk other men's lives in military actions he personally finds morally repugnant.

Equally serious is Mr. Sorensen's statement that he would virtually abolish clandestine CIA activity. In his 1975 book, "Watchmen in the Night," Sorensen wrote:

The covert political and paramilitary operations of the CIA (as distinct from its foreign intelligence and analysis functions) still occupy too much of its budget and personnel. . . . The continuing value of these clandestine operations and their effect on U.S. foreign relations should be critically reexamined . . . in the light of progress toward detente, developments in international and constitutional law, the new technology of intelligence collection and analysis, and the demonstrated ineffectiveness of any foreign operations, overt or covert, which are not backed by a broad national consensus.

In his Senate statement, Sorensen said he favored a foreign policy that prefers where possible the risks of peace to the risks of war and that believed in:

The application of moral and legal standards to national security decisions, including the limitation of covert operations to extraordinary circumstances involving the vital national interests of our country, with timely review by the appropriate Congressional Committees and written authorization by the President and his senior Cabinet officials.

Here we have Mr. Sorensen advocating policies also pressed by groups reflecting the policies of Moscow and Havana such as the Institute for Policy Studies, Center for National Security Studies and Center for Defense Information, which hold that the United States should restrict its intelligence agency to mere collection of publicly available documents—a joke in Communist countries, and the long-range technical collection of information such as satellite photos and the monitoring of radio broadcasts.

Under these rules the United States may not develop another General Penkovsky or use any other person as a

covert intelligence agent; nor can the United States provide any covert assistance, financial, technical or whatever, to any free world ally, whether country, group or individual, who is fighting Communist subversion.

We have heard from representatives of the American Civil Liberties Union which is working closely with the above-named groups the bizarre morality used to condemn covert operations—that anything covert requires a cover story and that a cover requires deception, deception requires lies, and therefore all covert activities are “immoral” and must be abolished.

It is a perversion of morality to argue that in 1977, faced with the activities of hostile intelligence agencies in the service of aggressive totalitarian regimes who have vowed our ultimate destruction, the United States must forswear any secret methods of finding out what our enemies intend and of aiding our friends.

In commenting on the Senate Intelligence Committee hearing for the benefit of a TV audience Tuesday, Mr. Sorensen said,

I worry about a country in which an individual who has done no wrong, who had not even been heard yet in his own defense, could be condemned and prejudiced on the basis of these false, anonymous accusations.

But it was apparent that Mr. Sorensen's statement and withdrawal from the nomination last Monday, and his press statements since have been designed to prevent the facts from being aired. He was not questioned by the Members of the Senate Committee; nor were those prepared to testify to the facts concerning him given the opportunity.

Mr. Sorensen acted so that only his own self-serving statements would appear on the hearing record; however, the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence did enter into the hearing record the affidavits Mr. Sorensen had made in the Ellsberg and New York Times Pentagon Papers cases.

THE SORENSEN AFFIDAVITS

Mr. Speaker, herewith are the full texts of the affidavits which Theodore C. Sorensen submitted in the two Pentagon Papers cases, United States against New York Times Company, et al., and United States against Russo and Ellsberg:

[In the U.S. District Court, Southern District of New York, Civil Action 71-2662]

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, PLAINTIFF, V. THE NEW YORK TIMES COMPANY, ET AL., DEFENDANTS

STATE OF NEW YORK,
County of New York, ss:

Theodore C. Sorensen, being duly sworn, deposes and says:

1. I am a member of the law firm of Paul, Weiss, Goldberg, Rifkind, Wharton & Garrison, 345 Park Avenue, New York, New York.

2. Having served as a lawyer in both the Executive and Legislative branches of the Federal Government from 1951 to 1964, including more than three years as Special Counsel to the President, at which time I held a top security clearance, read classified documents daily, and drafted many such documents to or for the President, I am very familiar with the United States Government's practices regarding the classification

of various papers in the name of national security.

3. Having read the materials appearing in the New York Times on June 13, 14 and 15, 1971, I am familiar in a general way with the Times' publication of summaries of, excerpts from and documents attached to a historical study of this nation's deepening involvement in the Vietnam War conducted by the Department of Defense.

4. A determination by the Government or anyone else as to whether our nation's security requires the withholding from public view of any particular document or documents is not a matter requiring military or other highly specialized expertise. The highly individual and frequently arbitrary opinion of the classifying officer is thus entitled to no or little more weight than the opinion of any other informed and concerned citizen. “Top secret” stamps are frequently and routinely applied with only the briefest and loosest consideration of what, if any, direct and concrete injury to the nation's security interest would result if the general public were to be granted access to the information; and, once applied, the tenure of such classification rarely if ever reflects a thoughtful reconsideration of whether the passage of time and events has altered the original grounds. The public's right to be informed, and the Congress' right to be informed, have not to my knowledge been regarded as important criteria by those determining classifications.

5. The nation's security does legitimately require the withholding from public view for an appropriate period and no longer certain documents, including those which if revealed could endanger or otherwise adversely affect the lives or movements of American military personnel. In addition, foreign governments are ordinarily entitled to expect that their confidential communications to our government will be treated with the same regard for their wishes as they provide for our confidential communications to them; and the President is ordinarily entitled to receive the kind of candid advice and reports from his top civilian and military subordinates which is possible only if they can be certain that words intended for his eyes alone are not shortly thereafter transmitted to the general public.

6. The question of whether any particular document or documents should remain secret today is thus one of balancing these interests, and the New York Times, a Federal Judge, a Senator or a citizen may be as capable of making that judgment as any one in the Executive Branch. My own judgment is that, on balance, publication by the New York Times of the documents in question in this case is not injurious to the national security. No current or future military operations or present top government officials appear to be involved in any way. No serious embarrassment to any foreign government appears to be involved. None of the information and opinions revealed appear to have any current facets requiring continued secrecy.

