

SFChronicle  
**Sharp Denial**

JUL 24 1974

**Motive Hinted in  
Reinecke Trial***By Joseph Albright  
Chronicle Correspondent***Washington**

The prosecution sought to suggest yesterday that Lieutenant Governor Ed Reinecke lied under oath because he wanted former Attorney General John Mitchell's support in the California gubernatorial race.

It was the first time in the eight-day-old perjury trial that prosecutors had offered any motive for the false statement Reinecke is charged with making to the Senate Judiciary Committee in April, 1972.

Reinecke, from the witness box where he was being cross-examined, curtly rejected the prosecution's theory and clung to his position that he had not lied at the senate hearings on the International Telephone and Telegraph Corp.

Assistant Special Prosecutor Richard J. Davis began a two-hour cross-examination by asking Reinecke whether he considered Mitchell a "very powerful man" at the time of the senate hearings.

"Yes," replied Reinecke, acknowledging that Mitchell had just resigned as attorney general to lead the Committee to Re-Elect the President.

Davis then asked whether Reinecke thought Mitchell could help him toward becoming governor in 1974. Reinecke replied, "Yes, along with (helping) in getting jobs for the state."

Returning to the subject later, Davis asked Reinecke whether "you had resolved, if at all possible, to protect John Mitchell" in testimony at the Senate hearings.

"Absolutely not," Reinecke replied.

The charge against Reinecke is that he deliberately lied when he told Senator Hiram Fong (Rep-Hawaii) that it was only after the Nixon administration settled an ITT anti-trust case in July, 1971, that he discussed with Mitchell an offer by an ITT hotel subsidiary to underwrite the Re-

publican National Convention in San Diego.

The prosecution has offered evidence that Reinecke first told Mitchell of the ITT pledge in a phone conversation in May, 1971, something Reinecke did not mention at the senate hearings.

Davis asked Reinecke yesterday, "Are you telling us you didn't consider your telephone calls a discussion with the attorney general?" Reinecke replied, "that is correct."

Reinecke also said, "I would have answered if they had asked me about telephone conversations."

Hoping to chip away at Reinecke's credibility, Davis got the lieutenant governor to acknowledge a few inconsistencies between his testimony this week and his earlier answers to the Watergate grand jury that indicted him.

The clearest conflict involved a statement by Reinecke that he had not informed his aide, Edgar Gillenwaters, about his May, 1971, phone conversation with Mitchell. Under cross-examination yesterday, Reinecke said he probably had informed Gillenwaters and that the earlier answer was untrue.

"It was either my mistake or the (court) reporter's mistake," he explained.

Judge Barrington Parker instructed the jurors they could consider the conflicting statements in weighting Reinecke's testimony.

After the two-hour cross-examination, defense attorney James Cox recalled a Senate stenotypist to explain a number of minor revisions in the transcript of Reinecke's 1972 ITT testimony.

Judge Parker strongly indicated that his earlier doubts about the transcript had been satisfied, but the defense is expected to renew its challenge before the case goes to the jury later this week.