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specific individuals. And as I can best recall this conversation, I was a little perplexed on this because I did not know these people at all. And it is——

Mr. Dash. Did you know Fred LaRue?

Mr. Kalmbach. Well, I, of course, knew Fred LaRue but casually. But as to how to distribute these funds—then again, my best recollection is that he indicated at that point that perhaps Mr. Ulasewicz might be the one to act as the distributor for the funds.

Mr. Dash. Is this Tony Ulasewicz?

Mr. Kalmbach. Yes, sir, it is.

Mr. Dash. Is that the Tony Ulasewicz who has testified before this committee before?

Mr. Kalmbach. It is.

Mr. Dash. Did you know Tony Ulasewicz?

Mr. Kalmbach. Yes, I did.

Mr. Dash. Had you worked with him in the past?

Mr. Kalmbach. I had met with him two or three times total from mid-1969 until approximately October 1, 1971, and I had three conversations, two or three conversations, during that period.

Mr. Dash. Did you have confidence that Mr. Ulasewicz was the kind of person who could be useful in this kind of assignment?

Mr. Kalmbach. Well, I knew that he had been acting and undertaking assignments for the White House for that period and I certainly knew that he had the confidence of whoever it was that he was working with, and when he mentioned Mr. Ulasewicz as someone to do this, I said that I would, I certainly would have confidence in him.

Mr. Dash. Did you know whether or not—did you know what kind of assignments he had undertaken for the White House before?

Mr. Kalmbach. No, sir; I did not, Mr. Dash.

Mr. Dash. But you knew that he would be somebody that you could have confidence in?

Mr. Kalmbach. Well, I knew that he was a retired New York City police officer who was competent and I was certain that he was someone that could be trusted and I would be——

Mr. Dash. Who other than Mr. Dean were you thinking of when you say they would have confidence? Did you mean Mr. Haldeman?

Mr. Kalmbach. Well, whoever he was talking for. He was using the editorial "we" all the time.

Mr. Dash. Well, if he was talking for anybody over in the White House, who did he work with most often, to your knowledge?

Mr. Kalmbach. Mr. Dean?

Mr. Dash. Yes.

Mr. Kalmbach. Well, he worked with practically everyone in the White House. But, of course, principally——

Mr. Dash. Who above him?

Mr. Kalmbach. He reported to Mr. Ehrlichman. And he also worked closely with Mr. Haldeman. He did not mention their names in this conversation.

Mr. Dash. Have you ever been given any other assignment of this nature in the past?

Mr. Kalmbach. No, sir.

Mr. Dash. After meeting with Mr. Dean, what did you do? Did you indicate, first, that you would accept this assignment from Mr. Dean?

Mr. Kalmbach. I did.
Mr. Dash. And you did accept it under the basis that if Mr. Dean was asking you as the President's counsel, that he had authority to ask you for that?

Mr. Kalmbach. Absolutely. I had known Mr. Dean since mid-1969, and I had complete trust in the man and knowing that he was counsel to the President.

Mr. Dash. All right, then, you accepted this assignment. What did you do right after that meeting with Mr. Dean?

Mr. Kalmbach. I walked back to the Statler-Hilton and I think within a matter of minutes after I was back at the hotel I called Mr. Stans.

Mr. Dash. What did you say to Mr. Stans?

Mr. Kalmbach. I told him that I had been given a special assignment requiring as much cash as perhaps he would have available, and I think I mentioned $50,000 to $100,000, and asked him if it would be possible that he could help me in this assignment.

Mr. Dash. What did he say?

Mr. Kalmbach. He said that he would see what he could do. He said that he would have, as I remember it, he said he would have to go to a safe deposit box but that he would meet me at the Statler-Hilton in my room early in the afternoon.

Mr. Dash. Did he meet you early in the afternoon?

Mr. Kalmbach. Yes, sir, he did.

Mr. Dash. Did he have anything with him?

Mr. Kalmbach. Yes, he did. He had—he gave me $75,100.

Mr. Dash. How were they packaged?

Mr. Kalmbach. It was in $100 bills, as I remember it.

Mr. Dash. Did he indicate to you the source of that money, Mr. Kalmbach?

Mr. Kalmbach. He did. As to $45,000 he said that it was the balance of the $50,000 that he had earlier given me. He said that he was giving it to me now but he did not indicate, as I remember it at all, the source of the balance of those funds.

Mr. Dash. Did you tell Mr. Stans at any time when you asked for this money, when you received it, what that money was going to be used for?

Mr. Kalmbach. No, I did not.

Mr. Dash. Did Mr. Stans question you as to why you needed the money?

Mr. Kalmbach. Again, Mr. Dash, when I talked to Mr. Stans, we had known each other a number of years, I told him it was for a very important assignment, that I had been advised that it was in complete confidence, that I could not tell him the nature of the assignment, that he would have to trust me, and he said “Of course, I do trust you, Herb”, and with that he gave me the funds.

Mr. Dash. All right.

Mr. Kalmbach. I held the funds until the following day when I gave them to Mr. Ulasewicz.

Mr. Dash. How did you make contact with Mr. Ulasewicz?

Mr. Kalmbach. When I had met with Mr. Dean I recall that, it seems to me that I asked him to get in touch with Mr. Caulfield who he knew well, and who knew Mr. Ulasewicz’ number in New York,
and to ask Mr. Caulfield to call me and give me that number, and then I would call Mr. Ulasewicz, and that is, that is what I recall that I did. I received a call, and then called Mr. Ulasewicz late in the afternoon on the—let us see, it was the 29th and asking him to come down to Washington the next day, on the 30th.

Mr. DASH. Did you say anything on the telephone as to why he should come down?

Mr. KALMBACH. No, I just said I wanted to see him for a special assignment.

Mr. DASH. Then you had a meeting with him?

Mr. KALMBACH. Yes, I did.

Mr. DASH. Where did you meet with him?

Mr. KALMBACH. I met with him at my room in the Statler-Hilton Hotel.

Mr. DASH. Did you tell Mr. Ulasewicz or ask him to undertake this assignment?

Mr. KALMBACH. Yes, sir, I did. I told him exactly what Mr. Dean had told me, namely that this, the purpose of this assignment was to provide funds for these defendants, for their legal help and also to provide support for their families, and I stressed again the statement that Mr. Dean had given to me that it must be in absolute secrecy and confidentiality, and he thoroughly understood and took the funds and left and went back to New York.

Mr. DASH. So he agreed to follow out this assignment that you had requested?

Mr. KALMBACH. Yes, sir.

Mr. DASH. Prior to Mr. Ulasewicz' coming down did you again meet with Mr. Dean?

Mr. KALMBACH. Yes. I met with him Friday morning at which time—

Mr. DASH. Friday morning?

Mr. KALMBACH. At which time I told him that I had contacted Mr. Ulasewicz, that Mr. Ulasewicz would be in Washington that afternoon and that I had raised $75,100.

Mr. DASH. Where was that meeting?

Mr. KALMBACH. In my room at the Statler.

Mr. DASH. Could it have been, Mr. Kalmbach, that you first had coffee in the coffee shop with Mr.—this was the Statler-Hilton?

Mr. KALMBACH. Yes, sir, it was.

Mr. DASH. Yes, could you first have met in the coffee shop and then in your room?

Mr. KALMBACH. Well, it could have been but my recollection is that we met in my room.

Mr. DASH. Now, you testified that you met—when you met with Mr. Ulasewicz you stressed the secrecy that Mr. Dean had stressed with you. Did you arrive at any method with Mr. Ulasewicz as to how you would carry out this assignment, under a covert operation?

Mr. KALMBACH. Well, the only method was that we would—it was again stressed, absolute secrecy. In my conversations with Mr. Ulasewicz when I stressed that, in our talks between ourselves, it was agreed that we should use telephone booths, talk between telephone booths and, of course, as it later became procedure that in his conversations with various of these people to whom he was—that he was contacting, he would use an alias.
Mr. Dash. Mr. Ulasewicz would use an alias?
Mr. Kalmbach. Yes, he would.
Mr. Dash. Do you know what Mr. Ulasewicz' alias was during this transaction?
Mr. Kalmbach. No, I think there were several.
Mr. Dash. Does the name Rivers make—
Mr. Kalmbach. That was one of those, yes, sir.
Mr. Dash. Did he suggest that name?
Mr. Kalmbach. Well, I do not know whether he did or whether I did, but in our conversation—but then back, I would then report to either Mr. Dean or Mr. LaRue, who would give me the directions or give me the directions, I would then give Mr. Ulasewicz the directions, he would then make the contact with the people.
Mr. Dash. Under your direction your conversation would be with Mr. Ulasewicz on the telephone?
Mr. Kalmbach. Yes, sir.
Mr. Dash. And they would be from telephone booth to telephone booth.
Mr. Kalmbach. Yes, usually.
Mr. Dash. Could you just give me a scenario how you would contact Mr. Ulasewicz, or how he would contact you, what one would say to the other, and how you would do it?
Mr. Kalmbach. Well, if there is a typical, and I don't know if there is, but it would, I would receive a call either from Mr. Dean or Mr. LaRue with instructions to get a amount of funds over to one of the defendants or one of the attorneys. I would then call Mr. Ulasewicz, and so inform him.
Mr. Dash. You would call him and reach him at his home number?
Mr. Kalmbach. I would reach him in New York at his home number.
Mr. Dash. What would you tell him to do?
Mr. Kalmbach. I would call him from a pay phone. He would then—
Mr. Dash. When you called him did you use a telephone credit card?
Mr. Kalmbach. No, always it was in cash and it was using a good number of quarters.
Mr. Dash. Putting a lot of quarters in the telephone as you went along?
Mr. Kalmbach. Yes, sir.
Mr. Dash. And when you referred to particular people who received, who would receive that, take for instance Mr. Hunt, did you have a particular code name for Mr. Hunt?
Mr. Kalmbach. I think we did. I think we called Mr. Hunt, just called him "The Writer," he had been an author, we called him "The Writer." I think we called Mrs. Hunt "The Writer's Wife." I don't know that we had any other names for anyone else.
Mr. Dash. Did you have any particular code name for the money that was being distributed?
Mr. Kalmbach. No. If there is a code name the name developed in—when I was at the Statler and Mr. Ulasewicz came down to receive the $75,100 that I had received from Mr. Stans, he came into the room and he didn't have a briefcase with him, so he just went to the shelf
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Mr. Edmisten. Yes. When was that?

Mr. Stanst. The same day of June 23, Mr. Sloan had balanced out his cash account, something which I had asked him to do as early as April 10 but which he couldn't do because he was waiting for the return of the proceeds of the various checks we were discussing. He showed a balance of $81,000 of cash on hand and expressed some concern about it because he was going on vacation and under the tense situation that was building up he didn't want to hold the cash in his custody. We discussed it and concluded that the funds were of a nature which did not classify them as funds of the current committees, that they were more properly funds of earlier committees, that they were not part of what we had to account for in an audit by the General Accounting Office, and that we should get legal advice.

At that time it was understood within the committee that Robert Mardian had been brought to Washington to work on legal matters that were current at the time, and I went to him for advice. His advice, after he learned the description of the money, was to get the money out of the office and out of the campaign and he suggested that I give it to Fred LaRue. Fred LaRue was the right-hand man of John Mitchell, assistant to Mitchell as campaign director. On that advice I gave the money, my half of the money to LaRue and Sloan later gave his half of the money to LaRue. I neglected to say that when Sloan expressed concern about having that much money in his custody, I agreed to divide it with him so that there would only be about $40,000 in each parcel, and I took one and put it in my desk and he took one parcel and took it home. I gave mine to LaRue rather promptly, at the first opportunity. Sloan went on vacation to Bermuda for about 10 days, and gave his money to LaRue upon his return.

Now, there is some uncertainty as to whether that money passed through Mardian's hands in each case. I can't recall whether I gave the $40,000 that I had directly to LaRue or gave it to Mardian to give to LaRue. Sloan did give his $40,000 to Mardian and Mardian gave it to LaRue.

Mr. Edmisten. Do you know what happened to that money in the end?

Mr. Stanst. I do not know specifically what happened to that money. Subsequently I received some funds for several purposes from Fred LaRue. Whether it was part of the same money or other money, I have no way of knowing, and only he could tell.

Mr. Edmisten. Now, Mr. Stanst, in late June or early July did you receive a call from Mr. Herbert Kalmbach requesting money from you?

Mr. Stanst. On the 20th of June I received an urgent call from Mr. Kalmbach. He said he was in Washington at the Statler-Hilton Hotel, that it was extremely vital that he see me right away, and he wanted me to come over there, and I did. I dropped everything and went over there to see him. He said, "I am here on a special mission on a White House project and I need all the cash I can get."

I said, "I don't have any cash to give you. Will you take a check?"

He said, "No, I can't take a check, it must be in cash, and this has nothing to do with the campaign. But I am asking for it on high authority."

Mr. Edmisten. What high authority did he say?
Mr. Stans. He did not say, "I am asking for it on high authority and you will have to trust me that I have cleared it properly."

As I said, I had no cash belonging to the committee at that time because we had closed it all out but I did have two parcels of money that were available, and I gave those to Mr. Kalmbach. They added up to $75,000 of funds outside the committee.

Mr. Edmisten. Now, Mr. Stans, did you not ask him why he wanted this money?

Mr. Stans. Yes, I did.

Mr. Edmisten. What did he say?

Mr. Stans. He said, "This is for a White House project and that I have been asked to take care of and I cannot tell you. You will have to trust me."

Mr. Edmisten. Would Mr. Kalmbach have been your superior in this organization, campaign organization?

Mr. Stans. No, Mr. Kalmbach was a man I knew very well. He had been my principal deputy in the 1908 fundraising campaign for Richard Nixon. He subsequently had close affiliation with a number of people in the White House that I was aware of.

He was personal counsel to the President. He was a man that I knew was a man of highest integrity, trustworthiness and honesty, and I had no question to doubt, no reason to doubt, anything he told me and I didn't.

Mr. Edmisten. Who in the whole organization would you consider your superiors, and would you just go up the line from you?

Mr. Stans. Well, I do not know that I had any superiors. It was a unique situation. The finance committee was separate from the campaign committee. The campaign committee exercised a dominance over the finance committee by their spending policies, forcing us to raise enough money to pay everything they committed. But I had no superior. I would have taken instructions from the President if he gave me any but he did not, and I would have been influenced by requests from certain people in the White House from time to time but I do not believe I had a superior in that sense.

Mr. Edmisten. Well, now, I just have one more question here. I want you to think carefully, Mr. Stans: Did you have a meeting on June 24, after the break-in, with Mr. John Mitchell to find out from him what had happened?

Mr. Stans. I am not sure of the exact date. I had meetings from time to time with Mr. Mitchell. I probably had one on June 24.

Mr. Edmisten. Did you ask him what happened at that meeting, if you recall it?

Mr. Stans. I do not recall that I asked him that question. Certainly I was curious about it, and it would not surprise me if I had. I have no recollection of specifically talking about that subject. That was a week after the break-in.

Mr. Edmisten. Yes. Do you recall at any time Mr. Mitchell telling you that there were others involved besides those who were apprehended?

Mr. Stans. No, I do not.

Mr. Edmisten. At a meeting of that nature about that time?

Mr. Stans. No, I do not.
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Mr. Sutter. I do. Mr. Chairman, I am sure much to the relief of the committee, Mr. Ulasewicz does not have a prepared statement he desires to read. He is here merely for the purposes of answering questions from the committee and I should like the record to indicate that he appears pursuant to a subpoena issued by the committee dated April 30, 1973, and served upon him on or about May 8, 1973. Thank you, sir.

Mr. Lenzer. Thank you, Mr. Sutter.

Mr. Ulasewicz, you testified here about your relationships with Mr. Caulfield in making contact with Mr. McCord. I just want to go back and ask you, were you contacted originally by Mr. Caulfield in February of 1969 with reference to doing some investigative work?

Mr. Ulasewicz. That is correct.

Mr. Lenzer. And in June of 1969 did you meet Mr. Herbert Kalmbach here in the District of Columbia?

Mr. Ulasewicz. That is correct.

Mr. Lenzer. Now, on or about June 28, 1972, did you receive a call from that same Mr. Kalmbach?

Mr. Ulasewicz. Yes, I believe it was on the 29th of June.

Mr. Lenzer. And could you tell us what he said to you and what you said to him?

Mr. Ulasewicz. Mr. Kalmbach asked me to come down to Washington the next afternoon, that he wanted to speak to me regarding an assignment.

Mr. Lenzer. And did you agree to do that?

Mr. Ulasewicz. Yes, I did.

Mr. Lenzer. Did you see him the next day?

Mr. Ulasewicz. I did.

Mr. Lenzer. Where was that, sir?

Mr. Ulasewicz. It was in the Statler-Hilton Hotel in his room.

Mr. Lenzer. Can you tell us what he said to you at that time and what you said to him?

Mr. Ulasewicz. Mr. Kalmbach advised me that he had a very important assignment, and he went at least three times over the statement, saying that it was a situation that developed that he was asked to do something and needed my help in doing it. He said that it was legal, that it was to provide funds for persons in difficulty for payment of their counsel, and for payment to assist their families during some troublesome period. He repeated the statement several times. He was very ill at ease, very nervous and we got to the point where I said, "Well, Mr. Kalmbach just what is this now?" and he says, "I have guessed it. It's the Watergate situation."

Mr. Lenzer. Mr. Ulasewicz, let me just interrupt—would you put the microphone more directly in front of you please, thank you.

Mr. Ulasewicz. And he said, "It's the Watergate situation. I guess you have guessed that," and I said "Yes, sir," and he said "Well, again, let me assure you I would not in any way or fashion ask anyone to do anything that I would not engage my own services in. It is an assignment for me and I am asking you to do this. It will necessitate confi-
dential methods possibly." He could not go into at that time as to what it might completely take in.

At a certain point in the conversation, he mentioned that there may be a necessity of communicating by telephone with me from time to time, and what might be the best procedures. I said if you mean as far as best procedures of eavesdropping or any of that type that the telephone booth method is the only one, and I started to explain however, "Wherever you want me to call you, you should give me the number in advance, you should check it out, know where I am calling and then I know it in return." And I went right over his head actually because it didn't quite work out that way but we went into the phone booth deal and we agreed to it. After that—

Mr. LENZNER. Would you explain what the phone booth deal was, Mr. Ulasewicz?

Mr. ULASEWICZ. Well, if we wanted to be absolutely certain of receiving a call at a cleared phone booth or so he should have, the way it would be he would go into an area where he wanted me to call from a phone booth, establish that it was actually a phone booth but we did make an arrangement later where we did furnish with numbers.

Mr. LENZNER. A phone booth?

Mr. ULASEWICZ. A phone booth.

Mr. LENZNER. Did you also talk about names that you and he could contact each other?

Mr. ULASEWICZ. Yes. Mr. Kalmbach agreed to use—suggested whenever he might call me in relation to this matter—he would use the name Novak and that would be just strictly for myself. In the course of that, he said that if another name would probably be necessary it would be Rivers.

Mr. LENZNER. Who was supposed to use that name?

Mr. ULASEWICZ. He anticipated that I might use that name in contact with distributing this money to the people that it would be necessary. At a point in the conversation he said that he had the money with him, and it was $75,100 which he gave me. It was in $100 bills.

Mr. LENZNER. What did you put it in?

Mr. ULASEWICZ. I went to the closet of the room and took a laundry bag and put the money in a laundry bag.

Mr. LENZNER. Now going back to the code names, do I understand it correctly, Mr. Ulasewicz, when he called you he would call your home and say, "This is Mr. Novak calling."

Mr. ULASEWICZ. Correct.

Mr. LENZNER. And would he leave a number for you to call back?

Mr. ULASEWICZ. It developed to that, yes.

Mr. LENZNER. What would you do after that?

Mr. ULASEWICZ. What happened when he called Mr. Novak, where he would say it is Novak after our initial call, which I supplied him with telephone, public telephone numbers, I would go to the telephone booth, and we had—and he would give me a time usually about a half hour, allowing me time to get to the phone booth and then he would call me at the booth.

Mr. LENZNER. Did you go back to New York with the $75,100?

Mr. ULASEWICZ. Yes, I did.

