

Illinois State Journal

FOUNDED
NOVEMBER 10, 1831

a Copley Newspaper

313 S. SIXTH ST.
SPRINGFIELD, ILL.
62705AREA CODE 217
544-5711Published Daily Except Saturdays, Sundays
and Holidays
By THE ILLINOIS STATE JOURNAL-REGISTER INC.JOHN P. CLARKE, Publisher
DE VAN L. SHUMWAY, Editor"The Journal paper was
always my friend and
of course, its editors the
same."A. LINCOLN
June 18, 1864

Despite Impatience Progress On Watergate

The Supreme Court of the United States of America made a historic decision May 31 when it agreed to bypass an Appellate Court and hear immediately Special Prosecutor Leon Jaworski's arguments as to why a subpoena should be served upon the President. The accelerated review process has occurred infrequently before, but never in connection with the impeachment of a chief executive.

Undoubtedly, the Supreme Court senses a widespread and growing impatience to get the whole Watergate business ended — an impatience that is not shared by many in Washington. The House of Representatives, for example, is acting like a classic boxer flicking left jabs into his opponent's face to keep him off balance and to add up points. It carefully and painstakingly sets up the circumstances for issuing a subpoena against the President, issues it and then starts the process all over again. The House never tries to enforce the subpoena, and it is doubtful that it could. Nor does the House seek remedies in court, insisting that the impeachment issue is a matter for Congress itself to resolve.

In another arena, the Supreme Court is gingerly feeling its way toward a determination of its own role in the process of impeaching a President — also holding eager protagonists at a distance to apply pressure for resolving the problems of evidence at a lower level. Serious questions exist whether even the courts can enforce a subpoena against the President. Scholars also are pondering if the chief justice of the United States could preside over a Senate impeachment trial if he also had pre-

sided over a Supreme Court session that sifted Watergate matters.

This tip-toeing, this snail's pace progress which frustrates many, still has some merit. The fact is, the President, Congress and the courts are all walking over unplowed constitutional ground. Questions are being raised to which there are no quick answers. When the questions are ultimately answered, they will establish constitutional precedent for alltime. In truth, we are in the process of fine tuning the Constitution which makes the President, the courts and the Congress equals, but leaves to contemporary times the sorting of details.

As the laborious sorting progresses matte, undoubtedly will become more vexatious and perplexing. It will be more difficult to distinguish between technicalities and points of law or, for that matter, to determine whether either constitutes a high crime or misdemeanor in the meaning of the Constitution.

There is virtue to caution when history is being written, and progress has been made toward arriving at the truth about Watergate. IT&T, dairy industry contributions, and so forth. We know more about these matters today than we did a month ago, or a month before that, and we will know more tomorrow.

Deliberate haste, we believe, is the drummer to whose cadence we should march. Precipitate action or short cuts through constitutional provisions are one unacceptable extreme. Deliberate stalling by anybody for whatever reason is at the other extreme. We hope that the Supreme Court found the sound middle ground Friday

Act Quickly On Disclosure

THE ILLINOIS Legislature is on its way toward adopting a truly effective campaign finance disclosure bill. We hope.

Legislation by Senate President William C. Harris of Pontiac and House Speaker W. Robert Blair of Park Forest has cleared the first of many obstacles on the way to Gov. Dan Walker.

But, bills have a way of getting lost in the crush during the final, hectic weeks of a session. We hope this doesn't happen to disclosure legislation.

Blair and Harris have introduced identical bills to require disclosure of income and outgo in state political campaigns. The Blair bill has cleared the House Elections Committee by an 8 to 5 vote and the Senate Executive Committee has advanced the Har-

ris bill by a unanimous 13 to 0 vote

However, Senate Minority Leader Cecil Partee, Chicago Democrat, announced that several amendments will be offered to the Senate bill when it reaches the floor, including one specifying a ceiling on campaign spending.

