

NYTimes JUL 25 1974
**Reinecke Loses in Effort
To Call Expert Witnesses**

By E. W. KENWORTHY

Special to The New York Times

WASHINGTON, July 24—A United States District Court judge refused today the requests by counsel for Lieut. Gov. Ed Reinecke of California to call a specialist in internal medicine and a semanticist as expert witnesses.

The requests were made at the outset of the ninth day of the trial of Mr. Reinecke, a Republican, for perjury at the hearings by the Senate Judiciary Committee in March and April, 1972, on the nomination of Richard G. Kleindienst to be Attorney General.

James E. Cox, Mr. Reinecke's attorney, explained to Judge Barrington Parker that he wished to call Dr. James Thomson, whom he described as an expert on the effects of air travel on mind and body, to testify that Mr. Reinecke, an asthmatic, was tired and under stress after an overnight plane trip when he tried to answer the committee's questions.

Mr. Cox said he wished to call Patrick Hunt, a semanticist, to show that many of the questions put to Mr. Reinecke were unclear, especially those by Republican Senator Hiram L. Fong of Hawaii.

Questions on I.T.T. Pledge

Mr. Reinecke's indictment is based on his answers to questions by Mr. Fong on whether Mr. Reinecke informed Attorney General John N. Mitchell in May or September, 1971, about the pledge by the International Telephone and Telegraph Corporation of up to \$400,000 for the 1972 Republican National Convention.

Judge Parker rejected Mr. Cox's requests. He said that "There is nothing in the record" to show that Mr. Reinecke suffered an asthmatic attack on April 19, the day of his testimony. Further, he said that Mr. Fong's questions were "clear, straightforward and coherent, not couched in any mediaeval language or Chaucerian English, and easily understood."

There was irony in the de-

fense's attempt to call a semanticist, for the question of perjury turns on the semantic issue of whether it is possible to have a "conversation" or a "discussion" over the telephone, or only in a face-to-face meeting, as the defense contends.

Mr. Reinecke told the Judiciary Committee in 1972 that he had had "no conversation" with Mr. Mitchell about the I.T.T. pledge and had not "discussed" the convention with him until September, 1971, six weeks after the settlement of three antitrust suits against I.T.T.

Phone Call Acknowledged

During the trial, however, Mr. Reinecke has acknowledged that he told Mr. Mitchell about the pledge in a telephone call in May, 1971, while the settlement was under negotiation. He also acknowledged on cross-examination that he did not tell the Judiciary Committee about the call.

Yesterday, Richard J. Davis, the prosecutor, asked Mr. Reinecke about this conversation in which there was a communication of information.

"I tol dhim by phone, not by meeting," Mr. Reinecke said.

"You didn't consider the telephone call a discussion with the Attorney General?" Mr. Davis asked.

"Tha's right," Mr. Reinecke replied.

Mr. Cox introduced today an affidavit by George Allen, coach of the Washington Redskins football team, stating that Mr. Reinecke "enjoys an excellent reputation for honesty and truthfulness."

Camera Turns Them Candid

MANCHESTER, England (UPI)—Three youths swiftly changed their innocent pleas to guilty when the prosecution presented in evidence a movie shot by an amateur cameraman showing them breaking into a movie house.