Mr. LENZNER. Did you thereafter receive money again from Mr. Kalmbach?
10. On or about June 29, 1972 LaRue met Kalmbach in Kalmbach's hotel room. Kalmbach advised LaRue of the nature of his assignment to provide financial support for the Watergate defendants. They discussed the method whereby the defendants could be contacted, how the amount of money needed could be determined, the man who would make the contacts (Ulasewicz, alias Mr. Rivers) and a code name to be used for contacts between Kalmbach and LaRue (i.e., Mr. Bradford). They determined that the contacts with the defendants should be made through the defendants' attorneys.
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Mr. LaRue. No; not to my recollection, no, sir.
Mr. Dash. Did he not tell you that he was acting on the approval of the White House or Mr. Mitchell?
Mr. LaRue. Mr. Dash, I don't recall a discussion of that nature, no, sir.
Mr. Dash. Now, when was the subject of fundraising for the Watergate defendants first brought up in your presence or mentioned to you?
Mr. LaRue. Mr. Dash, I am sorry, but I don't have any specific recollection or dates regarding the initial discussions on fundraising.
Mr. Dash. I am not trying to pin you down to any particular date. Was it around this time? Was it around the time that you had the meeting with Mr. Liddy?
Mr. LaRue. Yes; I would say that it was in this time period. To the best of my recollection, at the Liddy meeting, he indicated that certain commitments had been made to him and subsequently passed by him to the other people involved, that certain commitments had been made regarding the maintenance or expenses for the maintenance of their families, legal expenses.
Mr. Dash. Did he tell you who had made these commitments?
Mr. LaRue. No, sir, he did not.
Mr. Dash. But that he expected that there would be payments made for the boys in jail, is that right?
Mr. LaRue. Yes, sir.
Mr. Dash. Now, what was your role to be in this respect at this time?
Mr. LaRue. My role in what, I am sorry?
Mr. Dash. What was your role in providing funds or the payment for the defendants?
Mr. LaRue. At this time?
Mr. Dash. At this time.
Mr. LaRue. I didn't have any role, Mr. Dash.
Mr. Dash. Did there come a time when you had a role with Mr. Kalmbach?
Mr. LaRue. Yes, sir.
Mr. Dash. Will you tell us about that. When did you first learn that Mr. Kalmbach was going to be involved and what role you were going to have with regard to his activities?
Mr. LaRue. My best recollection of that, Mr. Dash, was that I received a phone call from Mr. Kalmbach to meet him at the Statler-Hilton Hotel, that date was the latter part of June, June 28, June 29.
Mr. Dash. And you did meet with him?
Mr. LaRue. Yes, sir.
Mr. Dash. Could you tell us what happened at that meeting?
Mr. LaRue. I met with Mr. Kalmbach, the nature of that discussion, as I recall, Mr. Kalmbach stated that he had undertaken an assignment to raise money to meet the commitments that had been made to the Watergate defendants. Our discussion centered on a method or a way that contact could be made with the defendants and in which the amount of money could be discussed or be determined.
Mr. Kalmbach indicated that he had a person who was very discreet, very reliable that could be used for this purpose. We discussed—
Mr. DASH. Did he mention his name?

Mr. LAKE. No; he did not mention his name but, as I recall, during this meeting determined that we would use a code name, Mr. Rivers, for this person.

Mr. DASH. I think you have since learned that Mr. Tony Ulasewicz was Mr. Rivers?

Mr. LAKE. That is my understanding, yes, sir. We also discussed how we would or how Mr. Rivers could establish contact with the defendants, and it was decided that probably the best way would be for him to try to contact some of the attorneys who were working for the defendants at this time.

Mr. DASH. Did you arrange any kind of a relationship that you and Mr. Kalmbach would have if you wanted to call each other about this?

Mr. LAKE. Yes, sir.

Mr. DASH. Any kind of a code arrangement?

Mr. LAKE. Yes, sir.

Mr. DASH. Will you tell us about that?

Mr. LAKE. Mr. Kalmbach indicated that this was, this would be necessary; that this would be a very secret operation, and that we should conduct our business by pay telephones, and that we would use the code name Bradford.

Mr. DASH. Were you Mr. Bradford?

Mr. LAKE. That really wasn't, I think, determined, at least not to my knowledge and consequently we both ended up with the code name Bradford.

Mr. DASH. In other words, when you called Mr. Kalmbach you asked for Mr. Bradford and if he asked for you, he would call for Mr. Bradford and you both would know what you were talking about?

Mr. LAKE. That is correct.

Mr. DASH. Did you learn of what problems Mr. Rivers was having with the lawyers?

Mr. LAKE. Yes; that subsequent, a subsequent telephone conversation I had with Mr. Bradford—Kalmbach—

Mr. DASH. How often did you really use that name so as to fall into the habit of calling Mr. Kalmbach, Bradford?

Mr. LAKE. He indicated that Mr. Rivers was having considerable difficulty establishing a contact through the lawyers, and as I recall at that time we had a discussion of this problem and decided that Mr. Rivers had tried to effect a contact with Mrs. Hunt.

Mr. DASH. Now, after your first meeting with Mr. Kalmbach and the arrangements were made, did you again meet with Mr. Kalmbach in Mr. Dean's office sometime in the middle of July, 1973?

Mr. LAKE. Yes, sir.

Mr. DASH. Mr. Dean was present at that time?

Mr. LAKE. That is correct.

Mr. DASH. Could you tell us what was said at that meeting, what the purpose of the meeting was?

Mr. LAKE. My recollection of that meeting, Mr. Dash, is Mr. Kalmbach had secured from Mr. Rivers a—some specific amount of money that would be necessary or would be required to meet the commitments, there were specific amounts for attorney fees at this time and, as I recall specific amounts of money that would be required for maintenance of their families.
Mr. KALMBAECH. Yes, sir, it was.

Mr. DASH. Did you find a lot of interest when you were there at the committee concerning that incident?

Mr. KALMBAECH. Well, again, Mr. Dash, it was a topic of discussion, and I know that I did talk about it, but it was nothing more than that.

Mr. DASH. All right after that meeting, you returned to California?

Mr. KALMBAECH. Yes, sir, I did.

Mr. DASH. Now, did you receive a telephone call from Mr. John Dean on June 28?

Mr. KALMBAECH. Yes, I did.

Mr. DASH. And what did he tell you on the telephone?

Mr. KALMBAECH. As I remember the telephone conversation, Mr. Dean called me. It was in the early afternoon, midafternoon, on the 25th. He told me that it was a matter of extreme importance that I return to or come back to Washington, preferably by the first available flight, to undertake a very important assignment.

Mr. DASH. And what did you do in response to that call?

Mr. KALMBAECH. I took a 10 or 10:15 or 10:30 flight that night.

Mr. DASH. Arriving in Washington when?

Mr. KALMBAECH. Arriving in Washington at 6, 6:15, 6:30, the following morning.

Mr. DASH. Now, what did you do next, Mr. Kalmbach?

Mr. KALMBAECH. I then took a cab into town and checked into the Statler-Hilton Hotel.

Mr. DASH. Did you then meet Mr. Dean, either at that time or a later time that day?

Mr. KALMBAECH. Yes, after I had some breakfast, I called Mr. Dean around, as I can best recall, around 9 in the morning in his office in the Executive Office Building.

Mr. DASH. And what transpired? What was the call about? What did Dean say, what did you say, and what followed?

Mr. KALMBAECH. It seems that in recalling that conversation, I told him that I am here in Washington at the Statler, and I can come over to your office right now if that is what you wish. He replied, "No, you are at the Statler, I am here at the Executive Office Building, why don't we both start walking and meet in front of the Hay-Adams Hotel?"

I said, "All right." This had never happened before, but it was a nice day and I said, "All right, I will do that; I will meet you in front of the Hay-Adams," and then left the hotel.

I was there about 9:30, I would guess, and I think I saw him coming up through the park and I suggested that we have coffee at the Hay-Adams. He said, "No, let's just walk in the park," which we did.

We walked for a time and I recall that he put his foot up on the bench and made some wide gestures, indicating to me that I should do likewise, which I am not certain that I understood what he meant by that, but I recall that very clearly.

Mr. DASH. He made wide gestures and asked you to do likewise?

Mr. KALMBAECH. Wide gestures, well, indicating that perhaps we were being observed. I don't understand, but I do remember that he did, in fact, do that, and suggest to me that I do likewise.
Mr. Dash. You would certainly be a greater target of observation if you were making wide gestures, would you not?

Mr. Kalmbach. I would think so.

Mr. Dash. Well, what, actually, did you and Mr. Dean discuss? What did he say to you, other than making gestures?

Mr. Kalmbach. Well, he indicated that the reason for this call and for my coming back to Washington was that it was necessary to talk to me about a very important assignment, namely that, he said—he used the editorial, "We,"—"We would like to have you raise funds for the legal defense of these defendants and for the support of their families."

Mr. Dash. When you say these defendants, now—

Mr. Kalmbach. The Watergate—

Mr. Dash. These were the seven defendants, Mr. Hunt, Mr. Liddy, Mr. McCord, Mr. Barker, Mr. Sturgis, Mr. Gonzales—

Mr. Kalmbach. That is correct.

Mr. Dash. Now, you knew that they were for all of these defendants?

Mr. Kalmbach. I just remember that he said the Watergate defendants at that time and I was not even certain at that point in time that I even knew their names.

Mr. Dash. All right. Did you ask them any questions about that?

Mr. Kalmbach. Yes, I did. I recall that in my conversation with him, I asked whether or not it would not be perhaps preferable to have a public committee formed to raise funds for these people and for these purposes. And also, I recall that I wondered aloud about whether or not maybe they could mortgage homes or raise funds in that way until a public committee could be established. His answer to that was that there was no time for this, that a public committee might be misinterpreted, and he just waved it aside and pressed on with his request.

Mr. Dash. Did he tell you how much money might be involved?

Mr. Kalmbach. My recollection is that he indicated $50,000 to $100,000 for this assignment.

Mr. Dash. Did he stress, since he had indicated to you that a public effort might be misinterpreted, did he stress that this had to be completely secret?

Mr. Kalmbach. Yes, it made a very strong point that there was absolute secrecy required, confidentiality, indicating that if this became known, it might jeopardize the campaign and would cause misinterpretation as to the reasons for raising these funds and for the help of these people.

Mr. Dash. Now, since you were to raise these funds, how would you know how much was to be given to which defendants? Was there a discussion about that?

Mr. Kalmbach. Yes, sir, there was.

Mr. Dash. Could you tell us about that?

Mr. Kalmbach. After he had made the request, I asked him if I, when I raised the funds, should I give them to him for distribution, and he said, no, not to me. And he indicated, I think, Mr. LaRue would be the person—

Mr. Dash. Is that Mr. Fred LaRue?

Mr. Kalmbach. Mr. Fred LaRue would be the person who would be giving me directions in this assignment as to specific amounts and
specific individuals. And as I can best recall this conversation, I was a little perplexed on this because I did not know these people at all. And it is——

Mr. Dash. Did you know Fred LaRue?

Mr. Kalmbach. Well, I, of course, knew Fred LaRue but casually. But as to how to distribute these funds—then again, my best recollection is that he indicated that at that point that perhaps Mr. Ulasewicz might be the one to act as the distributor for the funds.

Mr. Dash. Is this Tony Ulasewicz?

Mr. Kalmbach. Yes, sir, it is.

Mr. Dash. Is that the Tony Ulasewicz who has testified before this committee before?

Mr. Kalmbach. It is.

Mr. Dash. Did you know Tony Ulasewicz?

Mr. Kalmbach. Yes, I did.

Mr. Dash. Had you worked with him in the past?

Mr. Kalmbach. I had met with him two or three times total from mid-1969 until approximately October 1, 1971, and I had three conversations, two or three conversations, during that period.

Mr. Dash. Did you have confidence that Mr. Ulasewicz was the kind of person who could be useful in this kind of assignment?

Mr. Kalmbach. Well, I knew that he had been acting and undertaking assignments for the White House for that period and I certainly knew that he had the confidence of whoever it was that he was working with, and when he mentioned Mr. Ulasewicz as someone to do this. I said that I would, I certainly would have confidence in him.

Mr. Dash. Did you know whether or not—did you know what kind of assignments he had undertaken for the White House before?

Mr. Kalmbach. No, sir; I did not. Mr. Dash.

Mr. Dash. But you knew that he would be somebody that you could have confidence in?

Mr. Kalmbach. Well, I knew that he was a retired New York City police officer who was competent and I was certain that he was someone that could be trusted and I would be——

Mr. Dash. Who other than Mr. Dean were you thinking of when you say they would have confidence? Did you mean Mr. Haldeman?

Mr. Kalmbach. Well, whoever he was talking for. He was using the editorial “we” all the time.

Mr. Dash. Well, if he was talking for anybody over in the White House, who did he work with most often, to your knowledge?

Mr. Kalmbach. Mr. Dean?

Mr. Dash. Yes.

Mr. Kalmbach. Well, he worked with practically everyone in the White House. But, of course, principally——

Mr. Dash. Who above him?

Mr. Kalmbach. He reported to Mr. Ehrlichman. And he also worked closely with Mr. Haldeman. He did not mention their names in this conversation.

Mr. Dash. Have you ever been given any other assignment of this nature in the past?

Mr. Kalmbach. No, sir.

Mr. Dash. After meeting with Mr. Dean, what did you do? Did you indicate, first, that you would accept this assignment from Mr. Dean?

Mr. Kalmbach. I did.
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Q It is an affirmative statement, as you recognize.
A Unquestionably my recollection of that was better then than it is now because I just haven't had any occasion to go back over that.

BY MR. NEAL:
Q So the answer is that there may be some there in the President's papers, but at the present time you have no recollection of what the conversation would be and with whom?
A No.

BY MR. BEN-VENISTE:
Q Can you furnish the other two that you have mentioned to this Grand Jury within the next day or so?
A Yes. I wish you would ask my attorney and I would be happy to provide those.

Q When was the first time you had ever heard or discussed with anyone the subject of clemency with respect to any of the persons who were indicted or who might have been indicted in connection with the Watergate break-in?
A As I recall, that would have been a conversation that I had with the President around the week of the Fourth of July of 1972.

Q That's the very first time?
A That I can recall, yes.

Q Who was present?
A. No one else.

Q. What was the substance of that conversation?

A. Well, it was a very long, rambling conversation about a lot of things, and in the course of that we talked about the Watergate defendants, and I raised the point with the President that presidential pardons or something of that kind inevitably would be a question that he would have to confront by reason of the obvious political aspect of this.

We discussed it briefly at that point. He expressed the firm view that for what he considered to be very sound reasons, he would never be in a position to grant a pardon or any form of clemency in this case.

And then on the basis of that, he and I agreed, and I can't say who said it, that this ought not to be a subject that was ever brought to his door; that it just should be something that was excluded from his consideration.

Q. And I take it at this point, on the basis of all your previous testimony, that there was no suggestion that this break-in had been authorized by anyone connected with the White House or the Committee to Re-elect the President, or anyone representing the President?

A. That's right, but it was obviously an effort -- on the four corners of it -- an effort adverse to our opposition, our political opposition, and if the President were ever invited to take any action on clemency, all kinds of suspicions and
all kinds of imputations to them would then arise.

Q Well, this was quite premature for consideration of
clemency, which normally takes place after trial and conviction
of the defendants, and some service of sentence.

Why did you believe at that time, if I understand
your testimony, that it would inevitable or it was likely that
this subject would come up for discussion?

A Well, I didn't think it was inevitable, but I thought
it was certainly a hazard in this thing for the President, and
this was a matter of foresight as far as I was concerned.

Trying to anticipate future problems that might come
up is one of the things that I was there for.

Q In July of 1972 you said to the President that this
was a hazard which might come up, and that it was something
that you ought to discuss then?

A I didn't say we ought to discuss it. I said it was
just something that came in the flow of the conversation and
we did discuss it.

Q What else were you discussing at that time that this
came in the flow of?

A I'm hard pressed to tell you offhand. It was about
a three or four hours conversation, and we were just all over
the lot.

I can remember one thing we discussed was the develop-
ment of the waterfront on the southern coast of California.
Q. Well, let's move from waterfronts to Watergates. I take it that this came in the flow of some other conversation about the Watergate matter.

A. I'm sure it did, but I can't tell you what it was. It was in the setting of the Watergate episode then being quite removed from the President and his candidacy and the re-election effort by reason of the identity of these defendants being so removed from any hierarchy or from the White House.

I think I raised this in the sense that there were only a couple of ways that it could ever be imputed to the President or could any way be a liability to him, and obviously this was one of those ways.

Q. That if prior to the election he grants an executive clemency to someone who hadn't been tried yet?

A. No, not prior. I wasn't thinking of prior. I was thinking of sometime off in the future. In other words, we were looking at it in the long haul and not in any near term immediacy basis at all.

Q. And you both wanted to make sure that no one representing the White House would have any discussion linking the President to any question of clemency or leniency with respect to these arrested defendants?

A. That's the way we generally ended up with an understanding to that effect. It wasn't this great huge thing at that time at all. It was just the first time I can ever
remember a discussion on that subject."

Q And you say that there was no suggestion from any other person at any time before that that this might be an area that you ought to discuss either prophylactically or otherwise?

A Not that I can recall, no.

Q When was the next time you heard anyone discuss the matter of clemency?

A The next time that I remember it being a question or a problem was in January of this year at this meeting with Mr. Dean and Mr. Colson on the subject of Mr. Hunt.

Q Between July and January you have no recollection of anyone at all even mentioning the subject of leniency, clemency, the length of sentence that any of the defendants might get, how they might react to a long sentence, and so forth?

A I remember conversations about -- well, speculation about sentence.

Q With whom did you have that conversation?

A Just speculation. I don't know. It may have been one of the things that Dean was reporting from time to time. He was, of course, talking to the Justice Department, and he was trying to anticipate what was going to happen in the case, and he was bringing advance tidbits, so to speak, as they would come along, and I think this business of sentencing was one of those things that he brought over.
Q Now you have testified in the last two days that -- apparently contrary to your Senate testimony -- that Mr. Dean did not tell you on June 19th, 1972, that he had had a conversation with Liddy, and that Liddy had said that it was Liddy's operation, and Dean further related that it was just a matter of time before the Justice Department picked him up.

You've testified that you are unclear about that, and you think that it might not have been until the Fourth of July when you heard that from Dean. Is that fair to say?

A No. I think what's fair to say is that I'm not sure and I'm not. I don't intend to testify contrary to any prior testimony, but I do have to give you the best sense of my recollection that I have, and the sense of it is that it was later than that date.

Q But your best recollection is that it was between June 19th and the Fourth of July?

A Someplace in that area.

Q Now when was the first time that you were aware that the President was aware that Liddy had an involvement in this business?

A I don't know.

Q Was the President aware of that on the Fourth of July?
A: I haven't any idea.

Q: Was he aware of it before the 10th of July, based on your long and very complete discussions with him on the 6th, 7th, and 8th of July?

A: I don't know.

Q: Was he aware of it at the time you had a discussion about the possibility of executive clemency coming up for some of these people?

A: I don't know. I don't recall discussing Liddy with the President, or his indicating his awareness of Liddy to me on any specific occasion.

Q: But you have testified that you were aware of it, say by July 6th, or that week of July 4th when you -- after July 4th when you had these conversations with the President, you were undoubtedly aware from Dean that Liddy had admitted to Dean that it was Liddy's operation, is that correct?

A: I would assume so.

Q: And are you testifying that you were aware of that and you had conversations with the President about the possibilities of Executive clemency for these people, and you just omitted to tell the President the general counsel for the finance committee had admitted to Dean that it was his operation?

A: No, I'm not testifying to that.

BY MR. BEN-VENISTE:
First of all, did you have—your logs show that you had meetings with John Dean on January 3, 1973, January 4, and January 5. Would you tell the committee what the subject of those meetings was, beginning with the 3d?

Mr. Ehrlichman. On January 3, I met twice with Mr. Dean, once alone at noon and once at 7 p.m. with Mr. Colson. The meeting with Mr. Colson related to a letter which Mr. Dean had told me about at our earlier brief meeting, and this was a letter which I believe Mr. Colson had received from Mr. Hunt. I believe I am correct about that. It was a very melancholy and a very passionate kind of letter. I think the letter is in the record, as a matter of fact. And it talks about his being abandoned by his friend and so on. It was on the heels of Mr. Hunt having lost his wife.

Mr. Colson was genuinely concerned and shaken by this. He had had long friendships with the Hunts, both Mr. and Mrs., and he had proposed to Mr. Dean that he get together with Hunt or with Hunt’s attorney, at least, to register his continuing friendship and his compassion for Hunt’s loss of his wife and so on, and so that Hunt would not feel that he had been abandoned by his friend. This is the thing that we discussed with Mr. Colson that evening at 7 o’clock.

I took it as almost a given in the meeting that there would be some contact between Mr. Hunt or his attorney and Mr. Colson. And it was simply a question of what the proper conduct would be under the circumstances, it being, obviously, delicate to have a White House contact of one of the defendants right at this particular point in time. So it was discussed and it was discussed in terms not of a personal meeting between them, which is what Mr. Hunt, apparently, wanted in the letter, but Mr. Colson talking with William Bittman, who was then Hunt’s attorney, and conveying this message of support, personal support through that avenue.

Mr. Dean raised the cautionary warning that if anybody from the White House sat down with Mr. Bittman in a situation like this, that there was an inevitable opportunity for misunderstanding as to the purpose of the meeting, as to assurances that might or might not be given, and so forth.

Clemency was obviously at the forefront of everybody’s mind in this meeting as one of the things which was a potential danger, and I advised both people at the meeting, Mr. Dean and Mr. Colson, of a previous conversation that I had had with the President on that subject, and indicated to them that—

Senator Gurney. That was back in July, was it?

Mr. Ehrlichman. Yes, sir. I indicated to them the substance of that conversation, which was that the President wanted no one in the White House to get into this whole area of clemency with anybody involved in this case, and surely not make any assurances to anyone.

Mr. Colson said that he was sure that he could avoid that pitfall and have the conversation. He was advised by Mr. Dean to either take notes or make such mental notes of the conversation that he could reconstruct the conversation if the question ever came up again. And that is what Mr. Colson did. We had a subsequent meeting where—

Senator Gurney. Before we go to the subsequent meeting, could you be a little more explicit in your testimony as to how the discussion arose about Executive clemency? Who brought it up, and who said what on this subject at the January 3 meeting?
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Mr. Dasch. Now, I think, your diary shows you did meet with Mr. Colson and Mr. Dean on January 3, and then you met with the President and Mr. Haldeman on January 4 and again with Mr. Dean and Mr. Colson on January 5. This is approximately the time that Mr. Dean had testified that the request of the issue came up concerning Mr. Hunt's desire for Executive clemency. Mr. Colson and Mr. Dean, according to Mr. Dean's testimony, spoke to you about it and that you said, according to his testimony, that you would check with the President and came out and said that no commitment should be made, but that some assurance should be given to him. Do you recall that, not the testimony, but do you recall him doing that?