That is a worthwhile amendment and should strengthen the Blair-Harris proposal, now requiring every candidate who files an economic statement to report the source of contributions over \$1,000, and how this money is spent.

The bills have been in the lawmakers' hands long enough for them to become familiar with their provisions. There is no reason for undue delay in voting on them. We need disclosure legislation and the sooner it is enacted the better.

Stamping The Taxpayers

NO FEDERAL welfare program has grown as fast as the distribution of food stamps to help low income families buy groceries. It started in 1961 with about 50,000 people receiving stamps. This year about 14 million are on the program. By the middle of next year the figure is expected to reach nearly 16 million, at a cost of \$4 billion to the taxpayers.

That's why we shudder at news that a federal agency is toying with the idea of coming out with "transportation stamps" for the poor — coupons good for bus, train and taxi fares. On beyond is the possibility of "fuel stamps" to obtain gasoline for cars and heating

oil for furnaces and stoves.

There is no denying that increasing transportation and fuel costs are as hard to meet on a limited budget as higher grocery costs. However, the way to deal with the problem is in the basic welfare allotments of families that need help — not in starting another new program and another new bureaucracy to administer it.

Food stamps, are as good as money in a grocery store. Their intrinsic value on a "black market" has made it difficult to control abuses of the program. One thing we do not need is still more coupons in circulation which in reality are an IOU signed by the American taxpayer.

JOHN P. ROCHE



Tapes Reveal Lack Of Dignity

IT WAS, I SUPPOSE, inevitable: I was drawn to those tapes like iron filings to a magnet. Particularly when a friend sent me the big, blue book, published by the Government Printing

Office, which is double-spaced and not printed in a type size requiring a microscope. Probably just about everything that can be said on the subject has by now been printed three times, so I am not going to get involved in Talmudic explorations or (to balance the ticket) Jesuitical distinctions. The seven possible meanings of what D. said to P. on March 17 will be left to my brethren with a bent for cryptoanalysis; what profoundly disturbs me about the document as a whole is the degree to which those arch-defenders of the "Presidency" dragged the executive function through the muck.

For openers, the tone of the conversations is sickening. As has been noted here before, I have never believed that the President of the United States was converted into a god upon assuming office. Neither John Kennedy nor Lyndon Johnson could be portrayed as a candidate for "The Lives of the Saints." Moreover, I am not shocked by the (expletives deleted), though I am a bit curious to learn if some sanctimonious editor removed "Gee Whiz!" — it somehow seems to belong there. What stunned me was the total absence of what the Romans called

"gravitas"; that is, inherent dignity in the President of the United States.

THE FLAVOR of the discussions in the Oval Office reminded me of the way the owners of a used car agency would react to the news they had been caught turning back the mileage. I can attest from personal experience that one can argue with the President of the United States, even on occasion tell him (as I heard Joe Califano, Harry McPherson and George Christian, among others, do) that in your judgment he is dead wrong. But the dispute is on his terms. Lord knows, I am not famous for my deference to authority, but the thought of interrupting Lyndon Johnson in the middle of a sentence to say, "No, we can't do that," is mindboggling. It assumes the President is a collectivity, a "we." It should hardly be necessary to point out that there is only one President.

To look at it from a different perspective, nobody ever elected John Roche tree warden — and John Ehrlichman and Bob Haldeman were in the same category. For them to sit around chatting as equals with the President, interrupting him in mid-sentence and literally, on occasion, ramming a decision down his throat is simply demeaning, not just to the President but to the American people who chose him to be chief executive.

