

WATERGATE JUDGE HINTS WIDER TRIAL

Says 'One of Crucial Issues' in Case Will Be Motives

By WALTER RUGABER
Special to The New York Times

WASHINGTON, Dec. 4—The judge in the Watergate case said today that "one of the crucial issues" in the forthcoming trial would be the motives behind the bugging of the offices of the Democratic National Committee last June.

The remark was made by Chief Judge John J. Sirica of the United States District Court here during a pretrial conference on the criminal proceedings against seven men charged

with conspiring to spy on the party's Watergate headquarters.

The indictments confined themselves to certain aspects of the case, but the judge's statements today raised the possibility that the trial testimony may delve into more of the political questions raised by the case.

Two defendants in the trial, scheduled to begin on Jan. 8, are former White House aides. A third was the security adviser to President Nixon's campaign organization when he and four other men were arrested inside the Democratic offices.

'Purpose' of Actions

"This jury's going to want to know the purpose [of the break-in and bugging]," Judge Sirica said. "What did these men go into the headquarters for? Was their sole purpose political espionage?"

"Were they paid?" the judge

continued. "Were there financial gains? Who started this? Who hired them, if anyone hired them? A whole lot is going to come out in this case."

On several occasions, Judge Sirica questioned the principal Assistant United States Attorney, Earl J. Silberg, on whether the Government intended to offer evidence on the motives of the seven men.

"There'll be some evidence," Mr. Silberg said at one point.

"What do you mean, 'some evidence'?" the judge pressed. The prosecutor replied that the Government planned to present testimony that would allow the jury to draw various conclusions about the question.

Tracing of Checks

Judge Sirica inquired specifically whether the prosecution would attempt to trace checks totaling \$115,000 that passed through a Miami bank account

controlled by Bernard L. Barker one of the defendants.

It is generally conceded that the checks were intended as contributions to the president's re-election effort Mr. Silbert indicated that the Government would try to show how the money had reached Mr. Barker.

Mr. Silbert informed the judge that the prosecution expected to offer as evidence between 150 and 200 exhibits. It will call between 50 and 60 witnesses, he said, and will summon 30 additional unless both sides stipulate they are unnecessary.

Estimates of the length of the trial ranged from about one month to between two and four months. One defense lawyer, Henry B. Rothblatt of New York, warned that his side would hold the Government to "very close proof on every issue possible."

Today's session failed to re-

K

solve an issue raised by a defense effort to obtain a subpoena requiring The Los Angeles Times to produce tape-recordings of an interview with a key Government witness, Alfred C. Baldwin 3d.

Mr. Baldwin said in the interview that he had monitored the listening devices in the committee offices and that he had observed a number of pertinent developments in the case. The Los Angeles newspaper has said it will resist turning over the tapes.

William O. Bittman of Washington, the lawyer for E. Howard Hunt Jr., said the tapes were needed for the possible impeachment of Mr. Baldwin as a witness and for the possible development of leads useful to the defense.

Judge Sirica, suggesting that the defense request differs from other recent demands on

the press because the source of the information is not in question, ordered memorandums on the issue from both sides next week.

He noted that if the subpoena was issued and if The Los Angeles Times refused to comply, representatives of the newspaper—its publisher and reporters were mentioned—could be jailed for contempt of court.