Mr. Erlichman. Doing what, Mr. Dasch?

Mr. Dasch. Being asked by Mr. Colson and Mr. Dean to raise the question of Executive clemency for Hunt with the President?

Mr. Erlichman. All right, stop right there. They did not do that. Now, go ahead.

Mr. Dasch. All right.

You are checking with the President whether or not it would be possible to give Mr. Hunt Executive clemency.

Mr. Erlichman. That would be on the 4th of January in the company of Dr. Kissinger and Mr. Haldeman; is that right?

Mr. Dasch. Sometime around that.

Mr. Erlichman. That meeting at 3:02 on the 4th. Is that the meeting you are suggesting?

Mr. Dasch. You met with the President a couple of times during that period of time but on the 4th you did meet with the President?

Mr. Erlichman. I did not, as a matter of fact. I met with the President one time on the 4th at 3:02 in the company of Mr. Haldeman and Dr. Kissinger. Is that the time you are suggesting that I asked the President if we could give Mr. Hunt Executive clemency?

Mr. Dasch. Did you meet with the President on January 5?

Mr. Erlichman. Not according to my record. Oh, excuse me, Dr. Kissinger and I had a 10-minute meeting with the President at 4:55 on that day.

Mr. Dasch. Did you at any time meet with the President and discuss Executive clemency?

Mr. Erlichman. Yes.

Mr. Dasch. When?

Mr. Erlichman. In July of 1972.

Mr. Dasch. Now, why in July of 1972 would you be discussing Executive clemency with the President?

Mr. Erlichman. Because it occurred to me as an organizational proposition that sooner or later somebody was going to raise this issue and I thought it would be a very good idea to talk it through with the President before it came up in any specific context, and find out exactly where we stood.

Mr. Dasch. By that time the indictment had not come down?

Mr. Erlichman. That is correct.

Mr. Dasch. It was shortly after the break-in. Why would it even come to your mind that any of the defendants would have raised the question of Executive clemency?

Mr. Erlichman. Because you had a defendant who was an employee of the Committee To Re-Elect the President and it seemed to
mo just a very natural thing that inferences would be raised at some
time in the future. We had a long walk on the beach on that particular
day and we talked about a lot of subjects and this was one of the sub-
jects we talked about.

Mr. Dash. Had you had any discussion with Mr. Colson or Mr.
Hunt at that time about it?

Mr. Ehrlichman. At that time?

Mr. Dash. Yes.

Mr. Ehrlichman. Not that I can recall.

Mr. Dash. It would seem unlikely that you would and it just is
somewhat surprising that so early after the break-in you would even
be talking about Executive clemency with the President.

Mr. Ehrlichman. Who did it surprise, Mr. Dash?

Mr. Dash. I said it does seem surprising.

Mr. Ehrlichman. To you?

Mr. Dash. To me, that you in July, shortly after the break-in, before
any indictments, that you would be discussing Executive clemency, but
that is your testimony, that you did.

Mr. Ehrlichman. All right, that is what happened.

Mr. Dash. And you never did after having any discussions with Mr.
Dean later on in January?

Mr. Ehrlichman. I am sorry, I did not hear the question.

Mr. Dash. And you never again discussed that with the President
after talking with Mr. Dean about Executive clemency?

Mr. Ehrlichman. Never again? No, I think there were discussions
in March and April of this year about the allegations that Mr. Dean
was making.

Mr. Dash. I am referring back earlier to the January period be-
cause, to put the point in time accurately, just before Mr. Hunt pleaded
guilty is when Mr. Dean—

Mr. Ehrlichman. Mr. Dean's original story was, of course, that I
jumped up from the meeting and ran downstairs and popped into the
Oval Office which, of course, was nonsense. So then, he contrived this
other story and neither one of them are true, Mr. Dash.

Mr. Dash. On February 10, 1973, you, Mr. Haldeman, Mr. Dean, and
Dick Moore did meet in La Costa, did you not?

Mr. Ehrlichman. Yes, sir.

Mr. Dash. Could you tell us what the purpose of that meeting was?

Mr. Ehrlichman. Yes, that meeting was called because the Presi-
dent had asked who was handling the preparation of the White House
case for the Senate Select Committee hearings, and what planning
was being done, and what was the White House position going to be
on matters like executive privilege, and there were no answers to
those questions. We had just come from the inaugural, everybody
had been very busy occupied up to that point, and frankly, there
was not anybody handling that, and so one of us, and I forget who,
called John Dean and asked him to come out and sit down and talk
through this whole subject of White House response, so to speak,
to the upcoming hearings of the Senate Select Committee.

Mr. Dash. Well, did the discussion include just not only the White
House response in general on executive privilege issues, but did it also
include what steps you might take in terms of affecting the resolution
authorizing this committee? What steps you might take in obtaining
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The time has come to turn Watergate over to the courts, where the questions of guilt or innocence belong. The time has come for the rest of us to get on with the urgent business of our Nation.

Last November, the American people were given the clearest choice of this century. Your votes were a mandate, which I accepted, to complete the initiatives we began in my first term and to fulfill the promises I made for my second term.

This Administration was elected to control inflation—to reduce the power and size of Government—to cut the cost of Government so that you can cut the cost of living—to preserve and defend those fundamental values that have made America great—to keep the Nation's military strength second to none—to achieve peace with honor in Southeast Asia, and to bring home our prisoners of war—to build a new prosperity, without inflation and without war—to create a structure of peace in the world that would endure long after we are gone.

These are great goals, they are worthy of a great people, and I would not be true to your trust if I let myself be turned aside from achieving those goals.

If you share my belief in these goals—if you want the mandate you gave this Administration to be carried out—then I ask for your help to ensure that those who would exploit Watergate in order to keep us from doing what we were elected to do will not succeed.

I ask tonight for your understanding, so that as a Nation we can learn the lessons of Watergate and gain from that experience.

I ask for your help in reaffirming our dedication to the principles of decency, honor, and respect for the institutions that have sustained our progress through these past two centuries.

And I ask for your support in getting on once again with meeting your problems, improving your life, building your future.

With your help, with God's help, we will achieve those great goals for America.

Thank you and good evening.

NOTE: The President spoke at 9 p.m. in his Oval Office at the White House. His address was broadcast live on radio and television.

The Watergate Investigation

Statement by the President. August 15, 1973

On May 17 the Senate Select Committee began its hearings on Watergate. Five days later, on May 22, I issued a detailed statement discussing my relationship to the matter. I stated categorically that I had no prior knowledge of the Watergate operation and that I neither knew of nor took part in any subsequent efforts to cover it up. I also stated that I would not invoke executive privilege as to testimony by present and former members of my White House Staff with respect to possible criminal acts then under investigation.

Thirty-five witnesses have testified so far. The record is more than 7,500 pages and some 2 million words long. The allegations are many, the facts are complicated, and the evidence is not only extensive but very much in conflict. It would be neither fair nor appropriate for me to assess the evidence or comment on specific witnesses or their credibility. That is the function of the Senate Committee and the courts. What I intend to do here is to cover the principal issues relating to my own conduct which have been raised since my statement of May 22, and thereby to place the testimony on those issues in perspective.

I said on May 22 that I had no prior knowledge of the Watergate operation. In all the testimony, there is not the slightest evidence to the contrary. Not a single witness has testified that I had any knowledge of the planning for the Watergate break-in.

It is also true, as I said on May 22, that I took no part in, and was not aware of, any subsequent efforts to
write a complete report on all that he knew of the entire Watergate matter. On March 28, I had Mr. Ehrlichman call the Attorney General to find out if he had additional information about Watergate generally or White House involvement. The Attorney General was told that I wanted to hear directly from him, and not through any staff people, if he had any information on White House involvement or if information of that kind should come to him. The Attorney General indicated to Mr. Ehrlichman that he had no such information. When I learned on March 30 that Mr. Dean had been unable to complete his report, I instructed Mr. Ehrlichman to conduct an independent inquiry and bring all the facts to me. On April 14, Mr. Ehrlichman gave me his findings, and I directed that he report them to the Attorney General immediately. On April 15, Attorney General Klein­
dienst and Assistant Attorney General Petersen told me of new information that had been received by the prosecutors.

By that time the fragmentary information I had been given on March 21 had been supplemented in important ways, particularly by Mr. Ehrlichman’s report to me on April 14, by the information Mr. Kleindienst and Mr. Petersen gave me on April 15, and by independent inquiries I had been making on my own. At that point, I realized that I would not be able personally to find out all of the facts and make them public, and I concluded that the matter was best handled by the Justice Department and the grand jury. On April 17, I announced that new inquiries were underway, as a result of what I had learned on March 21 and in my own investigation since that time. I instructed all Government employees to cooperate with the judicial process as it moved ahead on this matter and expressed my personal view that no immunity should be given to any individual who had held a position of major importance in this Administration.

My consistent position from the beginning has been to get out the facts about Watergate, not to cover them up.

On May 22 I said that at no time did I authorize any offer of executive clemency for the Watergate defendants, nor did I know of any such offer. I reaffirm that statement. Indeed, I made my view clear to Mr. Eh­liehman in July 1972, that under no circumstances could executive clemency be considered for those who participated in the Watergate break-in. I maintained that position throughout.

On May 22 I said that “it was not until the time of my own investigation that I learned of the break-in at the office of Mr. Ellsberg’s psychiatrist, and I specifically authorized the furnishing of this information to Judge Byrne.” After a very careful review, I have determined that this statement of mine is not precisely accurate. It was on March 17 that I first learned of the break-in at the office of Dr. Fielding, and that was 4 days before the beginning of my own investigation on March 21. I was told then that nothing by way of evidence had been obtained in the break-in. On April 18 I learned that the Justice Department had interrogated or was going to interrogate Mr. Hunt about this break-in. I was gravely concerned that other activities of the Special Investigations Unit might be disclosed, because I knew this could seriously injure the national security. Consequently, I directed Mr. Petersen to stick to the Watergate investigation and stay out of national security matters. On April 25 Attorney General Kleindienst came to me and urged that the fact of the break-in should be disclosed to the court, despite the fact that, since no evidence had been obtained, the law did not clearly require it. I concurred and authorized him to report the break-in to Judge Byrne.

In view of the incident of Dr. Fielding’s office, let me emphasize two things.

First, it was and is important that many of the matters worked on by the Special Investigations Unit not be public­ly disclosed because disclosure would unquestionably damage the national security. This is why I have exercised executive privilege on some of these matters in connection with the testimony of Mr. Ehrlichman and others. The Senate Committee has learned through its investigation the general facts of some of these security matters and has to date wisely declined to make them public or to contest in these respects my claim of executive privilege.

Second, I at no time authorized the use of illegal means by the Special Investigations Unit, and I was not aware of the break-in of Dr. Fielding’s office until March 17, 1973.

Many persons will ask why, when the facts are as I have stated them, I do not make public the tape recordings of my meetings and conversations with members of the White House Staff during this period.

I am aware that such terms as “separation of powers” and “executive privilege” are lawyers’ terms, and that those doctrines have been called “abstruse” and “esoteric.” Let me state the commonsense of the matter. Every day a President of the United States is required to make difficult decisions on grave issues. It is absolutely essential, if the President is to be able to do his job as the country expects, that he be able to talk openly and candidly with his advisers about issues and individuals and that they be able to talk in the same fashion with him. Indeed, on occasion, they must be able to “blow off steam” about important public figures. This kind of frank discussion is only possible when those who take part in it can feel assured that what they say is in the strictest confidence.

The Presidency is not the only office that requires confidentiality if it is to function effectively. A Member of Congress must be able to talk in confidence with his assistants. Judges must be able to confer in confidence with their law clerks and with each other. Throughout our entire history the need for this kind of confidentiality
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Upper Great Lakes Regional Commission

Announcement of Intention To Nominate
Raymond C. Anderson To Be Federal Cochairman.
November 16, 1973

The President today announced his intention to nominate Raymond C. Anderson, of Maple City, Mich., to be Federal Cochairman of the Upper Great Lakes Regional Commission. He will succeed Thomas F. Schweigert, who became Alternate Federal Member of the Delaware River Basin Commission on September 6, 1973.

From 1969 to 1971, Mr. Anderson served as executive assistant to Michigan Gov. William G. Milliken. He has been retired since 1971 and was also retired from 1964 to 1969. From 1959 to 1964, he served as administrative assistant to then-Congressman Robert P. Griffin, from 1952 to 1959, he was administrative assistant to Senator Charles E. Potter of Michigan, and he was administrative assistant to Congressman Roy O. Woodruff of Michigan from 1937 to 1944 and from 1946 to 1952.

He was born on March 5, 1912, in Grand Rapids, Mich. Mr. Anderson was graduated from Grand Rapids Junior College in 1932. From 1944 to 1946, he served as an officer in the U.S. Navy.

NOTE: The announcement was released at Key Biscayne, Fla.

When Jack Horner, who has been a correspondent in Washington and other places around the world, retired after 40 years, he once told me that if I thought that the White House Press Corps answered (asked) tough questions, he (I) should hear the kind of questions the managing editors asked him. Consequently, I welcome this opportunity tonight to meet with the managing editors of the Nation’s newspapers.

I will not have an opening statement because I know, with 400 of you, it will be hard to get through all of the questions you have, and I understand the President has a prerogative of asking the first question.

Mr. Quinn (John C. Quinn, Gannett Newspapers, and president, Associated Press Managing Editors Association)

WATERGATE AND THE FUTURE

Q. Mr. President, this morning, Governor Askew of Florida addressed this group and recalled the words of Benjamin Franklin. When leaving the Constitutional Convention he was asked, “What have you given us, sir, a monarchy or a republic?” Franklin answered, “A republic, sir, if you can keep it.”

Mr. President, in the prevailing pessimism of the lingering matter we call Watergate, can we keep that republic, sir, and how?

THE PRESIDENT. Well, Mr. Quinn, I would certainly not be standing here answering these questions unless I had a firm belief that we could keep the republic, that we must keep it, not only for ourselves, but for the whole world. I recognize that because of mistakes that were made, and I must take responsibility for those mistakes, whether in the campaign or during the course of an administration, that there are those who wonder whether this republic can survive. But I also know that the hopes of the whole world for peace, not only now, but in the years to come, rest in the United States of America. And I can assure you that as long as I am physically able to handle the position to which I was elected, and then reelected last November.

*Gannett D. (Jack) Horner was a reporter with the Washington Star from 1937 until his retirement in November 1973. Since 1964, he was White House correspondent for that newspaper.*
I was in the middle of a conversation with Mr. Klein- 
den in the middle of the afternoon Sunday afternoon.

And a later conversation I had, the rest of Klein- 
den's conversation, a later conversation I had also with 
Mr. S. L. Credit, and the conversation at 9 o'clock at night with 
Mr. Dean was not there.

So I tried to find whatever recording, whatever record 
that would help the prosecutor in this instance to recon- 
struct the evidence, because it was the evidence that he 
was after and not just the tape.

What I found was not a dictabelt. What I found was 
my handwritten notes made at the time of the con- 
versation. I have turned those over to or have authorized my 
counsel to turn those notes over to the judge, so that he 
can have them checked for authenticity, and I understand 
there are ways that he can tell that they were written 
at that time. Those handwritten notes are available.

And then I did one other thing which I think will also 
be helpful. The next day I had a conversation with Mr. 
Dean in the morning at 10 o'clock. That conversation 
was recorded, and in that conversation there are repeated 
references to what was said the night before, and when 
compared with my handwritten notes it is clear that we 
are discussing the same subjects.

That entire tape, as well as the conversation I had 
in the afternoon with Mr. Dean for about 20 minutes 
will be made available to the court even though the court 
has not subpoenaed them.

I would just simply say in conclusion you can be very 
sure that this kind of a subject is one that is a difficult 
one to explain. It appears that it is impossible that when 
we have an Apollo system that we could have two missing 
tapes when the White House is concerned. Let me explain 
for one moment what the system was. This is an Apollo 
system. I found that it cost—just learned this—$2,500.

I found that instead of having the kind of equipment that 
was there when President Johnson was there, which was 
incidentally much better equipment, but I found—and 
I am not saying that critically—but I found that in this 
instance it was a Sony, a little Sony that they had, and 
that what they had were those little lapel mikes in my desks.

And as a result the conversations in the Oval Office, the 
conversations in the Cabinet Room, and particularly those 
in the EOB, those are the three rooms, only those three 
rooms, where they recorded—for example, the Western 
White House had no recording equipment, and my house in 
Key Biscayne had none—but as far as those particular 
recordings are concerned, the reason that you have heard 
that there are difficulties in hearing them is that the system 
itself was not a sophisticated system.

I do not mean to suggest that the judge, by 
listening to them, will not be able to get the facts, and I 
would simply conclude by saying this: I think I know 
what it is on these tapes from having listened to some, those 
before March 21, and also from having seen from my 
secretary's notes the highlights of others. And I can assure 
you that these tapes when they are presented to the judge 
and, I hope, eventually to the grand jury, and I trust in 
some way we can find a way at least to get the substance 
to the American people, they will prove these things with- 
out question:

One, that I had no knowledge whatever of the Water- 
gate break-in before it occurred.

Two, that I never authorized the offer of clemency to 
anybody and, as a matter of fact, turned it down whenever 
it was suggested. It was not recommended by any 
member of my staff but it was, on occasion, suggested as a 
result of news reports that clemency might become a factor.

And third, as far as any knowledge with regard to the 
payment of blackmail money, which, as you recall, was 
the charge that was made, that Mr. Hunt's attorney had 
asked for $120,000 in money to be paid to him or he would 
tell things about members of the White House Staff, not 
about Watergate, that might be embarrassing.

Testimony had been given before the Senate committee 
that I was told that before the 21st of March, actually 
told it on the 13th of March. I know I heard it for the 
first time the 21st of March, and I will reveal this much of 
the conversation—I am sure the judge wouldn't mind.

I recall very well Mr. Dean, after the conversation 
began, telling me, "Mr. President, there are some things 
about this I haven't told you. I think you should know 
them." And then he proceeded then for the first time to tell 
me about that money.

Now, I realize that some will wonder about the truth 
of these particular statements that I have made. I am 
going to hand out later—I won't hand them out, but I 
will have one of your executives hand out my May 22 
statement, my August 15 statement, and one with regard 
to these two tapes. You can believe them if you want—I 
can tell you it is the truth because I have listened to or 
have had knowledge of, from someone I have confidence 
in, as to what is in the tapes.

Q. Mr. President, Richard T. Schleede, Democrat and 
Chronicle, Rochester, New York. Could you tell us your 
personal reaction and your political reaction—and within 
that word I mean your credibility with the American 
people—your reaction to the discovery that the Dean and 
Mitchell tapes did not exist?

The President. Well, my personal reaction was one 
of very great disappointment, because I wanted the evi-
dence out, and I knew that when there was any indication 
that something didn't exist, immediately there would be 
the impression that somehow, the President, more likely, 
perhaps someone on the President's staff, knew there was something on those tapes that it wouldn't 
be wise to get out. But let me put out again, while I was 
disappointed, let me say I would have been a lot more 
disappointed if the tapes that had been considered 
important by both Mr. Cox, the Special Prosecutor, and the 
Wright committee, if any one of these had been missing.
11.6 President Nixon statement, May 22, 1973
Kunzig, who is now an associate judge of the U.S. Court of Claims. Mr. Sampson has been Acting Administrator of General Services since June 2, 1972. He joined the General Services Administration in 1969 as Commissioner of the Federal Supply Service. From 1970 to 1972 he was Commissioner of the Public Buildings Service in GSA and the first Deputy Administrator of GSA for Special Projects. He came to the General Services Administration after 6 years in Pennsylvania State government, where he was secretary of administration and budget secretary under Gov. Raymond P. Shafer, and deputy secretary for procurement, department of property and supplies, under Gov. William W. Scranton. Prior to entering government service, he was employed by the General Electric Co. for 12 years.

Mr. Sampson was born on October 8, 1926, in Warren, R.I. He received his B.S. degree in business administration from the University of Rhode Island in 1951 and has done graduate work at the George Washington University.

Active in several professional organizations, Mr. Sampson was presented the Synergy III Award for outstanding contributions toward the advancement of architecture by the Society of American Registered Architects in 1972. In 1973 he was selected as one of the Top Ten Public Works Men of the Year, and he was named an honorary member of the American Institute of Architects.

He and his wife, Blanche, have four children and reside in Washington, D.C.

Note: For the President's statement upon announcing his intention to nominate Mr. Sampson, see the preceding item.

I will not abandon my responsibilities. I will continue to do the job I was elected to do.

In the accompanying statement, I have set forth the facts as I know them as they relate to my own role. With regard to the specific allegations that have been made, I can and do state categorically:

1. I had no prior knowledge of the Watergate operation.
2. I took no part in, knew of, any subsequent efforts that may have been made to cover up Watergate.
3. At no time did I authorize any offer of executive clemency for the Watergate defendants, nor did I know of any such offer.
4. I did not know, until the time of my own investigation, of any effort to provide the Watergate defendants with funds.
5. At no time did I attempt, or did I authorize others to attempt, to implicate the CIA in the Watergate matter.
6. It was not until the time of my own investigation that I learned of the break-in at the office of Mr. Ellsberg's psychiatrist, and I specifically authorized the furnishing of this information to Judge Byrne.
7. I neither authorized nor encouraged subordinates to engage in illegal or improper campaign tactics. In the accompanying statement, I have sought to provide the background that may place recent allegations in perspective. I have specifically stated that executive privilege will not be invoked as to any testimony concerning possible criminal conduct or discussions of possible criminal conduct, in the matters under investigation. I want the public to learn the truth about Watergate and those guilty of any illegal actions brought to justice.

