

# The Daily Tar Heel

Chapel Hill's Morning Newspaper

Chapel Hill, North Carolina, Wednesday, October 16, 1974

Founded February 23, 1893

Vol. 83, No. 37

## Reform bill to revamp campaigns

by Donald Lambro  
United Press International

WASHINGTON—President Ford signed Tuesday, "with reservations," the most far-reaching political campaign reforms in the nation's history.

The sweeping reforms, a direct result of the Watergate scandals, will go into effect in 1975 and are certain to revolutionize political campaigns for federal offices.

Ford, who invited all 535 members of Congress to watch the signing in the White House East Room, said he had reservations about the measure but that the times demand legislation.

"There are certain periods in our nation's history when it becomes necessary to face up to certain unpleasant truths," Ford said, without mentioning Watergate. "The unpleasant truth is that big money influence has come to play an unseemly role in our electoral process. This bill will help to right that wrong."

His reservations centered on public financing of presidential campaigns and political conventions. He also cited "the First Amendment implications inherent in the limits on individual contributions and candidate expenditures."

Ford did not spell out the possible constitutional violations but apparently referred to First Amendment guarantees of freedom of speech. "I am sure that such issues can be resolved in the courts."

Despite his objections to the public financing provisions, Ford said he does support the present \$1 checkoff on federal income tax returns which are divided now among major party presidential candidates.

"I maintain my strong hope that the voluntary contribution will not become mandatory and that it will not in the future be extended to congressional races."

"By removing whatever influence big money and special interests may have on our federal electoral process, this bill should stand as a landmark of campaign reform legislation."

The major feature of the comprehensive package, approved by Congress this week, are the taxpayer financing of presidential elections, primaries and national conventions; a tight limit on political contributions; and low ceilings on candidate spending.

The legislation also creates a six-member Federal Elections Commission, with civil enforcement powers, to administer the reforms.

Major provisions of the bill:  
**General election financing**—Beginning with the 1976 elections, the Republican and Democratic presidential candidates can receive \$20 million each from the federal treasury for the general election. They can choose either federal funds or private contributions but cannot mix the two. Other party candidates can receive a proportionate share of the \$20 million based on election results.

**Primary financing**—Candidates to become eligible for public financing must first raise \$100,000, with \$5,000 from each of 20 states. The government will then match the first \$100,000 and every private contribution of \$250 up to a ceiling of \$5 million.

**Convention financing**—The Republican and Democratic parties can receive \$2 million each from public funds to finance their conventions.

**Contributions**—Individuals are limited to overall contributions of \$25,000 in a single year and no more than \$3,000 to an individual candidate—\$1,000 in the primaries, \$1,000 in a runoff and \$1,000 in the general election. Organizations can contribute \$5,000 to a candidate in each primary and runoff and in the general election. Presidential candidates can contribute \$50,000 to their own campaigns, Senate candidates \$35,000 and House candidates \$25,000.

**Spending**—Presidential candidates are limited to \$20 million in the federal election and \$10 million in the primaries. Senate candidates can spend eight cents times the voting age population or \$100,000 in the primaries and 12 cents of \$150,000 in the general election. House candidates are limited to \$70,000 in the primaries and \$70,000 in the general election.

Other provisions require candidates to establish a central campaign committee; require candidates to report contributions and expenditures; ban cash contributions over \$100; forbid contributions from foreigners; prohibit contributions in another person's name; and treat loans as contributions.

The measure also limits honorariums for elected or appointed officials to \$15,000 in a year and no more than \$1,000 for a single article or speech; allows state and local employees to participate in federal campaigns unless barred by state law; permits the use of excess campaign funds to defray the expenses of holding public office.



President Ford signs the campaign reforms bill, a direct result of the Watergate scandals, in a White House ceremony

## Defense charges Nixon lied

by Wesley G. Pippert  
United Press International

WASHINGTON—A defense lawyer charged Tuesday that former President Richard M. Nixon "deceived, misled, lied to and used" former White House aide John D. Ehrlichman "to save his own neck."

"In simple terms, Mr. Ehrlichman has been had by his boss, the President of the United States," William S. Frates, Ehrlichman's lawyer, said during an opening statement to the Watergate cover-up trial jurors.

Thus, Ehrlichman joined former White House Counsel John W. Dean III as an accuser of the former president. Dean was scheduled to take the stand as the prosecution's first witness.