7. On the contrary I believe the national security interests of the United States will be irreparably injured if these documents are suppressed from public and Congressional view; if the United States, on the verge of several fateful decisions in the Middle East, Latin America and Asia, is thereby prevented as a nation from learning the true history of what went wrong in Vietnam; if the same policies of concealment and deception which prevented debate and produced mistakes in this nation's approach to Vietnam are thereby judicially encouraged to continue; if the very purpose of this objective historical study is thereby frustrated, and the cost in time and talent invested in its evolution wasted, by confining its circulation to a handful of high officials who largely supported the original policy; and if the courts of this coun-

try, by enjoining a free press and permitting the concealment of official error, thereby erase still one more important distinction between ourselves and our adversaries.

8. I understand that this affidavit will be submitted in opposition to the motion made on behalf of the Plaintiff for an order enjoining further publication by the New York Times of this material.

THEODORE C. SORENSEN.

NEW YORK, N.Y., June 17, 1971.

[U.S. District Court for the Central District of California, No. 9373-(WMB)-CD]

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, PLAINTIFF, VS. ANTHONY JOSEPH RUSSO, JR., DANIEL ELLSBERG, DEFENDANTS

STATE OF NEW YORK,
County of New York, ss:

Theodore C. Sorensen, being duly sworn, deposes and says:

1. I am a member of the law firm of Paul, Weiss, Rifkind, Wharton & Garrison, 345 Park Avenue, New York, New York.

2. Having served as a lawyer in both the Executive and Legislative branches of the Federal Government from 1951 to 1964, including more than three years as Special Counsel to the President, at which time I held a top security clearance, participated in National Security Council meetings, read classified documents daily, and drafted many such documents to or for the President, I am very familiar with the United States Government's military, diplomatic and intelligence operations, policies and practices, as well as those regarding the classification of various papers in the name of national security. I regard myself as a devoutly loyal citizen who is proud of his years of public service and who recognizes the need for a limited amount of secrecy in government.

3. I can flatly state that “top secret” stamps are frequently and routinely applied with only the briefest and loosest consideration of what, if any, direct and concrete injury to the nation's security interest would result if the general public were to be granted access to the information; and, once applied, the tenure of such classifications rarely if ever reflects a thoughtful reconsideration of whether the passage of time and events has altered the original grounds. The public's right to be informed, and the Congress' right to be informed, have not to my knowledge been regarded as important criteria by those determining classifications. Nor is consideration given to the danger of irreparable injury to the national security interest of the United States if the public and Congress are denied facts necessary for an informed judgment, enlightened debate, the correction of mistakes, the discontinuation of invalid policies and strategies, and the prevention of a repetition of past errors.

4. I have frequently read classified documents containing information which was not secret, or the secrecy of which was not necessary for any conceivable purpose related to national security as distinguished from political embarrassment, or which the public and Congress had every right and reason to know in a democracy. Many such documents contained information which was well known to this country's enemies or adversaries who were involved therein; and thus the only people denied this information as a result of the classification of the documents were the members of the Congress and the general public.

5. During my years in the White House it was not unusual for me or other government officials to have photocopied or otherwise reproduced classified documents or excerpts therefrom; to take such documents home for review; or to quote from them, summarize them, or otherwise utilize them in “off-the-record,” “background,” or other kinds of sessions with one or more representatives of the news media and occasionally in speeches. No

formal authority was sought or obtained for such use, and no investigation or prosecution ensued. On the contrary, the President, Secretary of State, Secretary of Defense, Attorney General, Special Assistant for National Security Affairs, Director of C.I.A. and other members of the National Security Council knowingly and deliberately disseminated such information from time to time in order to advance the interests of a particular person, policy, political party or Department, or the Administration itself or, in their opinion, the national interest. Lesser officials often did the same for these reasons and others—including the maintenance of friendship with newsmen, a desire to demonstrate how much they knew or how important they were, a desire to undercut a rival official or agency, or a desire to oppose a policy or proposal with which they disagreed. While the President frequently expressed irritation over these "leaks" of classified information and documents, an investigation was rarely ordered and—even where the originator of the unauthorized dissemination was discovered—prosecution was never ordered.

6. It was the view of President John F. Kennedy "that the dangers of exclusive and unwarranted concealment of pertinent facts far outweigh[ed] the dangers which are cited to justify it . . . No President should fear scrutiny of his program. For from that scrutiny comes understanding; and from that understanding comes support or opposition. And both are necessary . . . I have complete confidence in the response and dedication of our citizens whenever they are fully informed; . . . [G]overnment at all levels must meet its obligation to provide you [the press] with the fullest possible information outside the narrowest limits of national security . . ." (Address, American Newspapers Publishers Association, April 27, 1961.) Even this speech, in which the President at the height of the Cold War was concerned about the publication of necessarily secret information and appealed to the nation's press to voluntarily and privately consider its own responsibilities in this regard, he refused to propose, much less impose, any form of governmental restraint, and spoke sharply against censorship, concealment, the stifling of dissent and the covering up of mistakes, and urged only self-discipline and self-restraint as the basis for preventing harmful unauthorized disclosures. On the basis of many conversations with the President on this topic, I know that this was consistent with his belief and practice. He stated to me and others his belief that the press erred in withholding the advance information it possessed on the Bay of Pigs Invasion, inasmuch as revelation of the real facts would have caused him to call off that ill-considered venture.