Allegations surrounding the Watergate affair have so escalated that I feel a further statement from the President is required at this time.

A climate of sensationalism has developed in which even second- or third-hand hearsay charges are headlined as fact and repeated as fact.

Important national security operations which themselves had no connection with Watergate have become entangled in the case.

As a result, little national security information has already been made public through court orders, through the subpoenaing of documents, and through testimony in judicial and Congressional proceedings. Other sensitive documents are now threatened with disclosure. Continued silence about these operations would compromise rather than protect them, and would also serve to perpetuate a grossly distorted view—which recent partial disclosures have given—of the nature and purpose of those operations.
In this area, I felt it was important to avoid disclosure of the details of the national security matters with which the group was concerned. I knew that once the existence of the group became known, it would lead inexorably to a discussion of these matters, some of which, even today, highly sensitive.

I wanted justice done with regard to Watergate; but in the scale of national priorities with which I had to deal—and not at that time having any idea of the extent of political abuse which Watergate reflected—I also had to be deeply concerned with ensuring that neither the covert operations of the CIA nor the operations of the Special Investigations Unit should be compromised. Therefore, I instructed Mr. Haldeman and Mr. Ehrlichman to ensure that the investigation of the break-in not expose either an unrelated covert operation of the CIA or the activities of the White House investigations unit—and to see that this was personally coordinated between General Walters, the Deputy Director of the CIA, and Mr. Gray of the FBI. It was certainly not my intent, nor my wish, that the investigation of the Watergate break-in or of related acts be impeded in any way.

On July 6, 1972, I telephoned the Acting Director of the FBI, L. Patrick Gray, to congratulate him on his successful handling of the hijacking of a Pacific Southwest Airlines plane the previous day. During the conversation, Mr. Gray discussed with me the progress of the Watergate investigation, and I asked him whether he had talked with General Walters. Mr. Gray said that he had, and that General Walters had assured him that the CIA was not involved. In the discussion, Mr. Gray suggested that the matter of Watergate might lead higher. I told him to press ahead with his investigation.

It now seems that later, through whatever complex of individual motives and possible misunderstandings, there were apparently wide-ranging efforts to limit the investigation or to conceal the possible involvement of members of the Administration and the campaign committee.

I was not aware of any such efforts at the time. Neither, until after I began my own investigation, was I aware of any fundraising for defendants convicted of the break-in at Democratic headquarters, much less authorize any such fundraising. Nor did I authorize any offer of executive clemency for any of the defendants.

In the weeks and months that followed Watergate, I asked for, and received, repeated assurances that Mr. Dean's own investigation (which included reviewing files and sitting in on FBI interviews with White House personnel) had cleared everyone then employed by the White House of involvement.

In summary, then:

(1) I had no prior knowledge of the Watergate burglary operation, or of any illegal surveillance activities for political purposes.

(2) Long prior to the 1972 campaign, I did set in motion certain internal security measures, including legal
12. On or about July 1972 and at other times subsequently, John Dean told H. R. Haldeman that CRP was raising funds for those involved in the break-in at the DNC headquarters.

12.1 H. R. Haldeman testimony, 8 SSC 3046-47.
12.2 John Dean testimony, 3 SSC 969.
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Mr. Dash. And certain wiretaps that had been taking place for certain security purposes.

Mr. Halderman. I did know of security wiretaps.

Mr. Dash. Now, when did it come to your attention, Mr. Halderman, that certain funds were being raised to pay for the legal fees of the defendants?

Mr. Halderman. Sometime in the period shortly after the Watergate break-in and I am not sure again of any specific date or occasion on which I became aware of that, but I was told at some time in that period and I was told at other times subsequently, I am sure by John Dean, and I think possibly also by John Mitchell, that there was an effort by the committee to raise funds to pay for the legal fees and for family support of the defendants who had been arrested in the Watergate burglary.

Mr. Dash. Now, when you received that information from Mr. Dean and/or Mr. Mitchell, did you raise any question? Did you ask why Mr. Mitchell, who was heading up the campaign, and Mr. Dean, who was counsel to the President, would be involved in raising funds to pay for legal fees and families of burglars and wiretappers?

Mr. Halderman. No; I did not. This was incidental information that I received and dismissed. I did not pursue it in any way.

Mr. Dash. Well, did you consider that if that became public that it might be a matter of embarrassment to the campaign?

Mr. Halderman. No; I did not consider that.

Mr. Dash. Why not?

Mr. Halderman. I am not sure that one is able to explain why he did not think something, but I did not. The reason — let me say that as a partial explanation — I have had a general awareness that there was a public effort to raise funds for the Watergate defendants and I do not know that I knew that these efforts were different than the public effort.

Mr. Dash. Do you know what—

Mr. Halderman. There was a reference to the Cuban fund.

Mr. Dash. Do you know whether it was a public effort to raise funds for Mr. Liddy, Mr. Hunt, Mr. McCord?

Mr. Halderman. No; and I never heard any discussion of this in my contacts other than as a group, the defendants. There was no discussion of individuals by name.

Mr. Dash. You say you did not consider it, but I can at least ask the question: Is it your view that persons who had high positions in administering the President's reelection campaign and certainly the President's counsel, had any business participating in raising funds for the paying of legal fees for burglars, wiretappers, or conspirators?

Mr. Halderman. This is not a question that occurred to me, Mr. Dash, and I did not ask it of myself or any of them.

Mr. Dash. You formed no moral judgment on it at all?

Mr. Halderman. No, sir.

Mr. Dash. By listening to passing reference, is it your recollection that you condoned it?

Mr. Halderman. Well, I do not think I was called upon to condone or condemn. I think I received information and that was that.

Mr. Dash. Well, when Mr. Dean gave you information of that kind,
I take it, he expected that if you guys agreed with that action you would tell him so.

Mr. Haldeman. Not necessarily. I do not think it was submitted to me for approval. I think it was transmitted to me as information.

Mr. Dash. Just a point of information.

Mr. Haldeman. Yes, sir.

Mr. Dash. Now there came a time, and I think we referred to this briefly when you looked at that memorandum, that you learned that a large sum of money, $350,000, had come from the Committee To Re-Elect the President to the White House.

Mr. Haldeman. Well, I did not learn that it had come from them. I caused it to come.

Mr. Dash. You asked for it?

Mr. Haldeman. Yes, sir.

Mr. Dash. And I think your statement indicates that it was for polling purposes.

Mr. Haldeman. Yes.

Mr. Dash. As a matter of fact, it was not used for polling purposes, was it?

Mr. Haldeman. That is correct, it was not.

Mr. Dash. Then you learned, and I think it is your testimony, it went back to the committee.

Mr. Haldeman. That is correct.

Mr. Dash. And is it your statement that you saw or knew of no connection between the money going back, the $350,000 or whatever amount went back to the committee, that you were aware of no connection between that money going back and the need for more funds to pay the legal defense fees and family support fees of these Watergate defendants?

Mr. Haldeman. Let me very specifically refer to my statement and to the development of events in that regard. I can repeat the statement if you want to.

Mr. Dash. I do not want you to repeat the statement.

Mr. Haldeman. OK.

Mr. Dash. If you could just briefly answer the question whether or not you knew of a connection between the money going back and the need for it for a defense fund.

Mr. Haldeman. As I said in my statement, I was asked by Mr. Strachan after the election what should be done with the cash fund that he had been custodian of. I told him that it should be returned or not returned but turned over to the Committee To Re-Elect and that he should work out the means of doing that with John Dean.

Subsequently, I was told that there was a problem in doing that. Subsequently to that, I was told by John Dean again as I had been told earlier, that there was a continuing need for legal fund, legal fees, for the Watergate defendants and at that time, following this sequence of events, I then said we have a desire to deliver funds to the committee. The committee apparently has a desire for funds and I suggested that Dean try to carry out both of those two objectives, which he subsequently did.

Mr. Dash. All right. Now you know, at least that this $350,000 represented campaign funds, did you not?
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source of the money or whether it was campaign money or any of the
details about the $22,000 that Stans had made available. I could not
locate Stanch and Stans indicated that it should be picked up imme-
diately but I cannot recall at this time the reason he called for the
immediacy. Accordingly, I asked Mr. Fielding to pick up a package
from Stans and give it to Stanch as soon as he could.

I informed Stans that Fielding would be over to pick up the pack-
age but he would not know what he was picking up until he was
informed Fielding I was somewhat annoyed becaue I felt it was unfair to Fielding. The money was then given
by Fielding to Stanch but no final decision had been made regarding
how to dispose of the $350,000.

Having explained the status of the cash at the White House, I must
now return to the pressure that was being placed on the White House
for the use of these funds which I have just described for payments
to the seven indicted individuals. This pressure began long before
election day in that Paul O'Brien was receiving messages from Will-
iam Bittman, Hunt's lawyer, that Hunt and others expected to have
more support money and attorney's fees in exchange for continued
silence. The initial payments by Kalmbach had not been sufficient.
O'Brien reported this frequently to Mitchell, Mardian, LaRue, and
myself. I, in turn, was reporting to Haldeman and Ehrlichman.

There were discussions in late July, August, and September of using
these funds at the White House for these payments. I informed Hald-
eman of these discussions, but they were still in the discussion stage and
no action was taken.

After the election, the pressure was greatly increased when Colson
received a call from Mr. Hunt, which Colson recorded. Colson brought
the recorded call to me and I, in turn, transcribed it onto a cassette
tape. I have been informed by the committee counsel that the com-
mittee has in its possession a transcript of the conversation between
Colson and Hunt in which Hunt makes demands for money. On No-

vember 15, I arranged a meeting with Haldeman and Ehrlichman so
that they could hear the tape of the conversation Colson had had with
Hunt and also to inform them of the increased and now threatening
demands that were being transmitted through Hunt's lawyer to Mr.
O'Brien and in turn on to the White House.

Haldeman and Ehrlichman were at Camp David at that time devel-
opng the plans for the reorganization of the executive branch for the
second term of the Nixon administration. I departed on the morning
of November 15 for Camp David with Mr. Walter Minnick, who was
going to Camp David to discuss the reorganization plans with Ehr-
lichman. Mr. Minnick had been doing virtually all of the legal work at
that time for Ehrlichman on the reorganization plan and was a member
of Ehrlichman's staff. In fact, I was somewhat surprised that the coun-
sel's office had not been more involved, or involved at all, prior to that
time in the reorganization plans. After arriving at Camp David,
Ehrlichman, Haldeman, and I went into the President's office in Laurel
Lodge, which was empty. I have referred earlier to the fact that in this
meeting the matter of Dwight Chapin's remaining at the White House
was discussed.

It was after that discussion that I told them of the telephone con-
verson between Hunt and Colson and played the tape for them and
13. On July 5, 1972 John Mitchell was interviewed by agents of the FBI and stated to them that he had no knowledge of the break-in at the DNC headquarters other than what he had read in newspaper accounts of that incident. Mitchell has testified that prior to the time he was interviewed by the FBI he received a report from Robert Mardian and Fred LaRue of a conversation they had with Gordon Liddy in which Liddy described his role in the Watergate break-in; but he was not sure this information was correct when he was interviewed by the FBI on July 5, 1972 and he was not volunteering any information under any circumstances.

13.1 John Mitchell testimony, 5 SSC 1926.
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Mr. Mitchell. I think that would have been the magnitude or consequence. Obviously, Mr. Liddy was known to me, attended meetings in the Justice Department on different subject matters including the drug abuse law enforcements and so forth, that would not have been of that magnitude.

Mr. Dash. In any event, your statement that you had no information whatsoever as to any of the circumstances on September 5 is quite different than your testimony before this committee, is that not so?

Mr. Mitchell. I believe that to be true, and I believe the rechecking of the records, and the committee being kind enough to furnish me a copy of the agenda that Mr. Dean provided, and further reflection so it has brought the subject matter very much into focus.

Mr. Dash. Now, you testified you asked Mr. Mardian to make an investigation for you as to the Watergate break-in. Did those instructions include cooperating with the Federal Bureau of Investigation?

Mr. Mitchell. The matter involved, I do not recall coming back on the plane from California, whether that was specifically discussed or not, but there was a policy within the committee that they should cooperate with the FBI and, of course, that was the basis for the discharging of Mr. Liddy when he did not cooperate.

Mr. Dash. Well, did you ever give instructions that there should be cooperation with the FBI to Mr. Mardian?

Mr. Mitchell. Mr. Dash, I don't recall the specific words. I would presume that it would be—

Mr. Dash. Did you consider—

Mr. Mitchell [continuing]. Implicit in his actions.

Mr. Dash. Did you include yourself in that requirement to cooperate with the FBI?

Mr. Mitchell. I would certainly believe so.

Mr. Dash. Isn't it a fact, that you were interviewed by Special Agents Mahan and Lill on July 5, 1972? Do you recall that?

Mr. Mitchell. I recall there was an interview, Mr. Dash. I don't recall the date.

Mr. Dash. Do you recall being interviewed as to what knowledge you had of the Democratic National Committee break-in and informing the agents that the only knowledge you had was what you read in the newspapers?

Mr. Mitchell. That is correct.

Mr. Dash. As a matter of fact, by July 5, and that is pretty close to June 21 or 22, you have been given information by Mr. Mardian on what Mr. Liddy told him about that break-in.

Mr. Mitchell. Mr. Dash, at that particular time, I was not sure whether that information was correct or otherwise.

Mr. Dash. Whether it was correct or not, the FBI was making an investigation and would not you want to give whatever leads or information they wanted, having been the former Attorney General and knowing how the FBI investigates, so they could check that out?

Mr. Mitchell. Mr. Dash, at that particular time, we weren't volunteering any information for the reason that I have discussed here.

Mr. Dash. Right. So that in other words, your answer to the FBI was part of the decision that you made, a strong decision for the reasons you have given, to see to it that none of these things got out.

Mr. Mitchell. It was the decision of those that were involved to not volunteer any information under any circumstances.
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Martian and Mr. LaRue based on Mr. Liddy's statement, to back them up?

**Mr. Mitchell.** You are talking about this time, you are talking before Magruder—

**Mr. Dash.** Before Magruder's testimony before the grand jury.

**Mr. Mitchell.** Before Magruder's testimony before the grand jury. I would believe that during that period of time there were some discussions of the so-called White House stories, yes.

**Mr. Dash.** Was there—

**Mr. Mitchell.** Horrors, I mean not stories.

**Mr. Dash.** Was there a concern expressed by you to Mr. Haldeman or Mr. Ehrlichman concerning whether stories would be revealed during this campaign?

**Mr. Mitchell.** I think that we all had an innate fear that during the campaign that they might be revealed. I recall discussing it specifically in that area but I am sure we must have had a mutual concern about the subject matter.

**Mr. Dash.** Well, did you yourself form a personal position as to what should be done about revealing this material?

**Mr. Mitchell.** I formed the opinion and a position that I did not believe that it was fair to the President to have these stories come out during his political campaign.

**Mr. Dash.** Were you aware that there was a program actually going on so as to actually prevent these stories from coming out?

**Mr. Mitchell.** No, which program are you talking about, Mr. Dash, so I can be sure to answer your question properly?

**Mr. Dash.** Well, a program on the part of yourself, Mr. Dean, Mr. Haldeman, Mr. Ehrlichman, and perhaps Mr. LaRue and Mr. Mardian to see to it that the information that got to the prosecutor or to the grand jury or to the civil suits did not in any way include this information concerning the so-called White House horrors, as you described them?

**Mr. Mitchell.** Well, Mr. Dash, that is a very broad question and covers a lot of areas. I may answer it, perhaps, by saying that we sure in hell were not volunteering anything. In addition to that, we were involved in a very difficult series of civil litigation, as you know, that involved discovery and all the rest of it. So we were not volunteering anything.

**Mr. Dash.** But you say you did come to know that, prior to Mr. Magruder's testimony, that he was going to testify falsely?

**Mr. Mitchell.** I think I can put it on the basis that I had a pretty strong feeling that his testimony was not going to be entirely accurate.

**Mr. Dash.** Right, and this discussion, I think you have already testified, was part of the discussion of some of the meetings with Messrs. LaRue, Mardian, Dean, and Magruder.

**Mr. Mitchell.** That is correct.

**Mr. Dash.** Would it be correct—

**Mr. Mitchell.** I think the best way to put it is that Mr. Magruder would seek an audience to review his story that he was going to tell, rather than somebody was trying to induce him to do so. I think Mr. Magruder has testified that nobody coaxed him to do this, that he made up the story, that he did it of his own free will. So it was more of a basis
of Mr. Magruder recounting to those assembled groups what he was going to testify to.

Mr. Dash: But would it be fair to say, Mr. Mitchell, that it was in the interest of the group to have the story that did go into the grand jury and the ultimate indictments that did come out cut off at Liddy? And Mr. Magruder, who was in such a high position in the committee, would not be involved in that type of thing?

Mr. Mitchell: Mr. Dash, I think you are jumping from one conclusion to another without the bridge. What we were really concerned about were the White House horror stories. Now, if the cutoff that you speak of helped in that direction, perhaps that was probably the case. In other words, Watergate did not have the great significance that the White House horror stories that have since occurred had.

Mr. Dash: Would you say that whatever coverup was taking place to this point, concealment and not volunteering information, had to do with actually preventing the so-called White House horror stories rather than Watergate break-in?

Mr. Mitchell: This was certainly my belief and rationale and I would believe the people in the White House, certainly some of them, might well be involved and certainly would have similar interests.

Mr. Dash: Well, did Mr. Dean, in carrying back the messages from Mr. Haldeman and Mr. Ehrlichman, indicate that he had in fact informed them of the actions that had been taken—the strategies performed by your group?

Mr. Mitchell: I cannot say that he did or did not. I would have to believe that Mr. Dean was reporting to those gentlemen over there. Mr. Dean, as a proper lawyer, proper counsel, was very, very limited in his discussions of what he did or said with people in the White House and that is the way, of course, he should have acted.

Mr. Dash: I think you testified that you at least discussed with Mr. Haldeman and Mr. Ehrlichman the problems involved in the Liddy operations, the Ellsberg, and other situations?

Mr. Mitchell: Yes, and that was somewhere down the line, probably much later than the time frame of which you are talking about in relationship to Mr. Magruder's appearance before the grand jury.

Mr. Dash: All right, now, let us look very briefly to the so-called wiretapping of the journalists and Mr. Kissinger's staff as a result of the SALT talk leaks. Were you aware of the leaking and those wiretaps?

Mr. Mitchell: Mr. Dash, I find it hard to give you a specific answer other than the fact that, yes, I was. To what extent, I do not know. This happened in 1968 and they were national security wiretaps. They should have a full record of everything that was handled in the Department of Justice, because every security tap, whether it be a strict national security dealing with foreigners or whether it is the type that the court has since frowned upon, is filed in the Department of Justice.

Mr. Dash: But this would require your authority as Attorney General, would it not?

Mr. Mitchell: I would believe that the FBI would probably not operate without it. I am not sure of that, but I believe that that would be the case.
14. On or about July 7, 1972 after several unsuccessful efforts by Ulasewicz to deliver funds for the Watergate defendants to attorneys, and after telephone conversations among Kalmbach, LaRue and Dean, instructions were given by Kalmbach to Ulasewicz to contact Howard Hunt's attorney, William Bittman. After that contact was made and after approval by Kalmbach of a $25,000 payment, Ulasewicz delivered $25,000 to Bittman by placing an unmarked envelope containing the money on a shelf in the lobby of Bittman's office building.

14.1 Herbert Kalmbach testimony, 5 SSC 2103-04.
14.2 Anthony Ulasewicz testimony, 6 SSC 2222-27, 2256-57.
in the room and wrapped it in a laundry bag, and so I, after that we both called it the laundry, as to how much money you had available.

Mr. Dash. And he carried it back then—

Mr. Kalmbach. That was just—and he carried it back in that laundry bag, as I recall it.

Mr. Dash. Kind of a significant name at this time to be used for that money, was it not?

Mr. Kalmbach. Yes.

Mr. Dash. Did you ever use the term "script" in such a conversation?

Mr. Kalmbach. I think we had that term "script."

Mr. Dash. Script for the writing?

Mr. Kalmbach. Meaning the script of all of the players involved, the defendants and certain of these attorneys that were representing certain of the defendants.

Mr. Dash. Now, did Mr. Ulasewicz have any knowledge or reason to know about these activities? He knew what you knew, did he not?

Mr. Kalmbach. Yes, sir.

Mr. Dash. Did you discuss with him at all the property of this activity?

Mr. Kalmbach. No, sir; I just told him that it was proper, and I told him that the purpose, as I have stated, was to furnish legal help for these people, and to furnish them with family support.

Mr. Dash. You did know, of course, that the particular people who were getting this money for their legal defense or support of families were charged or indicted with, under the crime of burglary, and illegal wiretapping and conspiracy, did you not?

Mr. Kalmbach. I knew the essence of the charges; yes, sir.

Mr. Dash. All right.

Other than being told by Mr. Dean that this would be an appropriate thing to do, you made no independent inquiry as to the property of this?

Mr. Kalmbach. No; I made none.

Mr. Dash. Now, how were instructions about the distribution of funds given to you and Mr. Ulasewicz? Was that by phone from Mr. LaRue or Mr. Dean?