On trial for conspiracy in the alleged attempt to conceal top-level involvement in Watergate are Ehrlichman; former White House chief of staff H.R. Haldeman; former Assistant Attorney General Robert C. Mardian; and Nixon re-election lawyer Kenneth W. Parkinson.

With the jury out of the room, Judge John J. Sirica set a hearing for Wednesday afternoon on whether Nixon, an unindicted co-conspirator, should be compelled to testify in the case.

Both Ehrlichman and chief trial prosecutor James F. Neal have subpoenaed the former president, but Nixon's doctors say he is too ill with a phlebitis ailment to make the cross-country trip to Washington. Frates said that time and again Ehrlichman recommended a full disclosure of the facts of Watergate—"let it all hang out."

"Richard Nixon prevented Ehrlichman's disclosure of the facts over and over again."

"Richard Nixon deceived, misled, lied to and used John Ehrlichman to cover up his own knowledge and activities while publicly stating that John Ehrlichman was one of the finest public servants he had ever known," Frates said.

"He was deliberately withholding information from him, covering up to save his own neck."

Frates referred to a taped March 20, 1973, White House conversation in which Nixon remarked to Haldeman: "Ehrlichman doesn't know a goddamn thing about Watergate."

On April 30, 1973, Nixon announced the resignations of Haldeman and Ehrlichman. "He called it a resignation but it was a forced resignation," Frates said. "The evidence will show that the President called John Ehrlichman to Camp David... and told him, 'John, you have been my conscience but I didn't follow your advice. It's all my fault. If I had only followed your advice we wouldn't be in this situation.'"

David Bress, attorney for Mardian, in his opening statement said Mardian was involved in the case in a very peripheral way.

Bress said that three days before the June 17, 1972, break-in at Watergate, Mardian wrote Mitchell a memo—just found in the National Archives—saying the Committee to Re-Elect the President was "a fragmented group of people... who will in the long run cause more problems than they will solve."

"The government did wrong in naming Mardian as a defendant," Bress said.

## Aldermen hear request for Granville driveway

by Henry Farber  
Staff Writer

Access should be provided from Granville Towers' parking lot onto Cameron Avenue, University Square representatives said at Monday night's marathon Chapel Hill Board of Aldermen meeting.

The Granville hearing came after a three-hour discussion on Laurel Hill condominiums, after which most of the standing-room-only crowd in the police-station courtroom dispersed.

University Square Manager Harold

Smith, the key proponent of the Cameron Avenue driveway at the hearing, asked the town to relieve Granville South of a stipulation placed on Granville's land-use permit when the building was constructed in 1968. The stipulation prohibits access from Granville to streets other than West Franklin.

Smith said he wants to cut Granville's access to Franklin Street and send traffic to Cameron so that he can institute a gate-attendant parking plan in University Square's lot. But after the hearing he said that a variation of his proposed system, with Granville retaining access to Franklin, was also possible.

Under the alternate system, drivers with Granville parking stickers would be issued magnetic cards which would be used to open a special Granville access gate. If implemented, visitors to Granville would not be able to use the residence-hall lot.

Opposition to the Cameron access came from Cameron Avenue residents who desire to maintain the residential character of the

street. Driveway proponents contended that Cameron is no longer just a residential street but a major thoroughfare.

David Yount, a traffic consultant firm representative, presented in behalf of Smith data intended to appease Cameron residents. If Granville drivers used Cameron exclusively, total traffic on the avenue would be increased by only 15 per cent, he said.

University Square merchants also testified that the Cameron access is needed to relieve traffic congestion on West Franklin Street. Their remarks led to a heated discussion of traffic problems in general.

Smith was asked after the meeting why no representatives of Granville Towers attended the hearing. The Granville management, he said, wants access to Cameron and West Franklin and is therefore opposed to his attendant parking plan.

Smith said he could conceivably separate Granville parking from the commercial lot even if the Cameron request is refused. He said Granville drivers could be required to enter their lot from Franklin through a special gate.

In the first public hearing, as reported in Monday's DTH, residents of the Morgan Creek area testified that the proposed condominiums would overload roads and sewer systems and change the character of their neighborhood.

The aldermen referred sworn testimony at both hearings to the planning board, who will make a recommendation for approval or rejection of the requests. The aldermen's final decisions are expected in two or three weeks.

## Rain

Today will be mostly cloudy with periods of occasional rain. Highs today will be around 70 and lows tonight in the low 50s.

Chance of rain is nearly 100 per cent today and 80 per cent tonight. Winds are SSW at 10-15 miles per hour.