7. In the course of working on that speech for the President, and preparing for his subsequent meeting with the nation's top editors on this topic, the Central Intelligence Agency and others directed to my attention a long list of unauthorized disclosures to the press which, in the opinion of the C.I.A., seriously compromised our national security. Some of these examples were summarized in the aforementioned Presidential speech as follows:

"[D]etails of this nation's covert preparations to counter the enemy's covert operations have been available to every newspaper reader, friend and foe alike; that the size, the strength, the location and the nature of our forces and weapons, and our plans and strategy for their use, have all been pinpointed in the press and other news media to a degree sufficient to satisfy any foreign power; and that, in at least one case, the publication of details concerning a secret mechanism whereby satellites were followed required its alteration at the expense of considerable time and money."

Further examples provided to me after this speech included newspaper and magazine

stories revealing details on new weapons; on U.S. methods of detecting Soviet missile and other tests; on SAMOS and other reconnaissance satellites; on the U.S. bargaining position in advance of the Test Ban talks in Geneva; on the internal memorandum regarding military strategy from the Secretary of State to the Secretary of Defense; on comparative U.S. and Soviet developments in the use of nuclear propulsion for submarines, carriers, aircraft, rockets and power plants; and on a variety of Soviet weaponry developments, publication of which revealed to the Russians our ability to monitor those developments. I was also informed that the technical details of a nuclear weapon triggering device had been leaked a decade earlier to Drew Pearson. Being generally familiar with the "Pentagon Papers" which appeared in the press last year, I know of nothing in those documents which compares in any way with the seriousness of some of the above mentioned disclosures. Revelations of past strategy, discussion, considerations, predictions, information, priorities, plans and assessments, unlike the then-current information and technology revealed in some of these cases, cannot compromise current national security. But no prosecution occurred in any of those cases.

8. Classified documents or the information contained therein also reached public view through the books and articles of former government officials. I have many times observed this practice and participated in it. In keeping with the long-standing practice that the papers and files of the President and his top appointees belong to them and may be removed from their offices at the conclusion of their service, I removed 67 cartons of papers, documents and files of all kinds (7 cartons of which were "classified") from my office in the White House upon my departure in February of 1964. I drew upon this material, keeping some of it in my own home, in writing the book "Kennedy," published in 1965. The classified material included copies of the Kennedy-Khrushchev correspondence, the transcript of their summit meeting at Vienna, secret memoranda and directives relating to the Cuban missile crisis, Berlin, Laos and Congo crises, and the Bay of Pigs, as well as other Presidential letters and memoranda of conversations. Although I generally did not use quotation marks when extracting classified material and submitted portions of the manuscript for informal review to individuals who then or previously served in high national security positions, I did not seek or obtain any formal clearance or approval from the government and was at no time questioned or reprimanded in this regard. The government, speaking through the National Archives, asked me as the lawful owner of these papers to donate them to the United States of America for eventual deposit in the John Fitzgerald Kennedy Library; and the government, acting through the Internal Revenue Service, recognized that these were my property in granting a tax deduction for this gift. The legislative history of the Presidential Libraries Act of 1955 and the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 made clear that these were my papers to dispose of as I saw fit, much as Sherman Adams, Samuel Rosenman, Clark Clifford and a great many others had done before me.

9. I also served as unofficial editor of the posthumously published manuscript on the Cuban missile crisis by Robert F. Kennedy entitled "Thirteen Days." That manuscript quoted from previously classified letters of President Kennedy and Soviet Chairman Nikita Khrushchev, summarized a highly classified memorandum to the Attorney General from J. Edgar Hoover, and quoted a variety of extremely confidential conversa-

tions. No question was raised with respect to this publication.

10. What all of the above boils down to is this: The government has always recognized and accepted the fact that arbitrary, inconsistent and indiscriminate over-classification of documents exists; and that consequently large amounts of classified material are passed from the government to the public—sometimes to the government's embarrassment, occasionally even to its injury—as part of the system of governing and living in an open society. Because classified labels have come to mean so little in practice, and because the guidelines for classification, declassification and utilization of classified material are so vague and obscure that no one can be certain when they are violated, hundreds of violations of the letter of the law if it is broadly interpreted occur every month. The government has accepted this as an inherent part of our system and has relied on the support of subordinates, on their loyalty, consciences and self-discipline, and occasionally on administrative procedures to deter and correct the dissemination of those state secrets that are actually injurious to the national security.

11. I understand that this affidavit will be submitted by counsel for the defense.

THEODORE C. SORENSEN.

A DISTINCTIVE APPROACH TO ELECTORAL COLLEGE REFORM

HON. GUY VANDER JAGT

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 20, 1977

Mr. VANDER JAGT. Mr. Speaker, with the convening of the 95th Congress and the 1976 contest for the Presidency behind us, we are once again hearing appeals for amending the constitutional mechanics of Presidential and Vice Presidential elections. Predictably, the proposal to establish a direct popular election in lieu of the Electoral College procedures is the focus of most discussion.

However, we should bear in mind the fact that while direct popular election is the most democratic means of selecting our highest officials, it is not the only approach which would overcome the perils of current practice. There are alternatives which would meet the problems of which astute observers every 4 years give warning, yet respect basic tenets of the American constitutional system.

In the event it goes forward in this area, whatever route Congress takes should eliminate the opportunity for electors to violate the wishes of their States' voters and by casting their electoral votes for someone other than their States' winners in the popular contests. The "faithless elector" poses unacceptable uncertainty in our election system. We can achieve a correction to the faithless elector problem by eliminating the Presidential electors as such, even while retaining the electoral votes and the positive values which they accord in our national political experience.