IN SHORT, I don't object in principle to human vulgarity. I have heard a great deal of it in the army, in politics and, believe it or not, in the academic world. On occasions, I have regrettably been known to use (expletives deleted). What upsets me is constitutional vulgarity, which — to use a vivid instance — might be described as the difference between a President giving a drunken address at the Lincoln Memorial and the chief executive, say at Camp David, pleasantly and privately a bit buzzed. The atmosphere vividly conveyed by the tapes is one of constitutional vulgarity. Without making any substantive judgment on what Mr. Nixon knew before his March 21, 1973, session with John W. Dean III, it is perfectly clear to anyone who has ever spent any time in politics that from that day onwards the boys in the backroom were trying to fix the tick-

I DO NOT ENJOY saying this; I hate to see the government of the United States splashed with muck. I have tried to give President Nixon the benefit of the doubt: I thought he was too smart to play those kinds of games. But there it is — and, for the benefit of Republican zealots, let me add that it doesn't do one bit of good to shriek, "Look how Wilson stole the election of 1916," or denounce L.B.J. for cheating at dominoes. The people are not interested in past sins, but in current regeneration.

WILLIAM F. BUCKLEY



New York Debates Gay Rights Bill

MY FRIEND MR. MICHAEL Harrington, who was Chairman of the Socialist Party until he found something even more disreputable to do, has called to ask whether I might adopt

one of my "maverick positions" in support of what they call in New York City "Int. No. 2-A", otherwise a Gay Liberation Rights Bill the intention of which is to remove civil disabilities from what the bill calls persons of differing "sexual orientation." This musing definition is elaborated to say that no one henceforward may discriminate against anyone on account of that person's "choice of sexual partner according to gender." A Homosexual Rights Bill is the straight-forward way to put it.

Mr. Harrington's interest in the legislation, I need not but will add, has nothing to do with his own preferences according to gender, which are altogether orthodox, if he will permit me the word, knowing his antipathy to it in political, or theological matters. But he is seduced by what most avant-gardists are taken with, and also a few others, which is the old saw that there is no such thing as sexual abnormality, that that which someone likes — little boys, little girls, sheep, cows — is simply of no civic concern. And therein lies the difficulty. Because Int. No. 2-A, although it is being sold as nothing much more than a compassionate piece of legislation forbidding the

starving or torture of the City's homosexuals, is, like the various proposals for amnesty for the draft evaders, something more than that.

MOST OF THE ACTIVE amnesty hawks are seeking slyly to find a way of codifying their personal view of the Vietnam War. Seeking a way of saying that the real heroes were not those who served, but those who did not serve. Too many of the Homosexual Rights Bill advocates are seeking a way of saying not that homosexuals should not be harassed, which clearly they should not be, but that homosexuals are, in the eyes of everyone — conceivable excepting their counterparts in the opposite sex — just the same as Michael Harrington and Don Juan.

This is a point that violates the deepest presumptions of the west, reaching from biblical Christianity right up through and including (yes, including) Freud. For the sake of mitigating the plight of the New York homosexual, or of protecting his sensibilities, there are many who are disposed to repeal the sanction in favor of heterosexuality: who are willing suddenly to declare that homosexuality is not unnatural.

THERE IS THE HISTORICAL projection — on top of everything else — to worry about. In recent years we have all experienced the quick evolution of the law or judicial decision that protects a person's rights, into the decision that protects those rights by denying the rights of others. Brown vs.

Board of Education began by forbidding compulsory desegregation, and ended by prohibiting voluntary separation. The Homosexual Bill would not inconceivably confront an employer, at some not too distant date in the future, with the requirement that he/she/it give proof to some Human Rights Agency or other that the employee roster shows that the same proportion of homosexuals are employed as reside in the city, sort of like McGovern's Miami Convention, transported to New York City's schools, fire department, and telephone company. That nightmare will be avoided by sensible legislators.

Of which there are quite a few in New York City, though they do not by any means always prevail. Mostly they are torn by the sentimentalization of the question, if you are against Archie Bunker-type assaults against the privacy of homosexuals, then you are in favor of Int. No. 2-A. It does not, of course, follow.

