

Fund Scandal Is an Issue in Race to Succeed Scott in

By JAMES T. WOOTEN

Special to The New York Times

PHILADELPHIA, April 21—

When Senator Hugh Scott announced last December that he would not seek re-election, there were few tears shed among his fellow Pennsylvania Republicans.

He had been accused of and had not denied taking money from the Gulf Oil Corporation, and no one in the party's hierarchy wanted that sort of millstone around his candidate's neck in this Presidential year.

Now, although the 76-year-old minority leader is out of the race, the results of the Republican primary for Mr. Scott's seat Tuesday may still hinge on precisely the same sort of scandal.

Representative H. John Heinz 3d, heir to the Pittsburgh food processing fortune and the early favorite to win the nomination, is apparently in serious trouble because he has admitted that he, too, was a recipient of the giant oil company's political contributions.

Too Close to Call

His two opponents, Arlen Specter, the former Philadelphia District Attorney, and George Packard, formerly the managing editor of The Philadelphia Bulletin, have repeatedly raised the Gulf Oil question as a part of their campaigns, and politicians across the state this week were judging the contest as much too close to call.

In contrast, Representative William J. Green, the popular Philadelphian who took his father's seat in Congress in 1964 at the age of 25, is the overwhelming favorite among the same politicians to win the Democratic Senate primary.

His opponent, State Senator Jeanette Reibman, is highly re-

spected for her legislative acumen in Harrisburg, but she is little known elsewhere in the state, an impediment her poorly financed campaign has yet to overcome.

Consequently, most public attention has been on the Republican contest where money—legal and otherwise—has become a running issue.

Vulnerable to Charge

Ironically, Mr. Heinz, 37, a millionaire who has spent more than \$250,000 of his own money in the campaign, left himself vulnerable to the Gulf Oil charge by accepting a relatively insignificant sum—\$4,000—from the company a few years ago.

Both Mr. Packard and Mr. Specter have presented themselves to the voters as men who never have and never would take corporate funds. The strategy has had apparent success.

Polls conducted by the candidates themselves and by independent organizations indicate that Mr. Heinz and Mr. Specter are running a few percentage points behind Mr. Packard.

Yesterday, Mr. Specter and Mr. Packard took each other to task on a Philadelphia television talk show, but the over-riding thrust of their rhetoric

has been against Mr. Heinz. And he, in turn, has devoted much of his campaign simply to defending himself against the charge of corruption.

Mr. Heinz's television advertising has stressed his legislative record and his own personal trustworthiness, and because he has been able to purchase substantially more broadcast time than his opponents, some Pennsylvanians believe he still retains the edge in the race and will probably win.

Campaign records through the end of March show that Mr. Specter spent the least amount of money on his pursuit of the nomination, \$84,000.

Mr. Packard, who has been endorsed by John Eisenhower, the son of the late President, and Thomas Gates, a former Secretary of Defense, spent \$133,000 in the same period.

Mr. Heinz, however, spent \$318,000 on his campaign, including \$288,000 of his own funds.

"He's buying the election," Mr. Specter said this week after sending Mr. Heinz a telegram asking for a public debate. All three men agreed early in the campaign that a debate would be in the best interest of the voters, but no such joint appearance has occurred.

Mr. Packard, who said last week that he had not lost any of the confidence he had gained when he walked across the state at the start of his campaign, has described himself as "what the people want." He promised that if he became Senator, he would refuse a \$3,000 salary increase voted by members of Congress for themselves last year.

Mr. Specter has vowed to approach the Federal Government with the same reformist's zeal he says was his when he served eight years as Philadelphia's District Attorney.

He was first elected in 1965, after serving as special counsel to the Warren Commission in its investigation of the assassination of President Kennedy. He originated the single-bullet theory on which the commission based much of its report.

Worked for C.I.A.

Mr. Specter, who is 45, ran unsuccessfully for mayor in 1969 and was defeated for a third term as district attorney in 1973.

Mr. Packard, 43, holds a doctorate in foreign studies and once worked for the Central Intelligence Agency in Japan.

He resigned as The Bulletin's managing editor last spring, announced his Senate candidacy

Pennsylvania

in the autumn and began his trek across the state.

Mr. Heinz, in his second term in Congress, has enjoyed remarkable success in his brief political career. In 1972, he won more than 70 percent of the general election vote and picked up 25 percent of the ballots in the Democratic primary as a write-in candidate.

Mr. Green, the Democrat, went to Congress in 1964 after the death of his father, a feared and respected political boss who had held the center city Philadelphia seat for several years. Although Mr. Green was defeated by Frank L. Rizzo in the Democratic mayoral primary here in 1971, he has never been challenged seriously in his district.

Mrs. Reibman, 60, a liberal who is a veteran of the state's legislative wars, has challenged Mr. Green's assertion that he was substantially responsible for the removal of the oil depletion allowance for big producers through Federal tax reforms.

"If that is true, then he must take some of the blame for the overall lack of tax reform that still allows 200,000 of America's wealthiest families to pay only nominal income taxes or none at all," she said here yesterday.