Also, we should seek to overcome the distortion of the national popular vote totals which commonly occurs within the Electoral College as a result of the "winner-take-all" nature of the States' procedures for choosing electors. Terminat-

ing this practice would also lessen the impact of those States now deemed to be "pivotal" in Presidential elections by virtue of an extraordinary weight which they carry in the Electoral College. Drawing the influence of these populous, industrial States closer to their proportionate share of the national population would not only advance the application of democracy's "one man, one vote" theme, but diminish the impetus for political parties to concentrate their campaigning in these areas of the country.

While the direct popular vote would achieve these objectives in the course of the total change that it would bring, this amendment proposal raises a number of sobering questions which should receive our attention. First, political scientists and other observers of American politics traditionally regard the Electoral College and its majority requirement as an extremely significant buttress supporting our stable, two-party system. Few people seem to have any desire to undermine the foundations of our traditional party system and bring on the characteristic instabilities inherent in multiparty systems.

Second, the direct popular vote totally nationalizes the Presidency's electoral base. Irrespective of sentiments in States, in theory a one vote margin in nationwide popular voting would determine a President. Without marked improvement in registration and voting procedures in the States, one could foresee very close elections to lead to charges of irregularity all over the country, and thus to substantial confusion as to the balloting's outcome.

Finally, as is implicit in the above comment, the direct popular vote would deprive the Presidency of one of the philosophical and practical premises upon which it now is founded, that of federalism. Such an amendment amounts to a further centralization of the Nation's political processes and institutions at a time when there is no apparent consensus that would support such a shift. The American people seem disinclined to extend the distance between themselves and their major political institutions.

In order to broaden Congress discussion of the complexities of modifying Presidential election mechanics and to place a distinctive approach before the House Judiciary Committee, I am today introducing a resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution. Compared to our current procedures, the provisions of my proposal would carry us toward the objectives which advocates of the direct popular vote generally seek, even while respecting the strengths of the system we now enjoy. Unlike a number of other proposals advanced in recent years, this one has received little prior congressional consideration. However, its nonpartisan character is implicit in the fact that Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY, Democrat of Minnesota, introduced a comparable resolution during the Senate's debate of this subject in 1956.

Under my resolution we would eliminate the electors but retain the electoral vote in its present size, 538, a number which is the total number of Senators and Representatives in Congress as well

as those to which the District of Columbia would be entitled if it were a State. Two votes would be awarded automatically to the candidates for President and Vice President winning the popular election in each State and the District. These 102 votes in all, constituting slightly less than 20 percent of the total electoral vote, would recognize the Federal foundation of our governmental system. The remaining 436 votes, or slightly more than 80 percent of the total, would be awarded to the candidates on the basis of the proportion of the national popular vote that they receive. This predominant segment of the total electoral vote would thus mirror national political sentiment in the same way that the more radical total substitution of the direct popular vote for the Electoral College would achieve.

The proposal includes a provision throwing the election into the Congress only in the event of a tie in the electoral vote. In such an unlikely instance, the House of Representatives would choose the President, with each Member having one vote as contrasted to the current provision assigning one vote to each State's delegation. The Senate would choose the Vice President. In both cases, two-thirds of the bodies would be required for a quorum rather than the routine number.

Dr. Ralph M. Goldman, a political scientist, discussed the implications of this approach in a 1958 article published in the *Midwest Review of Political Science*, and capsulized its merits in a recent letter to the *Washington Post*. In his article he indicated that he had applied the proposed procedure to the results of the 22 Presidential elections between 1872 and 1956, making the unlikely but necessary assumption that the factors giving rise to the results would not have differed. With the exception of the disputed election of 1876 which Congress ultimately decided in favor of Rutherford B. Hayes despite Samuel J. Tilden's popular vote victory, the winners would have been the same. However, reflecting a greater consistency to popular vote results than that of current procedures, the amendment's provisions would have yielded substantially narrower margins of victory in the electoral balloting.

Apparently, application of the amendment to more recent elections would also have yielded the same winners as actually occurred. This includes Jimmy Carter, whose electoral vote margin similarly would have been markedly reduced.

As I see it, this approach would serve well not only the cause of democracy, but also that of federalism. In contrast to the direct popular vote approach, it would encourage the perpetuation of our two-party system by according recognition to voter preferences within the 50 States and the District of Columbia. It would motivate our major parties to bring their campaign to all areas of the country. In eliminating the discouragement of voters that may occur by virtue of the "winner-take-all" effect, it would foster voter participation.

Despite the presumed popularity of the direct popular vote proposal and the fact that the House of Representatives in a prior Congress chose that approach

to reform, the 95th Congress owes the Nation a careful analysis of all potentially fruitful alternatives before it would launch a national amendment effort. Toward that objective I am pleased to offer this proposal.

BOY SCOUT TROOP 147 PLEDGE OF GOOD CITIZENSHIP

HON. JERRY M. PATTERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 20, 1977

Mr. PATTERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of Boy Scout Troop 147, from Garden Grove, Calif., I am pleased to share with you today its pledge to President Ford and President-elect Carter of good citizenship and loyalty to this great country.

Troop 147, during the 1976 Orange County Scout-O-Rama on December 10, 1976, demonstrated computer and electronics equipment. The computer print-out which follows is the result of this demonstration. It contains their pledge of good citizenship, significant parts of the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution, statements from other historical documents, as well as the members of Troop 147.

Mr. Speaker, as we embark upon a new era of democratic leadership, it is befitting that we recognize these fine young people who have pledged their loyalty to this country. It is with their support, enthusiasm, and fresh ideas that we can work together to strengthen our democracy, insure our freedom, and build an even better America.