## Stevens raps absent opponent

by Joel Brinkley  
News Editor

Republican U.S. senate candidate William E. Stevens berated his opponent Robert Morgan Tuesday night for refusing to join him at the Carolina Union's Senate candidates forum, held in Great Hall.

Morgan said in September he could not appear at the Union's forum—to which he was invited in June—because of previously scheduled campaign appearances elsewhere. He said his campaign manager, Charles Winberry, would appear in his stead.

But Stevens said in a letter to Union Current Affairs Chairman Janet Buehler last week that he refused to appear on the same stage as Winberry. He said he must be allowed to speak first and leave the stage before Winberry came on.

Winberry informed Buehler Tuesday morning that he considered this proposed format unacceptable.

"After all the arrangements were agreed to, the format was changed at the insistence of our opponent's headquarters," Morgan campaign aide Bill Bost said in another letter to Buehler. "These changes and the confusion that resulted caused us to conclude that it would be best if we did not participate."

Buehler said Tuesday night she had received the "clear impression" from talking to Morgan campaign aides that Morgan never really wanted to come in the first place.

"What questions does Mr. Morgan fear," Stevens asked during his speech. "Is he afraid to answer questions about the James Ladd firing, afraid to clarify whether or not he committed perjury when he testified he never asked Mr. Ladd for a campaign contribution?"

"Is Mr. Morgan afraid to clarify his role in Justice I. Beverly Lake's 1960 campaign for governor?" Stevens asked.

Morgan told the state NAACP last week that he worked as Lake's campaign manager in the 1960 campaign—described by Stevens Tuesday as "the last of the hard-core segregationist campaigns"—only because Lake had been his law professor at Wake Forest University.

As a result of this statement, Lake withdrew his support for Morgan last weekend.

"Mr. Morgan seems to have a penchant for making statements that are diametrically opposed to statements made by other people," Stevens said. "And, in this case, his statement conflicts with one made by an associate justice of the supreme court."

Among his proposals for slowing inflation, Stevens said in response to an audience question that he favors some reductions of appropriations for long-term federal environmental programs.

"Why finance programs which won't affect us for years to come," he said, "when inflation is hurting us right now?"



Staff photo by Bill Wynn

Republican candidate for U.S. Senate William E. Stevens in Great Hall Tuesday

## 'The Overeducated' wait for 'real' jobs

by Sid Smith  
Asst. Features Editor

This is the third in a series of articles examining the effect of the financial crunch on students and University life. Today, a graduate student looks at the ever-tightening Ph.D. market and the bleak economic outlook for graduate student life.

For some, the Ph.D. glut means only a minor delay in plans.

"I didn't get a job this year, but I'm not giving up. I've taken a temporary post, and I hope to find something next fall. Just one more year of tuna casseroles, I guess."

While for others, a complete reversal.

"I wrote over 500 letters, attended two professional conventions and travelled all over the state seeking a job," sighs one unemployed gentleman. "Next year I'm going to law school."

But for a large number of unemployed Ph.D.'s and their families, the college teacher explosion means an abrupt change in lifestyle that will require a long and indecisive period of adjustment.

"At the time of this writing, I have just finished a bit of style polishing for an article, and tomorrow I report to the state unemployment office to stand in line and get hassled for my weekly check," Dr. Adam Sorkin, UNC class of '72, recently wrote the English department. "Last year I completed

two years of, it turned out, temporary employment at Stockton State College. Now I take care of our two little girls every day while Nancy works; and without bitterness I hope to become re-established in a profession I like and which so far has offered me far less, I feel, than I have offered it. And, ob-la-di, ob-la-da, life goes on..."

Recent reports indicate that education is on the way out, at least in terms of quantity. Enrollments are dropping off, money to higher education is dwindling, and some institutions are shutting down entirely. As Jane Smith, UNC placement counselor for college teaching positions puts it, "Whenever the economy gets tight, education is one of the first priorities to go."

When the bottom fell out of the Ph.D. market around 1970, graduate students consoled themselves with the confidence that the overcrowding was a temporary phenomenon and that the employment dam would break any day. These days few cling to such thin hopes. With college student enrollment in perpetual decline and the level of jobless Ph.D.'s at suicidal heights, the doctorate crunch is now regarded as a decidedly permanent problem.

So permanent, in fact, that the tales of woe no longer surprise or shock. "Dante's Down

Please turn to Ph.D. GLUT, page 4