

With Men Who Know, Bugging Can Be 2-Way

By Jules Witcover

Washington Post Staff Writer

In the world of wiretapping that continued to unfold at the Senate's Watergate hearings yesterday, it is clear that the golden rule has been somewhat altered to read: Assume that others are doing unto you.

With men who know wiretapping best, two who do testified it's always a good idea to operate on the premise that there's a bug on the other end of the line—even when you're dealing with another man who knows the ways of wiretapping. Rather, especially when you are,

Anthony T. Ulasewicz, a big, burly former New York

detective who was the first contact to Watergate conspirator James W. McCord Jr. in the White House offer of executive clemency last Jan. 12, described to the senators how it works.

When John J. Caulfield, another former New York cop who later became a White House investigator, called him last June and asked him to set up a phone conversation with McCord, Ulasewicz said, he did what any normal, bug-wise individual would do.

"I proceeded immediately to the area where Mr. Mc-

See SCENE, A11, Col. 1

SCENE, From A1

Cord resides," he said. "Mr. Caulfield had given me the address. I looked around through the area, located a place, a Blue Inn or something (Blue Fountain Inn), which has a large parking lot, two telephone booths isolated by themselves.

"I took the two telephone numbers of the booths, put them on the note, put two different times, like 2:30 and 4:30, and then wrote on the note about a mutual friend wishes to speak to you . . ."

To make sure McCord knew he was really speaking for Caulfield, Ulasewicz said, he had asked Caulfield for "some identifying information," and Caulfield told him he had left his raincoat somewhere recently and McCord had picked it up for him. In the world in which they lived, that was good enough.

He wrote, Ulasewicz said, "you recently recovered a raincoat of his' . . . I then took the note. I went to Mr. McCord's residence, placed it in the letter box and walked away. I then called

from some area not too far, I called Mr. Caulfield and informed him that it was done."

Caulfield thereupon called McCord on the secure phone in the parking lot booth, conveyed his sympathies about McCord's recent arrest in the Watergate break-in and offered his help as a friend.

"I called him at that public telephone," Caulfield had testified Tuesday, "and simply asked him if there was anything I could do for him or his family at this time of personal difficulty."

Yesterday, Sen. Daniel K. Inouye (D-Hawaii), who evidently is not all that familiar with the world of wiretapping, asked the question right out for himself and all the other straights.

"Why all this secrecy," he inquired, "when as you have stated it was just to convey your sympathies to Mr. McCord? Why did you go through all this secret movement? Were you afraid that the phones were tapped?"

Caulfield smiled the

knowing, patient smile of the initiate when talking to the novice. "Yes sir," the ex-cop and investigator said. "To have spent a career in security work as I have, and as Mr. McCord had, and to watch the daily accounts of the Watergate developments from June 17th on, it certainly occurred to me, sir, that any conversations taking place over Mr. McCord's home telephone conceivably could have been the subject of some type of wiretapping by either governmental parties or other people who were concerned about Mr. McCord . . . That impression . . . indicated to me that a circuitous route, if I wanted to speak to him, would be the appropriate way to do it, sir."

When Caulfield asked Ulasewicz to contact McCord again in January, and to pass on a message indicating the White House was offering executive clemency to him if he would clam up, Ulasewicz again went the phone booth route—naturally.

Before doing so, though, Ulasewicz reminded Caul-

field that they were dealing with "a good wireman" in McCord—a wiretap expert in the parlance—and he added: "Jack, anything that is said to him, it can be expected it is probably recorded," by McCord himself presumably. Caulfield replied, he said, that "if this ever comes out, I will definitely admit that I asked you to do this, and under these circumstances and on a friendship basis." So Ulasewicz made the call.

In that second conversation, he told the senators, he passed on this word, taken directly from Caulfield: "A year is a long time. No one knows how a judge will go. Your family needs will be provided for. Rehabilitation and job opportunity will be provided for."

The message as repeated by Ulasewicz to the senators was essentially the one McCord had said earlier he had received, except that McCord recalled it as starting off with the words, "Plead guilty."

Samuel Dash, the committee counsel, asked Ulasewicz

whether anything had been said about "immunity."

Again, Ulasewicz responded like a man who never forgets the potential presence of a bug. He replied:

"I don't recall, it may very well have happened. I have heard Mr. McCord's testimony here, of course, as everyone has, and I searched my mind very strongly on the matter because I still believe Mr. McCord could have been taped and might have it on tape . . ."

Sen. Howard H. Baker Jr. (R-Tenn.), the vice chairman but apparently also a novice in electronic eavesdropping, was plainly fascinated. He pressed Ulasewicz about McCord's ranking as "a good wireman."

"Well," the expert witness replied, "from what I have read in the case and from the fact that Mr. Caulfield hire him, I would say he was one of the best wiremen in the business." A wireman, Ulasewicz elaborated, "in police parlance would be anyone who is familiar with ap-

plying wiretaps, any type of surveillances by electrical means, and so forth in a room, on a person, in an automobile, in a tire or any place, and I would say he was a good man."

It was a common police term, he said, but he added: "However, I was never a wireman." In his old bureau of the New York police department, though, "we have some of the finest wiremen in the department," he boasted.

"You think your wiremen were better than McCord's wiremen?" Baker asked.

Now, at last, it was time for the expert witness to render a professional judgment. Former detective first-rate Tony Ulasewicz was ready.

"I will tell you," he said, "any old retired man in the New York City Police Department who would become involved in a thing like that, he thought he had to for whatever reason it was, he would not have walked in with an army, that is for sure."

Even Baker the novice could appreciate the point.

"He would not have walked in with an army," Baker said, knowing the fate of McCord and his four-man, surgical-gloved platoon. "Would he have walked in with identification papers and serial-numbered \$100 bills and address book (all paraphernalia of the luckless Waterburggers)?"

"He probably would have walked in like any decent common-looking citizen," Ulasewicz said in an apt self-description, "laid something in the right place and walked right out, and that would have been the end of it for a long time."

The Caucus Room erupted in appreciative laughter, but Ulasewicz did not laugh not at first. "You see," he said, "I must be honest here, Senator."

Well, Baker wanted to know, how could he have obtained the information McCord was seeking at the Democratic National Committee "without going in there with an army and tapping the doors and all the rest."

The answer was easy, and even somebody who didn't have the faintest idea of

what a wireman is could have given it.

"Well," Ulasewicz explained, "a wireman would only do wires. He might not necessarily be a good man for a different type of investigation. If it is a question of obtaining information from the Democratic Party, Republican Party or anybody else, the easiest way is to write a postal card asking them to mail you all their leaflets. They will put you on their mailing list and you will have everything."

Baker, on more familiar ground now, conceded that the witness had a point. "Politicians are pretty anxious to add to their mailing list," he acknowledged.

After assuring Baker that he had no wires on the Senate committee, Ulasewicz was excused for the day. He may be back, though, because he testified that he had done "investigative work" for the White House, but was on the payroll of Herbert Kalmbach, President Nixon's fund-raising lawyer, through 1972. The senators may want to ask about that. And not from a phone booth, either.