

Krebiozen Figure Takes Side of ITT

CHICAGO — (CDN) — A chemist whose testimony was discredited by a federal judge during the 1965 Krebiozen trial is now supporting International Telephone and Telegraph Corp.'s contention that the Dita D. Beard memorandum is invalid.

ITT said the chemist and a handwriting expert had concluded that the Beard memorandum "was typed on a date later than the date appearing on the document."

The company's statement came after the Federal Bureau of Investigation said its own tests "suggest, but don't definitely establish," that the memo was written on June 25, 1971, the date typed on it.

Implies Deal

The Beard memo bearing the June date and obtained by columnist Jack Anderson implies that an ITT subsidiary agreed to make a substantial contribution to the Republican national convention in exchange for a favorable anti-trust settlement.

Mrs. Beard, a Washington lobbyist for ITT, since has denied writing parts of the memo, although ITT acknowledges it was written on her typewriter.

ITT contends that the Chicago chemist, Walter C. McCrone, owner of McCrone and Associates Chemical Research, and a New York handwriting expert, Mrs. Pearl L. Tytell, "made microscopic ultraviolet fluorescence and highly sophisticated microchemical analysis" and concluded that "the preponderance of evidence points to a period around January, 1972, as the most likely time when the alleged June 25, 1971, memorandum released by Anderson was typed."

Defense Witness

McCrone was a defense witness in the 1965 Krebiozen trial in U.S. District Court in Chicago.

After a trial that lasted nine months, four defendants were acquitted by a jury. They had been charged with fraud and conspiracy in promoting Krebiozen, an alleged anti-cancer drug that government scientists called "worthless."

McCrone testified both before the federal grand jury that indicted Dr. Andrew C. Ivy and Dr. Stevan Durovic, developers of the controversial drug, and two others, and at their trial.

During cross-examination of McCrone on Oct. 20, 1965,

U.S. District Judge Julius J. Hoffman excused the witness and the jury and examined a transcript of grand jury proceedings submitted by the government prosecutors.

After reading parts of the transcript, Hoffman told defense and prosecution attorneys: "It is my opinion from this examination that there are questions and answers given by this witness before the grand jury that tend to impeach him."

The trial record further shows that McCrone admitted in court that he had received a payment of \$25,000 from Duroic for testing drug samples over a 3½ year period, and that Duroic was paying McCrone his regular consultant's salary for the day he spent testifying in court.