The material follows:

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: The Scouts of Troop 147, El Capitan District, Orange County Council of the Boy Scouts of America wish to extend to you their pledge to be good and valuable citizens of this great country of ours. To this end we have assembled what we feel are very significant parts of the Declaration of Independence, the Constitution of the United States and other statements of import in American history together with a statement of our support and allegiance. To these we inscribed our names and those of our friends in attendance at the 1976 Orange County Scout-O-Rama.

Troop 147 is demonstrating and displaying equipment from the fields of electronics and computers and it is with this equipment that we have caused these statements to be printed and these names inscribed.

Mr. President, it is natural to man to indulge in the illusions of hope. We are apt to shut our eyes against a painful truth. Is this the part of wise men, engaged in a great and arduous struggle for liberty? Are we disposed to be of the number of those, who, having eyes, see not, and having ears, hear not, the things which so nearly concern their temporal salvation? For my part, whatever anguish of spirit it may cost, I am willing to know the whole truth; to know the worst and to provide for it.

We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their creator with certain unalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty and pursuit of happiness. That to secure these rights, governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed. And for the support of this declaration, with a firm re-

liance on the protection of divine providence, we mutually pledge to each other our lives, our fortunes and our sacred honor.

We the people of the United States, in order to form a more perfect union, establish justice, insure domestic tranquility, provide for the common defense, promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity, do ordain and establish this Constitution for the United States of America.

That this Nation, under God, shall have a new birth of freedom—and that government of the people, by the people, for the people, shall not perish from the earth.

I believe in the United States of America as a government of the people, by the people, for the people; whose just powers are derived from the consent of the governed; a democracy in a republic; a sovereign nation of many sovereign states; a perfect union, one and inseparable; established upon those principles of freedom, equality, justice, and humanity for which American patriots sacrificed their lives and fortunes.

I therefore believe it is my duty to my country to love it; to support its Constitution; to obey its laws; to respect its flag; and to defend it against all enemies.

To these preambles and statements of Patrick Henry, the Declaration of Independence, the Constitution of the United States, Abraham Lincoln, and the American's creed we pledge our support, our allegiance, and our honor as citizens of this great country of America.

Great conflicts have been waged to keep this Nation free from dependence on or to other nations of this world; and it must be realized by we, its citizens, that it is upon us that the United States of America is dependent.

This land is your land,
This land is my land,
This land was meant for you and me;
For we are America.

Martin Webb, Senior Patrol Leader; Bill Brogan, Patrol Leader, "76" Patrol; Brian Youn; Danny Fiegner; Eric Hartman; Shaun Lennert; Jeff Nelson; Gerard Waskiewicz, Patrol Leader, Beaver Patrol; Tom Brogan; Rob Blurton; Alex Bilbao.

Chris Lumbus; Don Boursier; Mark Phelps, Patrol Leader, Falcon Patrol; Brian Panter, Troop Scribe; Luke Bilbao; Scott Nelms; Chris Martz; Jeff Peterson; Loren Foy; Norman Webb, Scoutmaster; Ken Brooks, Assistant Scoutmaster; Jim Lennert, Assistant Scoutmaster.

Paul Webb, Junior Assistant Scoutmaster; Warren Young, Committee Chairman; Nancy Webb, Scout Coordinator; Sue Brogan, Secretary-Treasurer; Lynn Lennert; Doris See; Bill Brogan, Sr.; Marylou Baker, Committee Chairman, No. 29; Kevin Bullock, No. 1892; Craig Merkin, No. 296; Eric Takach, No. 75; David O'Brien, No. 75.

Mike Hopkins, No. 424; Briann Baudendistel, No. 588; John Baudendistel, No. 588; John Witmer; Gary Gleser, Treasurer, No. 296; Eric Brown, No. 278; Dan Asivid, No. 562; Brad Green, No. 800; Greg Merget, No. 800; Doug Welsh, No. 100; Dawn Baker, G. S. No. 44; Ron Keen, No. 510.

Bobby Bengel, No. 510; Michael Allen, No. 658; Robert E. Lee, No. 114; Tom Coleman, No. 216; Grady Beasley, No. 216; Skater Everett, No. 510; Louie Haseltine, No. 273; Joe Stanczyk, No. 773; Chris Beaufort, No. 773; Eric Buzhne; Joel Greenberg, No. 1509.

David Kelly, No. 216; Bob Carlson, No. 174; Bret Lonsway, No. 174; Alex Selley, No. 217; Billy Keys, No. 424; Mike Kelly, No. 225; Rusty Miller; Louie Black, No. 432; Mike Bennett, No. 1; Robert Hutchinson; George Kelly, No. 775; Jay Quinn, No. 1750; Mike Simanyi, No. 800.

Randy Slaughter, No. 273; Jennifer Quinn; Phillip Bastanchury, No. 75; Chris Linberg, No. 174; Kevin Shakley, No. 174; Craig

Dotzaun, No. 484; Craig Odolecki, No. 508; Steve Kuentz, No. 508; Jerry Baker, No. 484; Danny Clayton, No. 125; Dennis Cassidy, No. 412.

Timothy Dodd, No. 290; Guy Thompson, No. 221; Jim Guilliet, No. 526; Don Madczeski, Scoutmaster No. 515; Randy Butera, No. 575; David Laughlin, No. 1; Lee Coulter, No. 714; Bob Coates, Cubmaster No. 714; Steve Meyer, No. 558; Tony Stutzman, No. 526; Bart Limas; Brian John O'Leary.

Greg Wise; Ron Huntington, No. 526; Beverly Johnson, Roundtable Staff, C; Larry Kent, No. 357; Maynard Barber, No. 1165; Mike Debuck, No. 1165; Greg Anderson; Mary Kirlie, No. 775; Mark Monroe; David Barney, No. 183; Robby Coppola, No. 850; Michael Aarnold.