Mr. Kalmbach. Probably 90 percent of the time it was by telephone. The other 10 percent was in personal discussion with him in his office or more usually in Mr. Dean's office.

Mr. Dash. Now, what was the first instruction you received to give money?

Mr. Kalmbach. Again, as I have tried to reconstruct this, Mr. Dash, the first instruction that I received, which I passed to Mr. Ulasewicz was to have Mr. Ulasewicz give $25,000 to Mr. Caddy. I don't know much of Mr. Caddy, I understand he is an attorney here in Washington. And, as I recall it, this was probably from approximately July 1 through July 6 or 7. There were a number of calls. I would talk to either Mr. Dean or Mr. LaRue, I would then call Mr. Ulasewicz who, in turn, would call Mr. Caddy. He would have some response from Mr. Caddy, and I would call back up to either Mr. Dean and Mr. LaRue.

Mr. Dash. What was the response from Mr. Caddy?

Mr. Kalmbach. Well, the sum and gist of it was in that Mr. Caddy refused to accept the funds.
Mr. DASH. In that manner?
Mr. KALMBACH. That is correct. That was the end-all. There were several telephone calls, but the final wrap-up on it was that he refused to receive the funds.
Mr. DASH. Who was contacted next, which lawyer?
Mr. KALMBACH. I think Mr. O'Brien was contacted and again with the same result.
Mr. DASH. He refused to receive the funds?
Mr. KALMBACH. Yes, sir.
Mr. DASH. And then who next was approached?
Mr. KALMBACH. I think then it was Mr. Bittman, and Mr. Bittman—I think this may have been when the name Rivers was used. Mr. Dash, but my recollection would be that Mr. Bittman received $25,000, probably sometime during the second week of July 1972.
Mr. DASH. Did you follow any usual procedure that Mr. Ulasewicz would make the contact and pay the money, he would call you and then you would call Mr. Dean and tell him it had been accomplished?
Mr. KALMBACH. Or Mr. LaRue.
Mr. DASH. Or Mr. LaRue. Were all these phone calls booth to booth?
Mr. KALMBACH. Yes, sir.
Mr. DASH. Even when you spoke to Mr. Dean?
Mr. KALMBACH. Yes; that is correct.
Mr. DASH. Or Mr. LaRue?
Mr. KALMBACH. That is correct.
Mr. DASH. What other lawyers were supposed to receive money, to your recollection, Mr. Kalmbach?
Mr. KALMBACH. Well, after the disbursement to Mr. Bittman, I think there was—most of the remaining funds went to Mrs. Hunt who, in fact, was the person who did the distributing thereafter and she distributed to these other attorneys.
Mr. DASH. Mrs. Hunt?
Mr. KALMBACH. Yes.
Mr. DASH. Now, when you next—when did you next return to Washington, after this first series of meetings, where you received this money and met with Mr. Ulasewicz, when did you next return to Washington?
Mr. KALMBACH. Well, the next time that I was back in Washington involved in this assignment, Mr. Dash, was, I think it was, on July 10.
Mr. DASH. What happened at that time? What brought you back?
Mr. KALMBACH. Well, at that time, I think I was asked to come back, I think by either Mr. Dean or Mr. LaRue, and to meet with Mr. Dean and Mr. LaRue in Mr. Dean's office in the Executive Office Building.
Mr. DASH. Did you receive any money from Mr. LaRue at that time?
Mr. KALMBACH. Yes, sir, I did.
Mr. DASH. How much was that?
Mr. KALMBACH. Oh, some $40,000 was received from Mr. LaRue at that time.
Mr. DASH. Where did you receive it?
Mr. KALMBACH. In Mr. Dean's office.
Mr. DASH. Did you receive any additional instructions at that time?
Mr. KALMBACH. I may have. Mr. Dash. I am not certain as to that.
Mr. Ulasewicz. Yes, I did.
Mr. Lenzner. I would like to get your receipts all at once here if I can. Where was the next place that you received money from Mr. Kalmbach?
Mr. Ulasewicz. At the Regency Hotel in New York City.
Mr. Lenzner. Approximately how much?
Mr. Ulasewicz. $40,000.
Mr. Lenzner. And approximately when was that?
Mr. Ulasewicz. That would have been in July.
Mr. Lenzner. Of 1973?
Mr. Ulasewicz. 1972.
Mr. Lenzner. Where was the next delivery?
Mr. Ulasewicz. At the Hilton here in Washington, $28,000.
Mr. Lenzner. Again approximately when was that?
Mr. Ulasewicz. In July.
Mr. Lenzner. And—
Mr. Ulasewicz. And then my recollection is the final amount was $75,000 at the Airporter Inn in Los Angeles opposite the Orange County Airport.
Mr. Lenzner. All right.
Now, going back to the original $75,100 what denominations was that in did you say?
Mr. Ulasewicz. Hundred dollar bills.
Mr. Lenzner. Where did you keep that cash?
Mr. Ulasewicz. I kept it at home.
Mr. Lenzner. Did there come a time when you received these other amounts that you left them somewhere else?
Mr. Ulasewicz. Yes.
Mr. Lenzner. Where was that?
Mr. Ulasewicz. In a safe deposit box.
Mr. Lenzner. Now, after you got back to New York, did you hear from Mr. Kalmbach again?
Mr. Ulasewicz. I did.
Mr. Lenzner. And what instructions, if any, did he give you?
Mr. Ulasewicz. He mentioned—he told me to call a Mr. Caddy.
Mr. Lenzner. Mr. Caddy?
Mr. Ulasewicz. Right, Mr. Caddy, to come back to Washington, D.C., and call Mr. Caddy.
Mr. Lenzner. Approximately—
Mr. Ulasewicz. He supplied me with a telephone number.
Mr. Lenzner. How soon after you left Washington did he tell you that?
Mr. Ulasewicz. It probably was the same evening or the next morning.
Mr. Lenzner. What did you do? Did you go down to Washington and call Mr. Caddy?
Mr. Ulasewicz. I did.
Mr. Lenzner. Will you tell us the conversation you had with him.
Mr. Ulasewicz. I contacted Mr. Caddy and he suggested that he would—prior to this is when Mr. Kalmbach said, “Tell him that.” And it was of the code names we had gotten into other names. Tom Kune, and John Ferguson and Tommy Smith so there was a little confusion once in awhile on that. However, at this—
Mr. Lenzner. Who gave you those names?

Mr. Ulasewicz. Mr. Kalmbach and myself in conversation, as kind of backup.

However, with—in this case he instructed me to use, I believe it was John Rivers when I called Mr. Caddy and on this occasion I was to say the purpose of my call to Mr. Caddy was that I was asking the cost of a script, of a play plus the salaries of the players, which I did. I contacted Mr. Caddy, and he was—and he responded and said he would meet me in a restaurant sometime in the afternoon here in Washington, D.C.

Mr. Lenzner. Just to clarify it, you identified yourself to Mr. Caddy as Mr. Rivers, is that correct?

Mr. Ulasewicz. I believe Mr. Rivers, yes. In most of these transactions it was Rivers.

Mr. Lenzner. Was there any reason for the code name Rivers for you to use?

Mr. Ulasewicz. No.

Mr. Lenzner. Now, did you go to that restaurant in Georgetown?

Mr. Ulasewicz. Yes, I did.

Mr. Lenzner. What happened there?

Mr. Ulasewicz. I waited for Mr. Caddy's arrival. However, a phone call came in, I was paged by the bartender, Mr. Caddy got on the phone and said that he couldn't meet me, after speaking to somebody in his office in the attorney's office that he could not meet me, would I be able to come and see him. I told him I would get in touch with him. My instructions originally with Mr. Kalmbach was that I enter no negotiations at any time that he would not enter negotiations. This is refreshing my memory again and the other thing he said was that I am to do, if I received amounts or so, I am not to deliver anything until I get in touch with Mr. Kalmbach, and throughout these continually throughout these negotiations and drops and whatever may come up, this was the pattern, that I would make the contact as directed, but I would take no action until I reported whatever was said or done to Mr. Kalmbach and even I would await a return call from Mr. Kalmbach, as to whether to proceed or not. In this case I reported Mr. Caddy's message and Mr. Kalmbach said, "Well," probably "give me the number you are at—that is at a phone booth here in Washington. I will get back to you."

Mr. Lenzner. Did he call you back?

Mr. Ulasewicz. My recollection is he did. He called me back and I think in this instance it was, "Call Mr. Caddy again." And this might have been an hour or so later. I called Mr. Caddy again and we got nowhere as far as any costs, I am now picturing that I am going to deliver the $75,100 which I have under my arm and he is not going along with it, and so—

Mr. Lenzner. You had the money with you on that date?

Mr. Ulasewicz. Oh, yes.

Mr. Lenzner. How did you carry it on that date?

Mr. Ulasewicz. I carried it in a brown bag with, you know, the ordinary type of—with a little string around it. You know, sometimes carrying what is most obvious doesn't raise any suspicion, carrying an armored box would ask for trouble.

Mr. Lenzner. You were just carrying your lunch?
Mr. Ulasewicz. Carrying my lunch.
Mr. Lenzner. All right.
Mr. Ulasewicz. Nevertheless, I got to, back to Mr. Kalmbach. This was a series of calls. Then somewhere in there, Mr. Caddy suggested that I should come up to the office, that they would have, where there was a corridor, a separate office, and we would not be observed, et cetera. So then, that I had to report back to Mr. Kalmbach.
I think these calls might have been going Californiawide by now, I am not too certain. Then he would attempt to get back to me. However, there was a delay. Apparently, he could not reach whomever he was attempting to reach, the communications were not there for some reason or other.
Then I probably went back to the city—the final result being that that was it with Mr. Caddy. We never did meet.
Mr. Lenzner. At some point, did Mr. Kalmbach tell you to drop the whole Caddy business?
Mr. Ulasewicz. Yes.
Mr. Lenzner. I take it you were having these conversations phone booth to phone booth between yourself and Mr. Kalmbach?
Mr. Ulasewicz. That is correct.
Mr. Lenzner. Were you loaded down with change, Mr. Ulasewicz?
Mr. Ulasewicz. Oh, yes, indeed.
Mr. Lenzner. How did you carry that change?
Mr. Ulasewicz. When I started out, I started with a kind of little box deal. When I finished up, I had a bus guy's, one of these things that the bus drivers have. [Laughter.]
Mr. Lenzner. After you got back to New York, did you again receive instructions from Mr. Kalmbach?
Mr. Ulasewicz. Yes. Just about the time it ended with Caddy, which we got nowhere, and I still had the $75,100, I was asked to call Mr. O'Brien, using the name of John Rivers.
Mr. Lenzner. Did you call him?
Mr. Ulasewicz. I called Mr. O'Brien, received a very tart kind of brushoff response, and that was the end of that conversation. It was one phone call. He showed no interest in any script, players, or any type of message that I would give.
Mr. Lenzner. You were given the same instructions by Mr. Kalmbach to talk about a script, a scenario, the players?
Mr. Ulasewicz. Yes.
Mr. Lenzner. Did you call Mr. Kalmbach again, telephone booth to telephone booth?
Mr. Ulasewicz. I did.
Mr. Lenzner. And tell him—
Mr. Ulasewicz. I told him exactly as I have related here.
Mr. Lenzner. Did he come back again with other instructions?
Mr. Ulasewicz. He came back, gave me another person to call—it was not a person—he gave me a telephone number this time, no name involved. To the best of my recollection, when I called and it was answered, the fellow would be expecting a call, give the name of Mr. John Rivers or whatever name—it would have to be Rivers. I imagine.
Mr. Lenzner. Where was the number?
Mr. ULASEWICZ. Washington, D.C., area. And I may have called from the city of New York at that time, because running around with $75,100, trying to get rid of it was becoming a problem.

So I called the number and he said to me, you can talk to the writer's wife. And I said to him, well, as far as the writer's wife, I do not have a phone number. He said, why don't you do what I have to do, look in the phone book? So that was the end of that conversation, because that was apparently another one we were not going to get anywhere with.

Mr. LENZNER. Did you report that back to Mr. Kalmbach?

Mr. ULASEWICZ. I called Mr. Kalmbach again. All of these were precluded. I had to call and wait for a comeback. I began to call them Kalmbach comeback calls. [Laughter.]

So that was that.

Mr. LENZNER. Did you get further instructions from Mr. Kalmbach?

Mr. ULASEWICZ. Yes. I then was instructed to call Mr. Bittman in Washington, who I understood was an attorney.

Mr. LENZNER. What instructions did you have to talk to him?

Mr. ULASEWICZ. The same thing, the cost of the script, the writer, get what the attorney fees—not the attorney fees at this point. The cost of the script, the players, et cetera.

Mr. LENZNER. You were using the same name, Mr. Rivers?

Mr. ULASEWICZ. I believe so, yes.

Mr. LENZNER. Did you call Mr. Bittman?

Mr. ULASEWICZ. I did.

Mr. LENZNER. Did you speak to him?

Mr. ULASEWICZ. I spoke to Mr. Bittman and I recall that in the first conversation, Mr. Bittman said, "Well, I understand." He was expecting a call. He said, "Well, this is very unusual." He said something like, I do not know if you are an attorney, but an attorney does not anticipate fees and costs in this manner.

I said, "Well, I am instructed not to negotiate in any manner. I understood that you would have a figure" and I told him that I am prepared at this time if we can get down to this, because at this point, I still wanted to get rid of all those cookies, $75,100.

And he brought in the situation that—he was not prepared at that time, something was not according to the way he liked. I so reported to Mr. Kalmbach, received my call back from Mr. Kalmbach. He told me again to call and contact Mr. Bittman.

Now, this is some period of time passes by. Mr. Bittman said, all right, his initial fee would be $25,000.

Mr. LENZNER. What period of time, Mr. Ulasewicz, are we talking about?

Mr. ULASEWICZ. This would be around July 8 to the 10th, in that period of time.

Mr. LENZNER. You are talking now about your discussions with Mr. Bittman?

Mr. ULASEWICZ. With Mr. Bittman, correct.

Mr. LENZNER. And did you call Mr. Kalmbach and tell him Mr. Bittman had indicated he wanted an initial fee of $25,000?

Mr. ULASEWICZ. I did.
Mr. Lenzner. What was Mr. Kalmbach’s response?

Mr. Ulasewicz. He said to deliver it to Mr. Bittman in any manner I saw fit.

Mr. Lenzner. Did he give you any instructions about not being seen by Mr. Bittman?

Mr. Ulasewicz. Oh, yes; those came in after the Caddy call, that somehow conversations were arranged that I would not now be seen by anybody, to do the money without being observed, in a confidential manner.

Mr. Lenzner. That was Mr. Kalmbach’s instructions to you?

Mr. Ulasewicz. Right.

Mr. Lenzner. Now, you expressed some concern about carrying this amount of money around with you. How were you traveling during this period of time?

Mr. Ulasewicz. By airplane, Eastern Airlines shuttle, usually.

Mr. Lenzner. Did you ever change your mode of travel? Did you have a problem on the plane?

Mr. Ulasewicz. Well, there was a period of time, of course, with the hijacks and all—they started a searching system on the airlines and that was a little problem. I got in line one time to come back—when I had the problem, it would be only $50,000 at this time. A fellow in front of me, two or three persons in front of me stopped and had to produce—I think four packs of cigarettes or something, set off the alarm. So I went into a coughing fit and I went down to the Pennsylvania Railroad and took the train home.

Mr. Lenzner. Well, now, you arranged, as I understand it, Mr. Ulasewicz, to furnish Mr. Bittman with $25,000 for the script. Was that the end of the conversation?

Mr. Ulasewicz. That is correct.

Mr. Lenzner. And how did you arrange to deliver that money?

Mr. Ulasewicz. I contacted Mr. Bittman right from the lobby of his office there. I spoke with him and I told him that I had the cash. Prior to that, I went out to a drugstore in the area, bought a couple of envelopes and some scotch tape, and I had to count out $25 from that $75,100—$25,000 from the $75,100 original, which I did, and I put it into a plain kraft brown envelope.

I called Mr. Bittman from the lobby of his building. There are two or three phone booths. On one side of the phone booth was a ledge with the phone books and I called Mr. Bittman.

Mr. Lenzner. Mr. Ulasewicz, if I may interrupt you, could you now approach the easel and tell me if you can identify this first photograph?

Now, you started to describe, Mr. Ulasewicz, where you left us, is that the lobby of the building?

Mr. Ulasewicz. Yes [78]*, this is the lobby, these are the phone booths, these are elevators going to either side, and that is Ulasewicz right there.

Mr. Lenzner. Very good. Would you now indicate on the photograph where you called from and what happened after that?

Mr. Ulasewicz. I called from this telephone booth [indicating] to Mr. Bittman and told him that I had the delivery and that would he

---

*Figures in brackets indicate exhibit numbers being referred to. Exhibits appear on pp. 2226-2230.
come right down and that it would be on the ledge at the telephone booth.

Now, this gentleman is standing where the ledge is. There are two or three or four telephone books and there is a ledge above, a kind of space. I told him it would be a brown sack and that the money would be lying right there, would be come right down, if he walk right through and pick it up and go back to the elevator, I would be satisfied.

Mr. Leznner. Now, thereafter, did an individual come down on the elevator?

Mr. Ulasewicz. We had a description of clothing as I phoned, as I recall, that he would be wearing a brown suit or something at that time.

Mr. Leznner. Did somebody come down wearing those clothes?

Mr. Ulasewicz. Yes.

Mr. Leznner. Where were you at that time?

Mr. Ulasewicz. I was in a telephone booth. I had it half shut. There was another person in a booth. These booths on weekdays are very heavily used. There is a newsstand section in front. There is quite a bit of traffic on a weekday. This was taken on a Saturday afternoon.

He came right out of this elevator, the first elevator, and walked right over, picked it up, walked right back in, and went up.

Mr. Leznner. Now, Mr. Ulasewicz, rather than having you go back and forth several times between the table and the easel, I would like to go ahead and continue, if it is OK, and have you describe other contacts that you made with individuals you furnished with money.

Did there come a time later when Mr. Kalmbach instructed you to furnish funds to Mrs. Hunt?

Mr. Ulasewicz. Yes, that is correct.

Mr. Leznner. Did you have a conversation with Mrs. Hunt where you arranged to furnish her with some funds?

Mr. Ulasewicz. Yes, I did.

Mr. Leznner. Would you just describe what you told her, as to how she could pick up her money?

Mr. Ulasewicz. I told Mrs. Hunt that at a certain time in a day, and I picked an hour, to come into the lounge of the American Airlines, which is a long lounge area, leading right through the building. There are ticket desks on one side, seats in the center and it is a very busy area.

And at the center of that, she should check with the time on a large clock, so it would be almost exactly at that time. It would be 12 noon and if she saw 5 to 12, to go back out and come back at that time.

She followed instructions explicitly.

In the meantime, whatever drop I would have at the time, I would put in this particular locker and take the key. [79] And just before, when I pulled up with the instructions, now, 5 minutes before I knew she was coming, there was opposite, and about 25 feet away, across from Northwest Orient Airlines, there is a series of telephone booths, five or six booths [81], and there is a newsstand across and there is a bit of traffic.

Before making the arrangements, I spent some time observing the telephone booths and of all the booths, watching people going in and out, the most I saw in one for some reason, people didn't use the very end one. So that is the reason I used that and left the key.

So 5 minutes prior to the time I would tell her to come, I would go into this telephone booth and underneath where the coin drop is, I
Senator Gurney. You never asked her what she was going to do with it?

Mr. Ulasewicz. No, sir.

Senator Gurney. This $25,000 to Mr. Bittman, as I recall, that was the only payment you made to any of the attorneys directly, is that correct?

Mr. Ulasewicz. That is correct, sir.

Senator Gurney. Well now, this is a rather unique way of paying attorneys' fees, is it not?

Mr. Ulasewicz. Yes, sir; it is a way.

Senator Gurney. Did Mr. Bittman express any surprise at this method of getting his fee?

Mr. Ulasewicz. Oh, yes, in the initial conversation he probably said something that it was unusual, and I said "Well, however, those are my instructions" and then I made a call and relayed his message and I was told "No, it will be accepted." When I called back, Mr. Bittman agreed to take it.

Senator Gurney. Would you go into that a little further, the discussion about how his figure came up and how this attorney fees was going to be paid?

Mr. Ulasewicz. Well, when I spoke to Mr. Bittman he told me that it was the first conversation, that it was an unusual manner to discuss lawyers' fees, that you don't know about how much expenses will be entailed, and he started to go into appeals could come in. and I said "Well, I have no knowledge of this, I am told that you would have a figure and I am prepared to deliver that figure." I was thinking in terms of the $75,100 which I brought with me.

Senator Gurney. What did he say to that when you asked him or said to him, "I was told you were going to name a figure."

Mr. Ulasewicz. He said "Well," he said, "No, let me," something to the effect, "Let me get back or get back to me," and I relayed the message to Mr. Kalmbach, and after a period of time—

Senator Gurney. He said "Get back to him later."

Mr. Ulasewicz. Yes; he said to discuss it or he indicated something that he was not taking it at that time. He was not going to accept the money in that manner at that time.

Senator Gurney. He did name a figure of $25,000?

Mr. Ulasewicz. Finally he named a $25,000 figure in the next to the last conversation.

Senator Gurney. Why didn't he want to get into the business of taking it or arranging for the taking it at that time. He was perfectly willing to negotiate the fee with you, is that correct?

