

NYTimes
JUL 27 1974
**Panel's Olympian Tone
Shed in Rugged Debate**

By R. W. APPLE Jr.
Special to The New York Times

WASHINGTON, July 26—
The House Judiciary Committee came down from Olympus today.

The committee's seriousness of purpose remained intact in its third day of public impeachment deliberations, but with the end of the opening statements by the 38 members, ceremony gave way to nitty-gritty.

Vanished were the exquisite politeness, the polished rhetoric, the infinite concern for decorum, the preoccupation with large verities of the first two days.

Even though everyone within 500 yards of the committee room took it for granted that a bill of impeachment would be approved, the committee had to get down to working out final language. It did so in a welter of roll-calls, procedural haggles and substantive debate.

The air was filled with requests for unanimous consent for this or that, reference to distinguished gentlemen from here or there, cries of "Mr. Chairman, Mr. Chairman!" The proceedings in room 2141 of the Rayburn Office Building were approaching the Congressional norm.

Representative Charles W. Sandman Jr., the acerbic Republican from Erma Park,

Continued on Page 17, Column 3

Continued From Page 1, Col. 7

N.J., told his colleagues:

"I can't believe this is the same group that made all those speeches yesterday and the day before."

There were some classic wrangles.

One of them revolved around the question of whether the original Article I of the bill had to be read before a substitute for it could be read, or would it suffice to decree that the original Article I was assumed to have been read?

Finally, after a discussion that took nearly as long as reading the original article would have taken, it was solemnly concluded that the first two words of the original would be read ("It is . . ."), and then the substitute could be offered.

"Every time we get into facts," said Representative John F. Seiberling, Democrat of Ohio, "the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. Sandman] gets us off into procedure, and every time we get into procedure, the gentleman from Indiana [Representative David W. Dennis, a Republican] gets us back into facts."

Mr. Sandman and Mr. Dennis, an emotional man who resembles the late Felix Frankfurter, lost their tempers. Mr. Sandman yelled at a colleague that "I do not yield any further for those kinds of speeches." And Mr. Dennis, waving his arms, shouted "You can't just tear up the Constitution and throw it away, and that's what you guys are trying to do."

Huntgate's Elephant

The word "specificity"—one member conceded that he couldn't pronounce it—was used on national television more times in a single day than in all the years since the invention of the cathode ray tube. Representative Robert McClory, Republican of Illinois, tried the word twice, failed twice, broke up, and shifted to "specific allegations."

Toward evening, Representative William L. Huntgate, the Missouri Democrat from Mark Twain's home town, said he thought things were getting a little technical.

Why some of the Republicans, he said, would quibble if an elephant walked into the hearing room. Some wouldn't be sure it was an elephant because "it might be a mouse with a glandular condition."

Representative James R.

Mann, Democrat of South Carolina, coldly accused his colleagues of showboating for the television audience.

"I don't think Mr. Sandman would be so strident or even so partisan," said Mr. Mann in his soft accent, "if these proceedings were not conducted to influence the American people."

Through it all, Representative Paul S. Sarbanes, the Maryland Democrat who introduced the substitute Article I, kept cool, blandly fending off sharp questions and patiently attempting to explain its intentions.

He was the only man on the broad dais who didn't laugh at Mr. Huntgate.

It was precisely his calm, almost stoic temperament that led his colleagues to select Mr. Sarbanes, a 41-year-old former Rhodes Scholar from Baltimore, as their point man. It helped, too, that he is from a border state, that he had said so little earlier in the inquiry that he had offended no one, and that—in the words of a colleague—"he's one of the best lawyers in the world."

Fingering a pencil, scratching a spot under his right eye, occasionally patting his wavy hair, Mr. Sarbanes kept doggedly at it all day, with the kind of persistence that helped him drive from office early in his career two senior Democratic members of Congress.

Ad Hominem

As tempers wore thinner, the ad hominem attack entered the debate. The target: Albert E. Jenner Jr., the Chicago lawyer who once served as minority counsel and now serves as a de facto deputy majority counsel.

Representative Delbert L. Matta, Republican of Ohio, called to his colleagues—and, as he said, the American people's—attention a Wall Street Journal article reporting that a committee headed by Mr. Jenner had urged the repeal of anti-prostitution laws.

That prompted Mr. Seiberling to demand an apology from his fellow "gentleman from Ohio," a demand promptly refused.

It seemed like a long time since the opening of the session, when Mr. Seiberling, urging that the committee complete its work rapidly, quoted Judge Learned Hand's admonishment to dilatory lawyers some years ago:

"Gentlemen, some concession must be made to the shortness of human life."