Kirsten Ryder; Richard Stratton, No. 71; Valerie Dunn; Mike Tully, No. 151; Gordon Dunn, No. 850; Fred Riggs; Jeff Poppa, No. 138; Hank Sanchez, No. 138; Kevin Marx, No. 138; Jeff Wright; Mark Adkins, No. 114; Mike Fox, No. 424.

Glenn Moya, No. 216; Brian Burke, No. 296; Bill Payne, No. 100; Brenda Debuck; Eileen Debuck; Kathy Debuck; Paul Verschueren, No. 400; John McLuckey, No. 775; Andrew Franco, No. 1283; Ray McCauley, No. 1283; Robert Bents, No. 37; Ray Romero, No. 1509.

Russell Stoner, No. 71; Lorraine Waskiewicz; Mark Sanderson, No. 886; Thomas Waskiewicz; John Waskiewicz; Larry Dickerson; Al Waskiewicz; Jeff Young, Committeeman, No. 296; Chipper Fackrell, No. 488; Michael Kamenszki, No. 706; Joe Kamenszki, No. 778; Chris Gregg, No. 886.

Dale Welch, No. 138; Eric Daniels; Charlie Davis, No. 290; Billy Greenland, No. 274; Bob Salamon, No. 317; Sam Henderson; Eddie Casada, No. 52; Mike Sambrano, No. 714; David Feskanich, No. 189; Kevin Slumpff; Mitch Schmidt, No. 575; Paul Abshire.

Ron Smith, No. 640; Donald Slumpff, No. 575; Tim Lamb, No. 804; Jim Lamb, No. 804; Darren Morrill, No. 225; Darin Wolsleger, No. 225; Daine McHugh, No. 651; Darryl Owen, No. 543; Don Van Hoogmoed, No. 660; Gene Sollows, No. 685; Brian Persons, No. 778; Greg Stiles, No. 778.

Karl Blum, No. 208; Robert Brown, No. 138; Stephen Larsh, No. 723; David Amormino; Jeff Moersch, No. 807; Stephen Hileman, No. 723; Andy O'Leary; Chris Van Horn; Peter Van Horn; Richard Schroeder, No. 807; George Hand, No. 90; Todd Parker, No. 155.

Robert Brown, No. 138; Tim Smith, No. 138; David Simon, No. 272; Tom Bugler, No. 408; Michael Baumann; David Irwin; Jon Owens, No. 38; Bud Weber; Jose Marquez, No. 357; Jim Raley; Jesse Raley; Kenny Champagne, No. 270.

S. H. Fried, No. 208; Roger Monell, No. 615; Joey Lorenzini, No. 226; David Lorenzini, No. 226; Mason Ernest, No. 664; Mike Boland, No. 561; Kenny Warfield, No. 60; Dana Tolman, No. 225; Sean Potourny; Don Strupp; Rob Bradley, No. 664; Kevin Campbell, No. 36.

Mario Valadez, No. 1218; Chkis Cinocco, No. 454; John Valadez, No. 1218; Millis Irwig, No. 145; Scott Irwig, No. 145; Doug Irwig, No. 145; Doug Britton, No. 145; Carole Payetti; Marion McCowen; Geneva Sherwood, No. 273; Christopher Peck, No. 1616; Carol Lascola, No. 412.

Gina Grundy, No. 290; David Mee, No. 272; Chris Inouye; Edith Sherwood, No. 273; Kelly Sherwood, No. 273; Eric Cinocco, No. 454; Michael Mailman, No. 568; Dan Rudat, No. 553; Jim Duncan, No. 484; Kenny Metro, No. 568; Bryan Montoya, No. 1069; Marsha Young, den leader coach, No. 296.

Darleen Moore; Michelle Ryan; Elizabeth K. Johnson; Alan Call, No. 531; Patrick Conaway, No. 773; Jon Bender, No. 434; Kirk Dumhart; Paul Mras, No. 120; Michael O'Dowick; Carl Miller, No. 60; Denise Solina; Maryann Healey; Hom Debellis; Pat Bul-

leit, No. 115; Anthony Debellis; Randy Rogers; Raymond Pearis; Robert Gold, No. 667.

Cavin Jones; Richard Razey, No. 241; Allan Fisher, No. 455; Ricky Nino, No. 232; Larry Ortiz, No. 148; Kyle Madigan, No. 217; Alberto Alonzo, No. 526; Ardath McLaughlin; Mike Blake, No. 219; Charles Coleman, No. 7388; Kent Bisel, No. 664; Brian Law, No. 216.

Mitch Clark, No. 36; Todd Scranos, No. 640; Mike Caballero, No. 405; Sean Whaldon, No. 623; Oscar Romero, No. 1750; Bill Clark, No. 543; Alan Young, No. 1444; Mike Ehlers; W. S. Marcus; Ross Wilson, No. 488; David Berry, No. 1616; Morris Berry, No. 1616.

Robert Peck, No. 1616; Tony Peck, No. 1616; Todd Missler, No. 17; Troy Bush; Todd Bush, No. 216; Stephen Lopez, No. 61; Todd Murakomi, No. 271; Dennis Decker, No. 61; Eric Madigan, No. 217; Matt Caywood; Mark Wicks, No. 302; Mr. and Mrs. Roy Miller, No. 60.

Mike Garant, No. 516; Jeff Wagner, No. 148; Brian Kelly; Richard Dudra, No. 516; Tom Miller, Santiago District; Vince Greenlee, No. 638; Travis Greenlee; John Razey, No. 241; Mark Buehnerkemper, No. 671; Steve Schulz, No. 671; Billy Keys, No. 424; Eric Mokry.