Mr. Ulasewicz. He did not negotiate with me and I think that is the answer to the first question, he had to go back and negotiate a fee with either his client or somebody else, and then he seemed, then he gave me the figure. I think he negotiated with his client or—

Senator Gurney. Well, you say he negotiated with his client and gave you the figure you mean in another phone conversation?

Mr. Ulasewicz. In whatever manner they were dealing with his client, I don't know.

Senator Gurney. Let's go back here, you called him on the phone?

Mr. Ulasewicz. Yes, sir.

Senator Gurney. And the purpose of your calling him on the phone was to find out what he wanted for a fee, isn't that right?
Mr. Ulasewicz. That is correct. But it wasn’t—yes, it was the cost of a script, of course, which was a subterfuge and he didn’t come up with a number at all. He didn’t come up with a figure, I so reported to Mr. Kalmbach. Mr. Kalmbach says all right I will get back to you, he got back and he says call him again. This might be a day or it might be an hour. I don’t recall which. I call Mr. Bittman back, and he would start in that conversation with, “Well, you know, a flat fee is very unusual thing and all” and I said “Well, I have no control over that. I am prepared for a figure, for a figure, for the cost of a script.” And I would repeat the whole thing and he says “Well,” he says “Can you get back to me?” I says “All right” and I reported that to Mr. Kalmbach.

Senator Gurney. That is the second conversation?

Mr. Ulasewicz. Second conversation. I think I had four conversations or five with Mr. Bittman, and then finally he mentioned that he would accept the money and he gave me the figure of $25,000.

Senator Gurney. Finally on the fourth conversation he mentioned a figure?

Mr. Ulasewicz. That is correct, sir.

Senator Gurney. And he hadn’t mentioned any figure before that?

Mr. Ulasewicz. No, sir.

Senator Gurney. All this other business is horsing around?

Mr. Ulasewicz. Yes, sir.

Senator Gurney. Why?

Mr. Ulasewicz. I think he had to straighten it out with his client or with somebody is the only thing I can assume.

Senator Gurney. All right, now we arrive at a figure of $25,000. Then what happened?

Mr. Ulasewicz. I placed the $25,000 in an envelope.

Senator Gurney. Well, hold off now.

Mr. Ulasewicz. I reported to Kalmbach. I reported the figure to Kalmbach. My instructions were I never was to give anything until finally I reported and got the OK from Mr. Kalmbach. I reported to Mr. Kalmbach and he got back to me and said “OK, deliver the money.”

Senator Gurney. Incidentally, in those phone calls with Mr. Kalmbach, while you were—I will not use the word—negotiating—talking to Mr. Bittman on the phone, what was his reaction about all this time spent in phone conversations with Bittman?

Mr. Ulasewicz. No particular reaction. I think it was agreeable to him, or he was trying to make his mind up as to what kind of a fee.

Senator Gurney. Was he calling anybody about this, do you know?

Mr. Ulasewicz. Oh, I assume he was, yes, sir.

Senator Gurney. Did he tell you?

Mr. Ulasewicz. No, sir.

Senator Gurney. Now we get to how it is going to be paid. Would you describe that?

Mr. Ulasewicz. Yes; the manner of payment was I would place $25,000 in a brown clasped envelope.

Senator Gurney. I know that. Now let us go back to catching that. You arrive at a figure and that big hurdle is over. You must have told Mr. Bittman something about how you were going to make this contact.

Mr. Ulasewicz. I told him I would get back to him, because I had
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assurances were given us freely, without any requests on our part or any stipulation that a plea of one sort or another would be made by at least myself. I cannot speak for the other defendants.

It was certainly an assumption on my part that the option, all options were open to me and all legal expenses would be paid.

There came a time when I believe I was in Mr. Bittman's office and an anonymous delivery of funds was made.

May I consult counsel with regard to the chronology of these particular events?

Mr. Hamilton. Please.

Mr. Hunt. I am prepared to continue unless you want to --

Mr. Dash. No, no, go ahead.

Mr. Hunt. Let me go back a little for chronology's sake.

Sometime in July, I would estimate within two to three weeks of the time I had initially retained Mr. Bittman, Mr. Bittman informed me had received an envelope containing $25,000 which he understood was to be applied to legal fees for my representation.

Mr. Dash. Is that not related in any way to the early discussions, these calls from Mr. Rivers to Mrs. Hunt?

Mr. Hunt. Mr. Bittman received a call from a gentleman
identifying himself as Mr. Rivers. What the mechanics of the
transaction were I do not know. I have no first-hand evidence
of that. Suffice it to say that Mr. Bittman did inform me
of the receipt of $25,000 which would be applied in my behalf.

Mr. Dash. About when was this?

Mr. Hunt. Before the end of July.

Mr. Bittman. For the record, the precise date was July 7.
I do not know exactly when it was. I informed Mr. Hunt, but
it must have been on or about that date.

Mr. Dash. I think you have said, I want you to continue,
but at this point I think your sort of anonymous benefactors
or anonymous supporters had assured support. I do not know
whether I was out of the room when this was discussed.

You did mention at one point that Mrs. Hunt sometime
in June, was it, did go to the committee and speak to Mr.
O'Brien and Mr. Parkinson?

Mr. Hunt. Yes, sir, I covered that.

Mr. Dash. Was it never clear to you or through no
person by name as to who in fact was making any assurances?

Mr. Hunt. No, sir.

Mr. Dash. How were the assurances made? Was the
first knowledge of the assurances the fact that Mr. Rivers
made a call?

Mr. Bittman. Can I?

Mr. Dash. Yes.
15. In mid-July 1972, upon instructions from Kalmbach, Ulasewicz delivered $40,000 to Howard Hunt's wife for the benefit of the Watergate defendants and $8,000 to Gordon Liddy by sealing these monies in unmarked envelopes and placing them in lockers at Washington National Airport. These payments were made from the funds Kalmbach previously had obtained from Stans and delivered to Ulasewicz. In the usual situation in making such deliveries to Mrs. Hunt, Ulasewicz informed Kalmbach of the amount requested, and Kalmbach in turn discussed the amount with Dean or LaRue, and then instructed Ulasewicz to make the delivery in a specified amount.

15.1 Anthony Ulasewicz testimony, 6 SSC 2227, 2231-36.
15.2 Herbert Kalmbach testimony, 5 SSC 2102, 2140-42.
15.3 Memorandum from Dorothy Hunt to William O. Bittman, October 2, 1972 (received from SSC).
come right down and that it would be on the ledge at the telephone booth.

Now, this gentleman is standing where the ledge is. There are two or three or four telephone books and there is a ledge above, a kind of space. I told him it would be a brown sack and that the money would be lying right there, would he come right down, if he walked right through and pick it up and go back to the elevator. I would be satisfied.

Mr. Lenzer. Now, thereafter, did an individual come down on the elevator?

Mr. Ulasewicz. We had a description of clothing as I phoned, as I recall, that he would be wearing a brown suit or something at that time.

Mr. Lenzer. Did somebody come down wearing those clothes?

Mr. Ulasewicz. Yes.

Mr. Lenzer. Where were you at that time?

Mr. Ulasewicz. I was in a telephone booth. I had it half shut. There was another person in a booth. These booths on weekdays are very heavily used. There is a newsstand section in front. There is quite a bit of traffic on a weekday. This was taken on a Saturday afternoon.

He came right out of this elevator, the first elevator, and walked right over, picked it up, walked right back in, and went up.

Mr. Lenzer. Now, Mr. Ulasewicz, rather than having you go back and forth several times between the table and the easel, I would like to go ahead and continue, if it is OK, and have you describe other contacts that you made with individuals you furnished with money.

Did there come a time later when Mr. Kalmbach instructed you to furnish funds to Mrs. Hunt?

Mr. Ulasewicz. Yes, that is correct.

Mr. Lenzer. Did you have a conversation with Mrs. Hunt where you arranged to furnish her with some funds?

Mr. Ulasewicz. Yes, I did.

Mr. Lenzer. Would you just describe what you told her, as to how she could pick up her money?

Mr. Ulasewicz. I told Mrs. Hunt that at a certain time in the day, and I picked an hour, to come into the lounge of the American Airlines, which is a long lounge area, leading right through the building. There are ticket desks on one side, seats in the center and it is a very busy area. And at the center of that, she should check with the time on a large clock, so it would be almost exactly at that time. It would be 12 noon and if she saw 5 to 12, to go back out and come back at that time.

She followed instructions explicitly.

In the meantime, whatever drop I would have at the time, I would put in this particular locker and take the key. [79] And just before, when I pulled up with the instructions, now, 5 minutes before I knew she was coming, there was opposite, and about 25 feet away, across from Northwest Orient Airlines, there is a series of telephone booths, five or six booths [81], and there is a newsstand across and there is a bit of traffic.

Before making the arrangements, I spent some time observing the telephone booths and of all the booths, watching people going in and out, the most I saw in one for some reason, people didn't use the very end one. So that is the reason I used that and left the key.

So 5 minutes prior to the time I would tell her to come, I would go into this telephone booth and underneath where the coin drop is, I

*Figures in brackets indicate exhibit numbers being referred to. Exhibits appear on pp. 2228-2230.
would scotch tape the key to the locker where I made my drop. [80]*

Then I would leave that area and either go by the newsstand opposite or—this would be where the phone booth would be. This is a lounge, where she would be coming through in this direction. [81]* This is a window for airplane observation by the public, et cetera, and I would probably be in this area, walk there, would be a little further behind, where I could watch the booth. Her directions were the same thing, don't hesitate, go right into the booth, remove the key, go to the locker. The locker would be 25 feet, I guess, or so across the corridor.

Mr. LENZNER. Now, before she arrived on the first occasion, did you also have a description of her, the clothes she was going to wear?

Mr. ULASEWICZ. Yes; she mentioned that day she would be wearing a blue outfit and I think she said her hair in a clip back off the shoulders.

Mr. LENZNER. Now, I believe on May 19 of this year, when we went out to that phone booth with you, there was some scotch tape underneath that telephone box?

Mr. ULASEWICZ. That is correct.
Mr. LENZNER. Now, did you observe her on the first occasion come by, pick up the key, and go over to the box, which I think is X-301, and remove funds that you had left there?

Mr. ULASEWICZ. That is correct.
Mr. LENZNER. Did you see her do that on other occasions?

Mr. ULASEWICZ. On two other occasions.
Mr. LENZNER. Now, the first occasion, how much money did you leave in that box?

Mr. ULASEWICZ. $40,000.
Mr. LENZNER. The second occasion?

Mr. ULASEWICZ. I will just refer to the notes.
Mr. LENZNER. Sure.
Mr. ULASEWICZ. I mentioned there was one occasion that Mr. Hunt came. I mentioned actually there were four drops to the Hunts.

Mr. LENZNER. Four drops to the Hunts—three to Mrs. Hunt and one to Mr. Hunt?

Mr. ULASEWICZ. That is correct. There were $43,000 the second time, $18,000 the third, and $53,300 on the last occasion, which was September 19.

Mr. LENZNER. All right, sir. Now, I take it you had the telephone booth under observation from the lounge after you left the key until at some point when Mrs. Hunt picked up the key?

Mr. ULASEWICZ. Correct.
Mr. LENZNER. What if someone had come in and found that, Mr. Ulasewicz, while you were watching?

Mr. ULASEWICZ. Well, he would be very quickly relieved of that key. I think that is the best I can answer. Why put myself in that position?

Mr. LENZNER. I take it that was the purpose of keeping the booth under observation?

Mr. ULASEWICZ. Correct.
Mr. LENZNER. Did there come a time when you were instructed by Mr. Kulbach to deliver funds to Mr. Liddy?

Mr. ULASEWICZ. Correct.
Mr. LENZNER. Do you remember approximately when that was?

*Figures in brackets indicate exhibit numbers being referred to. Exhibits appear on pp. 2228-2230.
Mr. Ulasewicz. That was in July of 1972.
Mr. Lenzner. Did you contact Mr. Liddy and give him instructions as to how that money would be delivered?
Mr. Ulasewicz. I did.
Mr. Lenzner. How much was that, by the way?
Mr. Ulasewicz. $8,000.
Mr. Lenzner. All right, sir. Now, will you explain what you told Mr. Liddy?
Mr. Ulasewicz. I contacted Mr. Liddy. I had taken the phone number from Mrs. Hunt. She had made those arrangements, saying they needed money, and Kalmbach came back to me, delivered the money, $78,000. In that conversation, he started, and it was the only one I had with him, he started on that occasion, started saying something about—again he thought I was in policymaking or some contact—and he said, "You can check with anyone and the stand-up guy," et cetera. I said, "Mr. Liddy, I am only delivering something in the package." He said "OK".

We made arrangements and in this instance, I placed the money in the locker at this end of the lobby and at the end of the lobby, the main area, where Eastern Airlines comes in here. [85]* I placed the money in the bottom locker. [82]* I placed the key in an envelope and placed it on a ledge here by the window [83]* and myself in a position back to observe, much in this fashion.

Mr. Lenzner. What is next to the travel—
Mr. Ulasewicz. Next to the Mutual?
Mr. Lenzner. Insurance.
Mr. Ulasewicz. Insurance situation here.
Mr. Lenzner. All right.
Mr. Ulasewicz. Then he came in and did as instructed, told him he would be wearing a shirt of some description. He came in, walked by me and he proceeded up—there is a flight of stairs which lead to an upper deck, and I watched him from up here [84]*, and I lost sight of him, he had gone into a corridor leading in here and he probably thought that there were lockers in this area, and he went, however, he came back in maybe 30 seconds or so, and looking at his key opened the thing and took the money.

Mr. Lenzner. Now did there come a time when you were asked to deliver money to Mr. Fred LaRue by Mr. Kalmbach?
Mr. Ulasewicz. Yes.
Mr. Lenzner. Was that in September of 1972?
Mr. Ulasewicz. That is correct.
Mr. Lenzner. And approximately how much was that?
Mr. Ulasewicz. $29,000.
Mr. Lenzner. What arrangements did you make with Mr. LaRue to deliver those funds?
Mr. Ulasewicz. The instructions at that time from Mr. Kalmbach were there were two deliveries that day, one earlier to Mrs. Hunt in a manner as I described, and the second one to Mr. LaRue—shall I go into the entire conversation at this point?
Mr. Lenzner. Sure, go ahead.
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Mr. Ulasewicz. Mr. LaRue, Mr. Kalmbach said, gave me a telephone number and said, "Contact Mr. LaRue at 6 p.m. and Mr. LaRue lives in the Watergate apartments," which, of course, was a little surprise to me, and now we are back into the Watergate deal [laughter] and he said to leave, Mr. LaRue suggested that I leave the package at the desk and I said to Mr. Kalmbach that at no point have I been observed and I have been obeying the instructions as best as I know how and I certainly am not going to walk in and leave it at the desk because that is a third party. He said, "All right, handle it any way you want, as usual," et cetera.

What I did is there is a garage opposite where Mr. LaRue lived in the Watergate, his entrance had one telephone booth and it was very—it was being used quite a bit—so I didn't go there but I hated to go to where I did go, which was the Howard Johnson Hotel across from Watergate which was used in the original situation and that is where I wound up.

I placed the key, I called Mr. LaRue, and asked him to come down, I had a package, he was waiting the call—6 p.m. exactly, he was awaiting the call and he says fine, he would be right down. I had never met Mr. LaRue. I asked him to put two magazines under his arm, come across the street, come into the motel entrance and the money would be on the ledge in the motel.

When he came out, it is a wide street, I watched him through the motel window here [86] and he had two magazines. He stopped at the island because of heavy traffic, when he stepped off the island he was now approaching. I laid the money on the ledge in the envelope and I proceeded through a door back to the cigarette machines and I could see him come in, pick up the money, hesitate a moment, go right out and go back, back to his apartment.

Mr. Lenzner. So you had the money and him under observation until such time as he picked it up?

Mr. Ulasewicz. That is correct.

Mr. Lenzner. Thank you very much, Mr. Ulasewicz.

Can you return now to the table and we will go back and pick up some more of your conversations with Mrs. Hunt.

Now, after you delivered your $25,000 to Mr. Bittman, did you so advise Mr. Kalmbach that you had made that delivery?

Mr. Ulasewicz. I did.

Mr. Lenzner. Now, after that, did you receive another phone call from Mr. Kalmbach instructing you to contact the writer or the writer's wife?

Mr. Ulasewicz. Yes, and he gave me the telephone number to the writer's residence.

Mr. Lenzner. Who were you to call on that first occasion?

Mr. Ulasewicz. The writer, who would be Mr. Hunt.

Mr. Lenzner. And did you have any instructions? What were you supposed to say to him?

Mr. Ulasewicz. That a listing of the cost of the script and the same routine, the actors and who may be concerned in that show.

Mr. Lenzner. Did you call the number that Mr. Kalmbach had given you?

Mr. Ulasewicz. No. The telephone number?

Mr. Lenzner. Yes.

Mr. Ulasewicz. Yes, I did call.
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Mr. Lenzner. Did you have a conversation—did you ask for the writer and talk to somebody out there?

Mr. Ulasewicz. Yes, I spoke to a male whom I assumed was the writer. He was evasive and wouldn’t recognize my call in any way, and that was the end of that call, and I got back to Mr. Kalmbach who then—I had to await a return call, and the return call was to call again—and that if the writer’s wife, ask for the writer’s wife which, of course, was Mrs. Hunt.

Mr. Lenzner. Did you call and ask for the writer’s wife and talk to somebody?

Mr. Ulasewicz. I did, and she answered the phone.

Mr. Lenzner. And you identified yourself as Mr. Rivers?

Mr. Ulasewicz. Right.

Mr. Lenzner. And what—

Mr. Ulasewicz. She was expecting the call so that the contact was first made at this point with Mrs. Hunt.

Mr. Lenzner. Could you describe the conversations that you had with Mrs. Hunt?

Mr. Ulasewicz. Yes. I told her that I was calling regarding the figures and Mrs. Hunt stated that she started with a list of necessities of attorneys, attorney fees, and she went into the persons down, referring to people down South, with the necessity for aid.

Mr. Lenzner. I take it, Mr. Ulasewicz, you had a series of phone conversations during July of 1972 with Mrs. Hunt?

Mr. Ulasewicz. That is correct.

Mr. Lenzner. Well, can you tell the committee the substance of what those conversations concerned?

Mr. Ulasewicz. Initially, Mrs. Hunt was—when she went into figures—I would inform her that I am not to negotiate, I was simply in a position to deliver whatever was necessary. However, she injected herself continually and early feeling that I would pass a message on or something of that type. She started out initially in the early conversation requesting rather than demanding or building up, but she would mention—that she had lost her own job due to this and that should be taken into consideration, and that with that there are certain things with the job that, for instance, hospitalization, and whatever benefits might be there, that had been lost, and that she thought that perhaps $10,000 or $15,000 might—and this is no matter how many times I would try to stop her she would continue in with that. She said she was sure the same situation was occurring, and there was apparently—the calls I cannot separate completely but where it started from the four instances of dropping the money, she started with this suggestive way and then got into it heavier each time. Subsequently, she would mention the necessity of, that Mrs. Liddy was undergoing some psychiatric treatment or might be undergoing, and that she was a school teacher and that she probably would not be able to work as a result of this and that should be another amount of money.

When she spoke of costs to Mr. Hunt, her husband, Mr. McCord, Mr. Liddy, she gave figures of approximately $3,000 a month would be satisfactory, and she had hoped that that might be done in some multiples so we would not go through this thing monthly, and then she mentioned the name of Barker and he was particularly—this is in the four conversations, not all in this one.
Mr. Lenzner: I understand.

Mr. Ulasewicz: And it built up in that and no matter how many times I would say I am not negotiating, she got her bit in, and, of course, it continued in that manner.

When she got into Barker, she explained Mr. Barker had some peculiar problem in this matter. He was dealing with the people down South, that others may have become involved other than they started originally—there were some bail problems down South. She mentioned that she, in the course of these conversations over this period of time, that she was the one that was delivering the money to the various people after she had obtained it from me. Then she mentioned Sturgis, Gonzales, Martinez, and when she had mentioned Barker, she mentioned a sum of $10,000 for under-the-table, and she mentioned Barker with his problems and with other people suggesting that there were others possibly involved, and this is toward the final calls, so excuse me.

Mr. Lenzner: With reference to Mr. Barker let us just stick with him for a second. When she made reference to him she was asking or seeking a specific sum of money, is that correct?

Mr. Ulasewicz: Yes, with Mr. Barker.

Mr. Lenzner: Yes, sir.

Mr. Ulasewicz: She was asking a sum of money which wound up to $23,000.

Mr. Lenzner: How did she break that down?

Mr. Ulasewicz: She broke it down $10,000 bail, $10,000 under-the-table, and $3,000 for other expenses he was incurring with either coming in this area and going back down or suggesting something of that type.

Mr. Lenzner: Then, when she spoke about her own expenses for—

I take it, travel for delivering these funds?

Mr. Ulasewicz: Right.

Mr. Lenzner: How much was she seeking for that?

Mr. Ulasewicz: $5,000 for her personal expenses.

Mr. Lenzner: When she talked about her travels, did she also discuss with you her concern about the people down South and what assurances they might be given?

Mr. Ulasewicz: She wanted to, she was concerned that they receive money likewise for the support of their families and for attorneys.

Mr. Lenzner: Was there any discussion concerning the impending trial and its effect on the people down South?

Mr. Ulasewicz: Yes; that some of them were getting uneasy, were getting nervous, and she intimated that unless the money was forthcoming that that certainly would help alleviate the situation.

Mr. Lenzner: You spoke about multiple sums, and I take it—by the way you were transmitting these requests, these concerns of Mrs. Hunt to Mr. Kalmbach?

