

# Baker Asks Exclusion Of 'Bugged' Evidence

By Paul W. Valentine  
Washington Post Staff Writer

Robert G. (Bobby) Baker accused the Government yesterday of resorting to a "massive wiretapping" scheme to gather information used in the conspiracy indictment returned against him in January.

In a series of motions filed in District Court, he asked that all the information be excluded from his trial unless the Government can prove it was obtained independently of wiretapping activities.

Peter R. Taft, a Baker attorney, said in a lengthy affidavit filed with the motions that FBI agents "bugged" at least six hotels and gambling casinos in Las Vegas, Nev., during portions of 1962 and 1963 when Baker met there with various businessmen and discussed matters referred to in his indictment.

Taft said electronic listening devices were discovered in three of the hotels and also in the law office of Clifford Jones, former Nevada Lieu-



BOBBY BAKER

... charges evidence illegal

tenant Governor, charged with perjury in the Baker case.

Taft further claimed FBI agents leased 25 telephone lines from the Central Telephone Co. in Las Vegas under See BAKER, A7, Col. 2.

a couple of phony business names, hooked them up between local FBI headquarters and selected rooms in the gambling casinos, planted bugging devices in the rooms and monitored both phone calls and all room conversation.

The Taft affidavit was accompanied by telephone company records showing the phone lines were leased to "Henderson Novelty Co." and "Clark Associates." Both names are fictitious, he said, and telephone company officials knew it and even helped the FBI install the equipment.

The Taft affidavit said "massive wiretapping and eavesdropping surveillance" by the FBI embraced the Fremont, Sands, Stardust, Desert, Flamingo and Dunes Hotels.

Specifically, he claimed, a bug was planted in the office of businessman Edward Levinson at the Fremont from Oct. 30, 1962, to April 29, 1963.

Another bug was used to

monitor calls in the office of Carl Cohen, a managing partner of the Sands Hotel in February, 1963, Taft said, and still another in the office of Dunes Hotel partner Major Riddle in August, 1963.

## Conferred There

Baker had numerous conferences in these offices while they were bugged, Taft claimed.

He said he also believes the FBI may have bugged various Baker offices in Washington before Baker resigned his Senate job in October, 1963.

He said a court hearing to determine the extent of local bugging is necessary before a judge can decide what information and evidence should be barred from the trial.

Baker also filed a motion to dismiss the entire indictment against him on grounds that adverse newspaper publicity

during his grand jury investigation makes a fair trial impossible.

Also, "inflammatory" questions asked by members of the Senate Rules Committee investigating Baker in 1963 fed even more prejudicial headlines to the papers, he said.

Among such questions, he said, were whether he had referred Senate employees to a Puerto Rican doctor for abortions and whether he provided call girls and other entertainment for businessmen dealing with the Government.

## Hearing Scheduled

A hearing on Baker's motions has been set for June 17. His trial date is Oct. 17. Jones's trial will be later.

Baker, 37, former Senate Majority Secretary, was indicted Jan. 4 on nine counts of grand larceny, attempted income tax evasion and conspiracy.

Many of the allegations cen-

ter on a contention that Baker concealed payments to him from five business firms by channeling them through Washington coal lobbyist Wayne G. Bromley.

The firms named in the indictment are First Western Financial Corp., Las Vegas; United States Freight Co., New York; Redwood National Bank of San Rafael, Calif.; Harvey Aluminium, Inc., Torrance, Calif.; and International Marketing Associates, Inc., Los Altos, Calif.

Jones's perjury indictment arose from charges that he lied to the grand jury investigating Baker when he denied arranging for payments to Baker through Bromley.

The indictments do not say why Baker received the money. Last year, after months of hearings, the Senate Rules Committee held that Baker had abused his public position by amassing personal funds through dealings with persons interested in specific legisla-