Robert Shakleton, No. 778; John Nelson, No. 227; Erik Hatzenbuehler, No. 625; Renee Richerson, No. 412; Suzane Potter, No. 290; Kathy Fink; Steven Fink, No. 732; Brian Kelly, No. 225; Stephanie Rupiper, No. 290; Susie Litsch, No. 412; Kevin McCarthy, No. 151; Kelly Sland.

Jeff Swifka, No. 151; David Presly, No. 537; Craig Dall, No. 1572; Chuck Bengry, No. 516; Rico Thompson, No. 149; Steve Walker, No. 1424; Andy Walker, No. 1424; Gary Hartstein, No. 514; George Nauenburg, No. 562; James Nauenburg, No. 562.

Donald Hennagin, No. 226; John Seroggins, No. 175; Bobby Ferrington; Tim Swengel, No. 627; Andy McLaughlin, No. 167; Pete Krauser; Andy McLaughlin, No. 167; Kevin Indseter, No. 175; Jeff Chew, No. 271; Michelle Moreno, No. 804; David Smith, No. 732.

Michel Breithaupt, No. 147; Charles Norsdy, No. 502; Eric Matthila, No. 916; Ed Chew, No. 271; Tom Gruenbeck, No. 354; Tony Aguilera; John Harader, No. 354; Jimmy Brian, No. 354; Tim Bush; Greg Adams, No. 606; Brian Adams, No. 607; Chris Maki, No. 600.

Steven Contreras, No. 453; Maureen Johnson; Ruddy Chavez, No. 226; Jason Blake; Stacey Ollaloran; Farrah Gallo; Diane Gallo; No. 4621; Stuart Mencher, No. 798; Scott Williams, No. 187; Scott Valoff, No. 508; Randy Lukins; Louis Hungate, No. 422.

Steven Merrill, No. 49; Don MacElroy, No. 271; Tyrone Mangold, No. 75; Kim Williams; Mark Gorelick, No. 435; Becky Gorelick, No. 435; Robby Warren, No. 227; Jeffrey Miller, No. 125; Gene "Smokey" Bergner, Camp Director; Mike Dodson, No. 916; Eileen Dodson, No. 916; Michael Petrie, No. 283.

Lois Berger, No. 625; Derick Wolsleger, No. 225; Brian Adamcunst, No. 301; Robert Toepel, No. 514; Kleth Goss, No. 554; Scott Goss, No. 554; Dave Parque, No. 1892; Rachael Osborne, No. 28; David Petrie, No. 283; Nigel Osborne, No. 368; Stephen Vegh, No. 272; Ted Wingert, No. 670.

Steve Mascoli, No. 699; Mike Scheibel, No. 817; Charles M. Huntley; Linda Fort, No. 1058; Beth Josephson, No. 1058; Christian Miller, No. 455; Greg Garver, No. 455; Jeff Gambill, No. 455; John Lodin, No. 323; Angela Lodin, No. 323; Kevin Goss, No. 554; Susan Goss, No. 554.

Jamie Castonguay, No. 714; Gregory Fletcher, No. 223; Willie Flewellen, No. 223; Ron Erdrich, No. 611; John Fahland, No. 531; Pat Snedeker, No. 603; Chuck Snedeker, No. 1602; Fran Payette, No. 214; Larry Kaplan, No. 581; Randy Tee, No. 581.

Dennis Titzkowski; Colleen Carrington, No. 741; Daniel Carrington, No. 741; David Carrington, No. 741; Jeff Baerns, No. 205; Genee Phillips; Ted Nugget, No. 526; Richey West,

No. 784; Shana Norris; Lori Linebarger; Brandon McGrath, No. 784.

Bobby Enna, No. 227; Jimmy Page, No. 1345; Darin Norris, No. 784; Jimmy Enna, No. 227; Steve Grupenhagen, No. 183; Bryan Linebarger, No. 229; Steve Weiss, No. 581; Ian Anderson, No. 931; David Barney, No. 183; Robert Kunst, No. 301; Doug Tusji; Debbie Johnson.

David Brownstein, No. 527; Richard Franco, No. 1283; Susan Moore; Joseph Bacchi, No. 514; Jeff Patstone, No. 211; Leona Crespin; Norvin Lanz, No. 273; Jimmy Stapleton, No. 209; Ron Woods, No. 90; Sandy Herrera; Edward Gardner, No. 293; David Bush, No. 293.

Bill Farrel, No. 1170; Nari Naddafi, No. 723; Mike Naddafi, No. 723; Dave Andersen, No. 391; Julie Fisher, No. 391; Robert Brunner, No. 391; Warner Smith, No. 223; Eleanor Blurton, No. 147; Robert Blurton, No. 147; Marcia Andersen, No. 391; Stephan Motter, No. 293; David Gardner.

Keith Crespin; Wayne Crespin; Richard A. Gasper, No. 271; Jeffrey M. Gasper, No. 271; Kenneth M. Gasper, No. 271; Mike Libey, No. 526; Connie Libey, No. 526; Jefferson Young, No. 108; John Garrett, No. 75; Trent Binger, No. 456; Shawn Cunniff, No. 442; Rhett Binger, No. 456.

Edward Gonzales, No. 173; J. Jones; Luis Roncayolo; Pat Paulsen, No. 295; Louie Anderson, No. 220; Gary Goodner, No. 660; Jon Love, No. 1616; Craig Young, No. 147; Brad Williams, No. 71; Kevin S. Voas, No. 526; Karlo Holevas; Robert Toepel, No. 514.

Rick Holevas; Scott Lovette; James M. Akins, No. 104; Cynthia Akins, No. 104; Mike Floessir; Cheri Norris; Phil Brown, No. 778; Kenny Waddell, No. 265; Darrell Baldwin, No. 183; Lance Wantland, No. 524.