Mr. Ulasewicz: Continually; and no action taken until he would come back with an answer.

Mr. Lenzner: And was there an answer to the multiple sums that Mrs. Hunt was seeking for the defendants?

Mr. Ulasewicz: Yes; it was to be $15,000 to McCord, Liddy, and Hunt, $6,000 to Barker, $4,000 to Sturgis, $2,000 to Gonzales, $2,000 to Martinez.
Mr. LENZNER. And for how long a period was that to cover?

Mr. ULASEWICZ. Five months.

Mr. LENZNER. Now, in a later phone conversation with Mrs. Hunt, did that become a matter of concern?

Mr. ULASEWICZ. Yes; she said it was causing a problem down South because it so happened that they were concerned because the 5 months ended up in a period just after the election, and from that I gathered they feared that that was deliberate, and I reminded Mrs. Hunt she is the one that brought this matter up and I was cutting it off and as I did with the negotiations and I said, "I certainly do not think that is any situation here that I am concerned with, you will have to stick with the amount, the cost of the script," and so forth.

Mr. LENZNER. When you say down South, by the way, Mr. Ulasewicz, what are you referring to, do you know what Mrs. Hunt was referring to?

Mr. ULASEWICZ. The Florida area, Florida.

Mr. LENZNER. Now, was there also a discussion with Mrs. Hunt about the attorneys in the case?

Mr. ULASEWICZ. Yes; there was.

Mr. LENZNER. Would you tell us what she said to you about the attorneys?

Mr. ULASEWICZ. She said the attorneys, and she mentioned names of the defendants and their attorneys—she mentioned $25,000 for Bittman for Hunt. Now, this was in addition, and I do not know if she knew I delivered the $25,000, but she did present to me again in this text that Hunt and Bittman, $25,000; that McCord with Lee Bailey, $25,000; Liddy with Maroulis, $25,000; Barker with Rothblatt, $25,000. The three others, each $10,000, a total of $90,000.

Mr. LENZNER. All right. You were transmitting again those figures to Mr. Kalmbach?

Mr. ULASEWICZ. Correct.

Mr. LENZNER. Now, when you delivered your first delivery of $40,000 to Mrs. Hunt at National Airport, how was that figure arrived at?

Mr. ULASEWICZ. Mr. Kalmbach gave me that figure, and at that time, it was the only time in these that he—in that message was to say a certain amount for people—and it was just like a down payment, because it was obvious that the $75,000 was not going to cover into what we were getting.

Mr. LENZNER. And as a result you later picked up the various locations initial fund.

Mr. ULASEWICZ. Additional sums.

Mr. LENZNER. By the way, did there come a time when you totaled up the amounts of money that Mrs. Hunt was seeking?

Mr. ULASEWICZ. Well, it was, yes, it was in the vicinity of $400,000 to $450,000.

Mr. LENZNER. And did you have a conversation with Mr. Kalmbach concerning that figure and Mrs. Hunt's demands on you in California when you went to pick up the $75,000 out there?

Mr. ULASEWICZ. Yes; that was in August, and it was the last pickup from Mr. Kalmbach, and shall I go through it?

Mr. LENZNER. Yes, why don't you tell us what you said to him and he said to you.
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Mr. DASH. Mr. Ulasewicz would use an alias?
Mr. KALMBACH. Yes, he would.
Mr. DASH. Do you know what Mr. Ulasewicz' alias was during this transaction?
Mr. KALMBACH. No, I think there were several.
Mr. DASH. Does the name Rivers make—
Mr. KALMBACH. That was one of those, yes, sir.
Mr. DASH. Did he suggest that name?
Mr. KALMBACH. Well, I do not know whether he did or whether I did, but in our conversation—but then back, I would then report to either Mr. Dean or Mr. LaRue who would give us the directions or give me the directions. I would then give Mr. Ulasewicz the directions, he would then make the contact with the people.
Mr. DASH. Under your direction your conversation would be with Mr. Ulasewicz on the telephone?
Mr. KALMBACH. Yes, sir.
Mr. DASH. And they would be from telephone booth to telephone booth.
Mr. KALMBACH. Yes, usually.
Mr. DASH. Could you just give me a scenario how you would contact Mr. Ulasewicz, or how he would contact you, what one would say to the other, and how you would do it?
Mr. KALMBACH. Well, if there is a typical, and I don't know if there is, but it would, I would receive a call either from Mr. Dean or Mr. LaRue with instructions to get an amount of funds over to one of the defendants or one of the attorneys. I would then call Mr. Ulasewicz, and so inform him.
Mr. DASH. You would call him and reach him at his home number?
Mr. KALMBACH. I would reach him in New York at his home number.
Mr. DASH. What would you tell him to do?
Mr. KALMBACH. I would call him from a pay phone. He would then—he told me the number of another pay phone and 15 minutes later I would call him and he would be at the pay phone.
Mr. DASH. When you called him did you use a telephone credit card?
Mr. KALMBACH. No, always it was in cash and it was using a good number of quarters.
Mr. DASH. Putting a lot of quarters in the telephone as you went along?
Mr. KALMBACH. Yes, sir.
Mr. DASH. And when you referred to particular people who received, who would receive that, take for instance Mr. Hunt, did you have a particular code name for Mr. Hunt?
Mr. KALMBACH. I think we did. I think we called Mr. Hunt, just called him “The Writer,” he had been an author, we called him “The Writer.” I think we called Mrs. Hunt “The Writer’s Wife.”
I don’t know that we had any other names for anyone else.
Mr. DASH. Did you have any particular code name for the money that was being distributed?
Mr. KALMBACH. No. If there is a code name the name developed in—when I was at the Statler and Mr. Ulasewicz came down to receive the $75,100 that I had received from Mr. Staun, he came into the room and he didn’t have a briefcase with him, so he just went to the shelf
the instructions to Mr. Ulasewicz to contact Mr. Caddy. And I think
those instructions were received within a period of a few days after
I returned on the 30th.
I thereupon called Mr. Ulasewicz' home in New York and gave him
those instructions. He then went to Washington and there were several
calls back and forth, I think, between he and Mr. Caddy. Then he
would then call me. I would then contact either Mr. Dean or Mr.
LaRue until finally, at one point, eventually, it was clear that Mr.
Caddy would not receive the funds.
Senator Gurney. You say he would not receive them?
Mr. Kalmbach. Yes, sir.
Senator Gurney. Well, now, what eventually happened to them?
Mr. Kalmbach. Well, eventually, Senator, I think that an attempt
was made to contact Mr. O'Brien, with the same result. Mr. O'Brien
would not accept delivery of the funds.
Senator Gurney. Now, this is an attempt on the part of Mr.
Ulasewicz?
Mr. Kalmbach. Yes, sir; at my direction, and I had received the
direction from either Mr. Dean or Mr. LaRue.
Senator Gurney. Go on.
Mr. Kalmbach. Then I think it was in the second week of July that
eventually, a delivery was made of $25,000, I think to Mr. Bittman,
by Mr. Ulasewicz, again at my direction and after I had received
directions from either Mr. Dean or Mr. LaRue.
Senator Gurney. In other words, that $25,000 was turned over by
either Dean or LaRue instructing you to instruct Ulasewicz to give
it to Bittman?
Mr. Kalmbach. Yes, sir; that is right.
Senator Gurney. Now, that accounts for $25,000. What about the
$5,100—$50,100?
Mr. Kalmbach. Well, sir; my recollection is that I think Mr. Ulase-
wiecz disbursed some $8,000 to Mr. Liddy. I know that I had instructed
Mr. Ulasewicz to deduct from the funds that I gave to him whatever
he needed for his expenses.
Senator Gurney. Was this $8,000 to Liddy upon your instructions?
Mr. Kalmbach. Yes, sir; I am certain that it was.
Senator Gurney. Received from whom?
Mr. Kalmbach. From Mr. Dean or Mr. LaRue.
Senator Gurney. Go on.
Mr. Kalmbach. And also, $1,000 was—I received $1,000 which I had
turned over to Mr. Strachan at the White House in response to his
request for $1,000.
Senator Gurney. All right.
Mr. Kalmbach. About that time, Senator, I received some $40,000
from Mr. LaRue—I think it was on the 19th of July—which I
gave to Mr. Ulasewicz, and from that time forward, I think my mem-
ory is that almost all of the funds went to Mrs. Hunt, with some
$30,000 going to Mr. LaRue on or about the 19th or 18th or 19th of
September—that when the final payment was made to Mr.—one pay-
ment of some $30,000 to Mr. LaRue and, I think it was some little
more than $50,000 to Mrs. Hunt at that time.
Senator Gurney. Well, if we can go back now, we were down to
we accounted for $34,000 out of the $75,000.
Mr. Kalmbach. Yes, sir.

Senator Gurney. Which would leave $11,000, plus another $10,000 from LaRue—$11,000. Now, at that point, what happened as far as the instructions to do something with the $11,000? What was the next step?

Mr. Kalmbach. Senator, throughout this period, several times, I received instructions to instruct Mr. Ulasewicz as to disbursements and as I say, I think most of those disbursements after mid-July. I think went to Mrs. Hunt, who in turn distributed funds to various of the defendants and to various of the attorneys involved.

Senator Gurney. Well, can you give us a little better understanding than that. Did you receive word from Dean or LaRue to give a amount to Mrs. Hunt?

Mr. Kalmbach. Yes, sir. I remember that, I was told from time to time to give a amount to Mrs. Hunt.

Senator Gurney. Do you remember what those amounts were and when?

Mr. Kalmbach. No, sir. But in reconstructing this history in trying to develop what the amounts were and to whom these funds went, my memory is that approximately $150,000 or thereabouts went to Mrs. Hunt, out of which certain of the attorneys were paid and various of the defendants. Beyond that $150,000, there was $30,000 that was given to Mr. LaRue in the final disbursement. Twenty-five thousand dollars was given to Mr. Bittman. I think $8,000 was given to Mr. Liddy, as I remember it, $1,000 to Mr. Ulasewicz, and $1,000 which I retained and delivered to Mr. Strachan. Now that total is approximately $219,000.

Senator Gurney. And the amount, as I recall, was $219,000?

Mr. Kalmbach. Yes, sir.

Senator Gurney. So then as I understand it this rather large amount to Mrs. Hunt, approximately $150,000 was paid from time to time and you don't actually recall the specific dates and the amounts?

Mr. Kalmbach. No, sir; I do not. I don't recall—I recall with particularity the dates when I received funds, but I don't recall with anything like particularity as to the dates that I called Mr. Ulasewicz or when instructions were given to Mr. Ulasewicz to make these disbursements and, as I said, after mid-July, I think most of all of the money went to Mrs. Hunt who, in turn, distributed the funds to various attorneys and other defendants, plus the $30,000 that went to Mr. LaRue in September.

Senator Gurney. What is your recollection of the instructions that you were receiving from Mr. Dean or Mr. LaRue at this time so far as payments to Mrs. Hunt are concerned?

Mr. Kalmbach. Well, the instructions as I remember it, were to give her funds for attorneys, and I recall the names of the attorneys over and above Mr. Bittman, Mr. Rothblatt. I think, Mr. Bailey and Mr. Maroulis, plus there were attorneys for—but I never, I could not, I do not remember the names of attorneys for other of the defendants and a lesser amount was given to those attorneys, some three attorneys for three of the defendants.

Senator Gurney. Who did the instructions come mainly from, Mr. Dean or Mr. LaRue?
Mr. KALMBACh. Well, initially it's my recollection that they came primarily from Mr. Dean, but shortly thereafter or shortly into the period there they began to come more from Mr. LaRue or although I always gained it interchangeably, Senator.

Senator GERNERY. In the raising of the money, as I understand it you received four amounts here that totaled $210,000. Where did most of the pressure come from to raise this money, do you recall that, from whom?

Mr. KALMBACh. No, sir. I was just—I was given my instructions, again by Mr. Dean or Mr. LaRue and then I recall that Mr. Ulasewicz would receive communications from the people that he was talking to and primarily Mrs. Hunt, which I would relay back to these people, and then I would relay again back down after I received my instructions, I would then call Mr. Ulasewicz.

Senator GERNERY. Just one final question, Mr. Kalmbach: Did you have any discussions following the break-in of Watergate down to now with the President?

Mr. KALMBACh. No, sir.

Senator GERNERY. About Watergate?

Mr. KALMBACh. No. Not at any time.

Senator GERNERY. Neither on the phone nor in person?

Mr. KALMBACh. No, sir.

Senator GERNERY. That is all, Mr. Chairman.

Senator ERVIN. Senator Talmadge.

Senator TALMADGE. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Kalmbach, I want to get into an area that you have not testified on, that we have had reports in the press about it. Are you familiar with funds going into the State of Alabama during the 1970 election?

Mr. KALMBACh. Senator, I am familiar with funds that I disbursed in 1970 under instructions. At that time—I had no knowledge as to where the ultimate distribution would be.

Senator TALMADGE. Will you tell us about that fund, please?

Mr. KALMBACh. Yes, sir. During the 1970 period I was raising funds toward the— in the senatorial races, and also I was directed by Mr. Higby on three different occasions to disburse funds out of trust funds that I had under my control. I recall that there was a call that Mr. Higby made to me, in—I think it was in late March of 1970—directing that I disburse $100,000 to someone there in New York. I took these funds from the box, safe deposit box, at the Chase Manhattan Bank in New York and delivered them to an individual at the Sherry-Netherland Hotel in New York.

Senator TALMADGE. Who was the individual?

Mr. KALMBACh. I did not know his name, and do not know him.

Senator TALMADGE. How did you know you gave the $100,000 to the right man?

Mr. KALMBACh. I was advised at a later date that I had given the funds to the right person.

Senator TALMADGE. Who gave you the instructions as to whom to meet and where?

Mr. KALMBACh. I talked to Mr. Higby, and he instructed me, and I said that I would deliver the funds at the Sherry-Netherland Hotel, and an individual then came up to me and the identification was proper, and I——
15.3 Note: The following document was received from the SSC. It may be a typed copy of an original document. The original document has not been located in the SSC files.
A went from 11 to Walker to Bittman for disbursement to def.
Memorandum to: Mr. William O. Dittman

From: Dorothy Hunt

Subject: Accounting of Monies Received

In July, I received and paid out the following amounts:

- $5,000  Bail money for Frank Sturgis
- $15,000 Income replacement James McCord
- $12,000 Bail at $4,000 each for Messrs. Barker, Martinez and Gonzalez
- $6,000 Income replacement for Mr. Barker
- $4,000 Income replacement for Mr. Sturgis
- $30,000 Income replacement for Mr. Hunt and Mrs. Hunt
- $3,000 Income replacement for Mr. Martinez
- $3,000 Income replacement for Mr. Gonzalez
- $10,000 Under-table bail money for Mr. Barker

(Note: Income replacement was for a period of July-Nov.)

In August, I gave Mr. Barker a total of $3,000 for expenses of travel for himself and others and for telephone expenses, and for interest paid on pawning of wife's jewelry.

In other words, I received a total of $88,000 and have paid out $91,000 (using the final $3,000 from my own funds)

You already have an accounting of the $53,500 received on September 19th.
16. On July 19, 1972 Porter falsely stated to FBI agents that the funds he had paid Liddy were for the purpose of conducting lawful political intelligence activities.


April 18, 1973 3:10 in the FBI Headquarters where I am now reviewing FBI 302's I will be reviewing the 302's of Magruder, Mr. Porter, Mr. Sloan, and Mr. LaRue.

The first interview will be of Mr. Herbert Lloyd Porter, 4340 Garfield St., N.W., Telephone Number 244-1823, Office address 1701 Pennsylvania Ave., N.W., Suite 417, Telephone 333-2615.

Mr. Porter was interviewed on July 19, 1972 by agents Michael L. Hanigan and Mr. Thomas Najeski. At this interview there was present Mr. Kenneth Wells Parkinson, attorney for the Committee. Porter stated that he was director of scheduling for the Committee. Porter stated that he was scheduled for the Committee to Reelect the President. Held the position since May 1, 1971 prior to that time he worked as a staff assistant at the White House under Herbert G. Klein, Director of Communications and his immediate supervisor at that time was Mr. Jeb Magruder, Deputy Director of Communications. His job was to schedule and coordinate the work of the circuit candidates for the president and to develop budgets, regarding employees of the staff and there salaries and to take care of the celebrities at particular functions. He stated that in either case that he directly handled funds. He stated that during his job of scheduling of at rallies and appearances of celebrities aware of possible demonstrations and demonstrators that would distract the message of the President. He was concerned for the safety of the celebrity and other prominent members of the either state government or federal government. He was also concerned that the film coverage would primarily cover the demonstrators. Among the names mentioned by Porter as potential demonstrators were Jerry Rubin and Abby Hoffman. He said he would need funds to obtain intelligence concerning potential appearance of demonstrators for the protection for circuit candidates. He discussed this problem with his superior Magruder at one point when he was asked how much he would need to gain such intelligence he answered roughly One Hundred Thousand dollars. This figure was based on ten individuals working undercover from January to November, 1972. Approximately $1,000 per person. Magruder suggested that a employee of the Committee, Mr. Liddy might be able to handle the job. In a meeting sometime in at the end of January 1972 Magruder met with Porter and Liddy and Magruder told Porter that Liddy would handle the responsibility for gaining the intelligence. The arrangement for the funds was explained by Mr. Magruder in the following way. That Porter would advise Mr. Sloan the amount of money he needed and that he would obtain this money from Sloan in Sloan's office which would be in the form of cash in $100 dollar bills, that Liddy would then come to Porter's office and count the money and furnish Porter a receipt. Porter would learn of the amount he needed to ask for from Sloan from Liddy. Porter stated that he couldn't understand why Magruder wanted him to serve as a conduit of the funds and that he destroyed the receipts which had been signed by Liddy. His
explanation was he didn't see any reason to keep them. What Porter stated that each time he received the money he was alone, it was placed in an envelope and that on one occasion he noticed that the envelope bore Sloan's name and address of 1701 Pennsylvania Ave., and it did not name the Committee. He was not sure whether the other envelopes were equally so identified. Between mid to late January 1972 and April 1, 1972 Liddy made about eight to ten requests for money. Usually the amounts were between one to five thousand dollars. Porter indicated that he gave Liddy during this time roughly $35,000 dollars. None of the money furnished to Liddy was ever returned Liddy to Porter, during this time Porter followed the procedure of notifying Sloan, obtained the money from Sloan and then personally giving the money to Liddy. In every case the money consisted of One hundred dollar bills. Porter stated that Liddy furnished three pieces of information in turn for funds received.

Prior to March 3, 1972 a rally in New Hampshire, Liddy stated that flyers were being circulated supporting anti-war demonstrations against the rally. Liddy estimated that some two hundred demonstrators would be presented.

Prior to March 9, 1972 rally at Miami Liddy advised that there would be a right-wing demonstration at the rally on behalf of supporters of the ASBROOK candidacy. Governor Pegan was to speak at this rally. Liddy also advised Porter that the convention were held in San Diego, California there might he as many as two hundred fifty thousand demonstrators present. Subsequent to April 1, 1972 Liddy made only one request for funds. This was prior to May 10 and Liddy requested Fifty three hundred dollars to cover demonstrations scheduled at the Capitol around May 10. Porter obtained the funds from Sloan, gave it to Liddy, and Liddy returned two thousands dollars to Porter. Porter had stated that he had decided no supervisory role over Liddy gaining of intelligence because he did not consider it to be his job. He felt it was the job of Magruder because Liddy was Magruder's employee. Porter stated he never heard the name of Howard Hunt prior to the newspaper stories. And that he was not familiar with anyone using the name of Edward Hamilton. He also stated that prior to employment of the committee he had never heard of his name and knew nothing about him. This was also true of Mr. McCord. He stated that he was unaware of Liddy's use of McCord for gathering intelligence. Porter said he asked or wanted to no the method Liddy used or intended to use to gain intelligence. This was because he felt it might be illegal but because this was not his responsibility. He said that Liddy never furnished him with any memorandum or vouchers or expenditures records or receipts for the money received.

Retyped from indistinct original
Mr. Porter was again interviewed on March 15, 1973 by special agents Angelo J. Lano. Porter was interviewed in his new capacity of Executive Director of the Inagural Committee, 2nd & T Sts. S.W.

The purpose of the interview was to obtain Porters knowledge of a particular publication "WHY A LIBERAL SHOULD VOTE FOR MCGOVERN" and that the interview was requested by the criminal division of the Department of Justice. Porter claimed that he could not recall positively about the fact that he recalled conversations concerning certain unknown persons at the committee to reelect the President. Another group named "Peace and Freedom Party" he did not recall having funded that party or any money used for pamphlets nor had he seen any of the pamphlets fitting the description of the one mentioned. He acknowledged disbursing from his post in the Committee with the approval of Mr. Magruder but his said his total expenditures during the period of time [sic] was about $52,000. Only $4,400 went to an individual with regard to something published. This individual was Mr. Phil Joanou, who requested the monies to print an ad relaying the support of the President's decision on the mining of Hyphon Harbor. Magruder approved the expenditure, and he obtained the money from Mr. Sloan.

Retyped from indistinct original
April 18, 1970 in the 34th District where I am now reviewing
the 34th's I will be reviewing the 30th's of Magruder, Mr. Porter,
Mr. Sloan, and Mr. elusive.

The first interview will be of Mr. Herbert Lloyd Porter, 1724
Parkfield Ct., N.W., Telephone number 291-1820, Office address
1701 Pennsylvania Ave., N.W., Suite 617, Telephone 333-2615.