IN FACT, there are few grounds for believing that New York's homosexuals are an aggrieved lot. Beyond, that is to say, the psychological lot of those who suffer from a maladjustment in a society that recognizes it as a maladjustment. The figures appear to indicate that there are hundreds of thousands of men and women who have successfully negotiated their way into normal sexuality by a combination of resolution, psychological help — and a social sanction.

No Place For Snap Decisions



KEN WATSON

Bumpers' Win Percy Boost?



THE ARKANSAS victory of Gov. Dale Bumpers over U.S. Senate titan J. William Fulbright has brought a big boost in morale to Springfield supporters of the presidential bid of U.S. Sen. Charles H. Percy.

They contend that the big Bumpers triumph clearly reflects the voters' desire for new faces on the national political scene.

Percy backers are quick to point out some similarities in the Bumpers win over Fulbright and Percy's stunning rout, by 422,302 votes, over veteran Illinois Democratic Sen. Paul H. Douglas in 1966.

Like Fulbright, Douglas at that time was considered a major Senate figure. He had been elected to three successive terms by big margins and was considered of national stature.

But like Bumpers, Percy chose to gamble and instead of waiting for a second try for governor, having lost to Democrat Otto Kerner by only 179,299 votes in the disastrous GOP year of 1964, Percy chose to take on Douglas and by his surprise victory became a national political figure on his own.

Now the Percy supporters assert that what he accomplished on a statewide basis in 1966, he can now do nationally and win the 1976 Republican presidential nomination despite the odds against him.

BUMPERS, BY HIS routing of Fulbright, has already stimulated a wave of national speculation as a potential 1976 Democratic nominee for vice president with even an occasional mention as a presidential nominee.

The speculation centers around the new faces in politics theory and the Percy people believe that this must inevitably involve their man and increase the national exposure he so desperately needs if he is to become a serious presidential contender.

Although the Percy presidential drive has been under way for about six months he has failed to pick up much in the national polls. As a result his effort lacks the momentum that must soon develop if he is to be taken seriously.

Percy has mapped a busy speaking schedule which takes him to about all parts of the nation and it is hoped that the emergence of Bumpers will also result in increased mention of Percy as a new-face Republican.

BUT, UNLIKE BUMPERS, Percy has the big handicap of being fenced in by his own party. Democrats, who may not be sold on Massachusetts Sen. Edward (Ted) Kennedy can cast about freely for new faces.

But regular Republicans appear to be increasingly sold on Vice President Gerald Ford as the 1976 candidate, regardless of whether he might advance to the presidency before then.

Percy can only hope that his political luck, which has benefited him so richly in the past, will continue to hold.

Watson is a member of the Journal staff.

RAY CROMLEY



Energy Crisis Long Term

BY 1985, if we invest \$60 billion a year effectively, we should be virtually out

of the current petroleum/energy crisis, barring unexpected disasters.

But then, we shall almost certainly be faced with a new energy crisis worse than today's — brought on by a skyrocketing worldwide demand, including persistent growth of American requirements. We can also expect a gradual decline in production rates at some of the world's leading oil-producing areas.

In short, 10 years and \$60 billion will merely buy time.

Doubling coal output, doubling our total investment in oil and gas, speeding nuclear power plant building, pushing oil from shale and synthetic liquids from coal with vigor — and expanding refining, transportation and auxiliary industries to boost domestic output and delivery by a third conceivably could put us in rough balance a decade from now, assuming rigorous steps to conserve fuel use. From then on, we'll begin to lose ground, slowly at first and then rapidly unless there are major scientific breakthroughs someplace

along the line. This means new technical and engineering discoveries in breeder reactors, fusion power, solar energy, the liquefaction of coal and extraction of oil from shale and geothermal energy to make these processes sufficiently practical and economically competitive on a large scale.

IT WILL NOT be necessary, of course, to succeed simultaneously in all these fields. But there must be breakthroughs in a variety of areas to provide the huge amounts of energy which will be required in the last 15 years of this century and beyond.