Linda Voas, No. 855; Russell Carpenter, No. 642; Bobby Groner, No. 670; Alex Bradley, No. 279; Alex Bradley, Sr., No. 279; Dennis Cassidy, No. 412; Robby Briethaupt, No. 147; Michael Briethaupt, No. 147; Ronnie Brooks, No. 147; Margie Byrne; Jeanne Byrne.

COMMUNISTS OPPOSE BELL NOMINATION AS ATTORNEY GENERAL

HON. LARRY McDONALD

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 20, 1977

Mr. McDONALD. Mr. Speaker, from the day that Judge Griffin Bell was nominated to be the next U.S. Attorney General he has been the subject of vicious and bitter personal attacks by alleged civil rights groups and by the Communist Party. Slander has been the principal weapon because there are no issues of substance with which to oppose Judge Bell.

While I and other conservatives and moderates respect his judicial competence although naturally there have been instances of disagreement with his decisions; but the ideologues of the left cannot tolerate the appointment to high office of a man whose well-reasoned decisions interfere with their political programs.

On Friday, January 14th, a top member of the Communist Party, U.S.A.—CPUSA—testified against the Attorney General-designate without revealing to the Senate Judiciary Committee that she was a member of an extremist totalitarian organization or that she personally advocated revolutionary armed violence.

In order to set the record straight, I have sent the following letter to Senator JAMES O. EASTLAND, chairman of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., January 19, 1977.
Senator JAMES O. EASTLAND,
Chairman, Committee on the Judiciary, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR EASTLAND: I would like to request that the following information be included in the record of your Committee which heard testimony on the nomination of Judge Griffin B. Bell as Attorney General of the United States.

On Friday, January 14th, Charlene Alexander Mitchell testified against the nomination of Judge Bell, according to press reports, representing the National Alliance Against Racist and Political Repression (NAARPR). This organization is a "front group" of the Communist Party, U.S.A. (CPUSA) and was so identified by the Committee on Internal Security of the House of Representatives in their hearings, *Revolutionary Activities Directed Toward the Administration of Penal or Correctional Systems*, Part 4, July 25, 1973.

Mrs. Mitchell has been a full time CPUSA organizer and member since the end of the 1940s, and has served as the executive secretary of the NAARPR since its formation in 1973.

In the context of her testimony against Attorney General-designate Bell, it should be noted that at a 1969 CPUSA National Convention, Mrs. Mitchell presented a report on "Armed Self-Defense" which was also printed in the Party's confidential internal publication, *Party Affairs*. In it she stated, "Our stand is forthright—we advocate armed self-defense as an increasingly important part of the black people's ability to continue and develop their struggle for complete liberation."

As the Attorney General will be responsible for decisions regarding prosecutions of violence-oriented and terrorist groups as well as decisions regarding future FBI surveillance of such groups, it is important that a man of high integrity who will enforce the

law and protect the people of the United States from subversive and criminal violence. It is clear that the Communists consider Judge Bell to be such a man; that is why they have opposed his confirmation.

It is therefore incumbent on responsible Americans to rally behind Judge Bell and urge his confirmation by the Senate.

With best wishes and kindest personal regards, I am

Sincerely,

LARRY McDONALD.

REBECCA REID OF DALLAS—
MISS TEENAGE AMERICA

HON. JAMES M. COLLINS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 20, 1977

Mr. COLLINS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, Rebecca Ann Reid was chosen in December as Miss Teenage America for 1977. Rebecca is the daughter of Mr. and Mrs. Robert H. Reid of Dallas, Tex. She is a straight-A high school senior, a talented pianist and singer, 17 years old, 5 feet and 7 inches, 120 pounds.

Miss Teenage America was selected on her "positive image" from 20,000 entries. It's more than beauty, as this recognition is based on the girl with an all-around outlook. Miss Reid is attractive, gracious, charming, talented, and poised. I am mighty proud to have Rebecca Reid as a neighbor in the Third District of Texas.

The Dallas Times-Herald reported Rebecca's answers from a Press Conference at the National Pageant:

On women's lib. "Every woman should be free to pursue the career of her choice. She should have the same advantages and disadvantages as men. And if she wants to be a homemaker, she should have that right, too, and be proud of her accomplishments."

On premarital sex. "I can only answer for myself. I've been raised to believe that sex belongs only in marriage and I could never have premarital sex."

On drug abuse. "I go to a school (W. T. White High School) where a lot of students use drugs. It's their individual choice, but I don't think they'll find the answers to their problems there. I have never used drugs and feel it's not right for me."

On the future. "After my year as Miss Teenage America, I will go to SMU or Baylor to study piano pedagogy—playing and teaching piano. After I graduate, I would like to get married and have a family, and I feel that teaching piano is a profession that I could do with a family."

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Monday, January 24, 1977

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.
The Chaplain, Rev. Edward G. Latch, D.D., offered the following prayer:

In Thee, O Lord, do I put my trust; let me never be put to confusion.—Psalms 71: 1.

Eternal God, our Father, we commend our Nation to Thy loving care and this House of Representatives to the guidance of Thy Holy Spirit. With Thy redeeming and renewing power come Thou into the heart of our President and into the life

of every Member of Congress that together they may labor for the highest good of our beloved Republic.

Write Thy law on our minds and work Thy love into our hearts that we may be loyal to Thee, true to promises made, faithful in our daily duties, and open to the needs of our people. May we so serve Thee and our country in these days that in the years to come our citizens may be thankful for the work done by this 95th Congress.

In the spirit of Christ, we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Without objection, the Journal stands approved.

There was no objection.