Mr. Porter was interviewed on July 12, 1972 by agents Michael
L. Ensign and Mr. Thomas Hajaski at this interview there was
present Mr. Kenneth Wells Parkinson, attorney for the Committee.
Mr. Porter stated that he was director of scheduling for the Committee
to Reelect the President. Held the position since May 1, 1971
prior to that time he worked as a staff assistant at the White
House under Herbert G. Kline, Director of Communications and
his immediate supervisor at that time was Mr. Jeb Magruder,
Deputy Director of Communications, his job was to schedule
and coordinate the work of the circuit candidates for the
President and to develop budgets, regarding employees of
the staff and their salaries and to take care of the
celebrities at particular functions. He stated that in either
case that he directly handled funds. He stated that during his
job of scheduling of at rallies and appearances of celebrities
aware of possible demonstrations and demonstrators that would
distract the message of the President. He was concerned for the
safety of the celebrity and other prominent members of the either
state government or federal government. He was also concerned
that the film coverage would primarily cover the demonstrators.
Among the names mentioned by Porter as potential demonstrators
were Jerry Rubin and Abby Hoffman. He said he would need funds
to obtain intelligence concerning potential appearance of
demonstrators for the protection of circuit candidates. He
discussed this problem with his superior Magruder at one point
when he was asked how much he would need to gain such intelligence
he answered roughly One Hundred Thousand dollars. This figure was
based on ten individuals working undercover from Jan.-Nov., 1972
Approximately $1,000 per person. Magruder suggested that an employee
of the Committee, Mr. Liddy might be able to handle the job. In
a meeting sometime in the end of January 72 Magruder met with Porter
and Liddy and Magruder told Porter that Liddy would handle the
responsibility of gaining the intelligence. The arrangement for the
funds was explained by Mr. Magruder in the following way. That
Porter would advise Mr. Sloan the amount of money he needed and that
he would obtain this money from Sloan in Sloan's office which would
be in the form of cash in $100 dollar bills, that Liddy would then
come to Porter's office and count the money and furnish Porter a
receipt. Porter would learn of the amount he needed to ask for
from Sloan from Liddy. Porter stated that he couldn't understand
why Magruder wanted him to serve as a conduit of the funds and that
he destroyed the receipts which had been signed by Liddy. His
Prior to March 3, 1972 a rally in New Hampshire, Liddy stated that flyers were being circulated supporting anti-war demonstrations against the rally. Liddy estimated that some two hundred demonstrators would be present.

Prior to March 9, 1972 rally at Miami Liddy advised that there would be a right-wing demonstration at the rally on behalf of supporters of the ASBROCK candidacy. Governor Reagan was to speak at this rally. Liddy also advised Porter that the convention were held in San Diego, California there might be as many as two hundred fifty thousand demonstrators present. Subsequent to April 1, 1972 Liddy made only one request for funds. This was prior to May 10 and Liddy requested fifty thousand dollars to cover demonstrations scheduled at the Capitol around May 10. Porter obtained the funds from Sloan, gave it to Liddy, and Liddy returned two thousand dollars to Porter. Porter had stated that he had decided no supervisory role over Liddy gaining of intelligence because he did not consider it to be his job. He felt it was the job of Magruder because Liddy was Magruder's employee. Porter stated he never heard the name of Howard Hunt prior to the newspaper stories. And that he was not familiar with anyone using the name of Edward Hamilton. He also stated that prior to employment of the committee he had never heard of his name and knew nothing about him. This was also true of Mr. McCord. He stated that he was unaware of Liddy's use of McCord for gathering intelligence. Porter said he asked or wanted to no the method Liddy used or intended to use to gain intelligence. This was because he felt it might be illegal but because this was not his responsibility. He said that Liddy never furnished him with any recommendations or vouchers or expenditures toward expenses.
Mr. Porter was again interviewed on March 15, 1973 by special agents Angelo J. Disn. Porter was interviewed in his new capacity of Executive Director of the Imperial Committee, 2nd & 7 Sts., S.W. The purpose of the interview was to obtain Porter's knowledge of a particular publication "MA A HERN SHOULD VOTE FOR RICHARDS" and that the interview was requested by the criminal division of the Department of Justice. Porter claimed that he could not recall positively about the fact that he recalled conversations concerning certain unknown persons at the committee to realact the President. Another group named "Peace and Freedom Party" he did not recall having funded that party or any money used for pamphlets nor had he seen any of the pamphlets fitting the description of the one mentioned. He acknowledged disbursing from his post in the Committee with the approval of Mr. Magruder but his said his total expenditures during the period of time was about $52,000. Only $4,400 went to an individual with regard to something published. This individual was Mr. Phil Joano, who requested the money to print an ad relying the support of the President's decision on the mining of Tyton Harbor. Magruder approved the expenditure, and he obtained the money from Mr. Sloan.
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA  
v.  
HERBERT L. PORTER,  
Defendant.

Criminal No. 74-32

Violation of 18 U.S.C. § 1001  
(False Statements to Government Agency)

INFORMATION

The United States of America, by its Attorney,  
the Special Prosecutor, Watergate Special Prosecution Force; charges:

On or about July 19, 1972, in the District of Columbia, HERBERT L. PORTER, the DEFENDANT, did knowingly and willfully make false, fictitious and fraudulent statements and representations to agents of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, United States Department of Justice, which Department was then investigating a matter within its jurisdiction.

(In violation of Title 18, United States Code, Section 1001)

LEON JAWORSKI  
SPECIAL PROSECUTOR
United States District Court for the District of Columbia

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PARTIES</th>
<th>ATTORNEYS</th>
<th>CRIMINAL NO.</th>
<th>D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UNITED STATES VS. HERBERT L. PORTER</td>
<td>Office of United States Attorney for the District of Columbia</td>
<td>74-392</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**CHARGE:**
18 USC 1001 (False Statements to Government Agency)

**DATE:** 1-28-74
**PR. r/conditions:**
32451 Mediterranean Drive, Laguna, Niguel, California

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>PROCEEDING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1974Jan 21</td>
<td>INFORMATION FILED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1974Jan 21</td>
<td>APPEARANCE of Charles B. Murray, Esq., filed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1974Jan 21</td>
<td>WAIVER of Indictment &amp; INFORMATION filed in Open Court;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1974Jan 21</td>
<td>Court directs that case be randomly assigned.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1974Jan 21</td>
<td>ORDER directing that case be randomly assigned to a Judge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1974Jan 21</td>
<td>other than Judge Richey. (N) SIRICA, C.J.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1974Jan 28</td>
<td>CASE subsequently assigned randomly to Judge Bryant.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1974Jan 28</td>
<td>ARRAIGNED: PLEA OF GUILTY entered to Information (18 USC 1001);</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1974Jan 28</td>
<td>Referred; Oral Motion of defendant for release on Personal Recognizance pending sentence heard and granted; Oral motion of Special Prosecutor that Probation Report be made available, prior to sentencing heard and granted; personal recognizance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1974Jan 28</td>
<td>BRYANT, J Rep-Phyllis Harper Charles B. Murray, Atty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1974Jan 28</td>
<td>ORDER for release of defendant on Personal Recognizance with conditions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1974Jan 28</td>
<td>Defendant released from Court Room.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(CONTINUED)
**CRIMINAL DOCKET**

United States District Court for the District of Columbia

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Proceedings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1974 Apr 11</td>
<td>SENTENCE: Not less than Five (5) Months nor more than Fifteen (15) Months.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SERVE 30 days; balance of sentence suspended; Unsupervised Probation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>One (1) Year; Defendant directed to report to U.S. Marshal's Office.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>312 North Spring Street, Los Angeles, California no later than 10 A.M.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Los Angeles time), Monday, April 22, 1974. Court recommends commitment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>to Federal Correctional Institution at Lompoc, California; Defendant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>permitted to remain on Personal Recognizance until he reports to U.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Marshal in Los Angeles, California April 22, 1974; personal recognizance.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**JUDGMENT & COMMITMENT**

BRYANT, J Rep- Joan Blair Charles B. Murray, Atty
17. On July 20, 1972 Magruder falsely stated to FBI agents that he had authorized Sloan to permit Liddy to spend up to $250,000 to gather intelligence information for use in attempting to prevent disruption at the convention and at speeches by surrogate celebrities and political figures. Magruder has testified that he had volunteered at one point "to take the heat" but that the decision was that if it got to him it would go higher.

17.1 Jeb Magruder testimony, 2 SSC 802-03.

17.2 Jeb Magruder, SSC report of FBI 302 interview, July 20, 1972 (received from SSC).
Mr. DASH. What was that story, Mr. Magruder, that you finally came up with?

Mr. MAGRUDER. What we did was we simply took factual activity that we had asked Mr. Liddy to do and we exaggerated to a great extent the amount of money spent on those activities to the tune of the $200,000.

I asked Mr. Porter to, would he be willing to work with us on this cover-up story and, as he has testified, he indicated that he did.

So he took care of, in effect, $100,000 and I took care of, in effect, $150,000 by indicating that Mr. Liddy had legal projects for us in the intelligence field, and we worked over this story with Mr. Mitchell, Mr. Dean, Mr. LaRue, and Mr. Mardian, although Mr. Mardian has participated to a much lesser extent with me than the others did. My primary contacts on the story were Mr. Dean and Mr. Mitchell.

Mr. DASH. All of these persons that you have named—you finally did arrive at the story and they knew in fact what actually had occurred?

Mr. MAGRUDER. Yes; they did.

Mr. DASH. Could you tell us why the story required that the break-in involvement be cut off at Mr. Liddy and not at you?

Mr. MAGRUDER. Well, there was some discussion about me and I volunteered at one point that maybe I was the guy who ought to take the heat, because it was going to get to me, and we knew that. And I think it was, there were some takers on that, but basically, the decision was that because I was in a position where they knew that I had no authority to either authorize funds or make policy in that committee, that if it got to me, it would go higher. Whereas Mr. Liddy, because of his past background, it was felt that that would be believable that Mr. Liddy was truly the one who did originate it. And, of course, it was true, I think, that Mr. Liddy did originate the plan, was basically the one who did come up with these ideas in specific terms.

We felt that was more believable than somebody like myself who did not have any background in this area authorizing these kinds of sums of money and authorizing this type of program when it was known full well throughout the committee and White House that I had no such authority.

Mr. DASH. Now, did you tell this story that was developed to Mr. Parkinson and Mr. O'Brien, who were representing the committee?

Mr. MAGRUDER. After July 4, Mr. Mardian brought Mr. Parkinson into my office and said to me that he would like me to tell the true story. I said, "You mean the true story"—which you know, at that time, we were dealing in a number of stories, and he said, "No; I want the true story."

I then for 2 hours, I think, told Mr. Parkinson the true story.

Mr. DASH. But later, you then told Mr. O'Brien and Mr. Parkinson the story that had been developed and agreed to by the other parties you mentioned?

Mr. MAGRUDER. Yes; that is correct.

Mr. DASH. When were you first called before the grand jury, Mr. Magruder?
Mr. Magruder. My first grand jury appearance was July 5, it was just an organizational appearance, in effect, who was who in the committee.

The second appearance was on August 16, which was—

Mr. Dash. Before that appearance, were you interviewed by the Federal Bureau of Investigation?

Mr. Magruder. Yes; immediately after my grand jury appearance, I was interviewed by the Federal Bureau, or soon thereafter.

Mr. Dash. At the time you were interviewed by the FBI, had the story been developed?

Mr. Magruder. We still had not come up with the money amount, but other than that, we basically had developed the guidelines to the story, yes.

Mr. Dash. When you were interviewed by the FBI, did you tell this false story to the FBI?

Mr. Magruder. Yes; I did.

Mr. Dash. You say you were next brought before the grand jury when?

Mr. Magruder. In August, August 18.

Mr. Dash. When you testified to the grand jury that time, did you testify to the false story?

Mr. Magruder. Yes; I did.

Mr. Dash. What role did Mr. Dean play in preparing you for your second grand jury appearance?

Mr. Magruder. On the day before the grand jury appearance, I was aware that I was a target of the grand jury at that time. So, I was briefed by our lawyers and Mr. Mardian. Also, I was interrogated for approximately 2 hours by Mr. Dean and approximately 3/4 hour in a general way by Mr. Mitchell.

Mr. Dash. Now, after you appeared before the grand jury for the second time, did Mr. Dean give you any report?

Mr. Magruder. Yes; the day after Mr. Dean indicated that I would not be indicted.

Mr. Dash. Did he tell you how he knew that?

Mr. Magruder. No; he did not.

Mr. Dash. By the way, were you not aware of Mr. Dean's participation, you were aware, were you not, that Mr. Dean worked in the White House and did report to Mr. Ehrlichman and Mr. Haldeeman?

Mr. Magruder. Yes, sir.

Mr. Dash. And I think you yourself, when you testified before us in executive session, indicated that you were familiar with the roles that you played at that time and that Dean played?

Mr. Magruder. Yes; that is correct.

Mr. Dash. What was your understanding, therefore, when Mr. Dean was working with you prior to your appearance before the second grand jury? Was he doing this on his own, or was he doing it as a representative for other persons in the White House?

Mr. Magruder. Well, again, it is an assumption on my part. I think I should be very careful. He was in a staff role and did report to the gentleman you mentioned. Consequently, you would assume, and I did not know and at no time did I know, that he was directly reporting
JEB MAGRUDER

Excerpts from FBI interviews relevant to campaign espionage and sabotage.

Date of interview: 7/20/72

Magruder was interviewed by special agents Michael L. Hanigan, William T. Hajeski and Paul P. Magallanes. Kenneth Parkinson represented Magruder. Material in quotations is directly from interview; other material is paraphrased.

"Magruder has on only one occasion made a cash disbursement since his employment by the CRP. This disbursement was in the amount of $20,000 and went to Ritz-Columnist Victor Lasky. Lasky had requested the funds in cash for certain political work which he had prepared for the White House, but which the White House had decided not to have published. Payment was directed by the White House and personally made by Magruder in late February or early March, 1972. The funds for this cash disbursement were obtained from Hugh W. Sloan, Jr., Treasurer FCTRIP."

"In late January or early February, Magruder assigned Liddy the responsibility of gathering intelligence concerning two specific problems which the CRP could foresee. The first of these problems concerned the appearance of surrogate candidates or celebrities at various rallies and other public appearances throughout the nation. Specifically, the CRP felt that it was responsible for insuring that the surrogate candidates and celebrities were not harassed, and were least aware when demonstrators or dissidents were likely to be present at such rallies and/or attempt to disrupt them. The other security problem which concerned the CRP was possible disruption at the convention site itself."

"Herbert Lloyd Porter, Director of Scheduling, CRP, had previously conversed with Magruder concerning the security problem connected with surrogate candidates and celebrity appearances. Porter had advised Magruder that he (Porter) had estimated the cost of intelligence for the surrogate-celebrity appearances to run approximately $100,000, and in view of the concern Magruder had re disruption at the convention site itself, Magruder authorized Hugh W. Sloan, Jr. to permit George Gordon Liddy to expend up to $250,000 to gather intelligence re both concerns."
"Magruder recalled that he did hold a meeting in his office in mid or late January, 1972, with Herbert Lloyd Porter and George Gordon Liddy. At this meeting, he advised Porter that George Gordon Liddy would gather intelligence re the surrogate-celebrity appearances. He further explained that Liddy would periodically come to Porter, request the funds needed and that Porter was to then notify Hugh W. Sloan, Jr., Treasurer, FCTRP, who would furnish the funds in cash to Porter and Porter would then give the funds to Liddy. Magruder advised that he understood that Porter had given Liddy roughly $35,000 for this purpose."

"Results regarding this surrogate-celebrity intelligence efforts were furnished to Herbert Lloyd Porter. With regard to the convention site of intelligence problem, Liddy advised Magruder that if the convention were held in San Diego, California, there might be as many as 250,000 demonstrators. And further, that the physical location of the convention hall in San Diego would allow the demonstrators to easily disrupt the convention."

Magruder couldn't remember when he first broached the subject of intelligence gathering to Liddy. CRP was concerned about some bombings that had occurred, they knew that demonstrators had opened a San Diego office, and they read underground and radical articles about disrupting the convention. Magruder said he never mentioned or suggested to Liddy any suspicion or any thought that officials of the Democratic party or Democratic candidates would encourage or finance or direct demonstrations at the convention site or at any public appearances by surrogate candidates. Magruder specifically advised Liddy to conduct his intelligence gathering lawfully.

Magruder indicated that most cash expenditures were made by Porter. As an example, "Magruder made reference to the pamphlet which the CRP had published entitled 'Why Liberals Should Vote for Muskie.' Apparently this publication contained references unfavorable to George McGovern. The pamphlet was published during the New Hampshire primaries and surreptitiously delivered to Muskie headquarters in New Hampshire. Thereafter, a phone call was made to the McGovern headquarters in New Hampshire and the caller suggested the McGovern people should see what the Muskie people were preparing to distribute. The purpose of this publication was to create friction between the Muskie people and the McGovern people." Magruder indicated that this undertaking cost approximately $30,000. He denied that any money was used to finance demonstrations at the appearances of any democratic candidates. He said that the New Hampshire mailing was the only
harrassment effort.

"Magruder explained that the $250,000 authorization which he had made for intelligence gathering was justified since the Committee to Re-elect the President was an independent, private group, which did not have access to government intelligence reports. And though he could not account for how George Gordon Liddy had spent any of the funds, the information which Liddy had furnished regarding this San Diego convention site was (in his opinion) sufficient to justify the expenditure. He stated that this information had been the primary basis for which the convention site had been changed from San Diego, California to Miami Beach, Florida."

Date of interview: 3/14/73

Magruder was interviewed special agent Angelo J. Lano. Magruder emphasized that he did not control overall disbursements for the Committee, but only for those activities he personally directed. The authorization for the disbursement to Victor Lasky came from the White House. Sloan and LaRue were present when Magruder gave the money to Lasky.

In addition to Sloan's cash fund, Magruder had a cash fund (obtained from Sloan), which Magruder kept in Porter's safe. From his cash fund Magruder authorized Porter to pay $300.00 to a group known as "Peace Freedom," which published a pamphlet entitled "Why Liberals Should Vote for McGovern." Magruder indicated that the $30,000 in cash be expended covered the entire campaign, not just "a short time span as previously inferred." This is an apparent, although confusing, reference to Magruder's statement in his 7/20/72 interview that $30,000 was spent on the New Hampshire mailing. The 3/14/73 interview did not follow up on other projects covered by the $30,000.

In early December 1971, Dean and Magruder discussed hiring Liddy as counsel for CRP. Magruder may have mentioned to Dean the need to gather intelligence about potentially disruptive groups. To Magruder intelligence meant "information as to who, what, when and where people may plan or in fact attempt to engage in any type of disruption." On December 29, 1971, Magruder, Porter and Liddy met in Magruder's office. "At this time, Magruder brought up the subject of 'intelligence gathering' and explained to Liddy what he wanted. Liddy said he could handle it. Porter was then given the assignment of determining how much money and manpower would be needed. Porter arrived at a figure of $100,000. However, in view of the possibility of disruption at the convention site, Magruder authorized the
expenditure $250,000 to Liddy. He recalled during this discussion that Liddy told him, 'in this type of work, you don't have to know the identity of the personnel.' (Magruder took that to mean that Liddy would be hiring people and their identities would be unknown to Magruder and the Committee.)"
18. On July 19, 1972 Herbert Kalmbach met with Dean and LaRue in Dean's EOB office. At that meeting LaRue, in Dean's presence, delivered cash to Kalmbach for use in meeting the commitments to the Watergate defendants. That evening Kalmbach delivered this cash to Ulasewicz in a hotel room in New York City. The amount of this cash is uncertain, being reported as $20,000 by LaRue and as $40,000 by Kalmbach. On or about July 20, 1972 Kalmbach was asked by either Dean or LaRue to raise from outside contributors additional funds for the Watergate defendants. On July 27, 1972 Kalmbach received another $30,000 from LaRue in LaRue's CRP office. These payments to Kalmbach were made by LaRue out of $81,000 in cash he had received from Stans and Sloan early in July, when Stans decided that it would be unwise to retain such a cash sum in FCRP custody.

18.1 Maurice Stans testimony, 2 SSC 701-02.
18.2 Hugh Sloan testimony, 2 SSC 548.
18.3 Fred LaRue testimony, 6 SSC 2290-91.
18.4 Herbert Kalmbach testimony, 5 SSC 2104-05, 2108.
18.5 John Dean testimony, 3 SSC 950-51.
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The treasurer, not being sure, discussed it with the general counsel for
the committee and the general counsel suggested that he take the
check and convert it into cash. The treasurer gave him the check.

Now, again, I can report what the treasurer has said, that he did
not get the proceeds of the check back until some time in May. He
received them in full and they were deposited in a bank account on
May 25.

Now, as to those two transactions and several others in a similar
category, we treated that as cash on hand on April 7 and reported it
in the report of the media Committee To Re-Elect the President, in
the amount of $350,000, and that exact amount of $350,000 was de-
posited in that committee's bank account on May 25. We felt that we
had complied with every requirement of the law as to the handling
and reporting of that money; we had accounted for it fully.

The General Accounting Office subsequently cited our committee
for a possible violation of the law in failing to report the $25,000. But
the Department of Justice, in a letter some months later, concluded
that there was no violation of the law in the handling of that trans-
action.

Mr. EDMISTEN. Mr. Stans, when was the first time that you learned
that these checks had cleared through a bank account of Bernard
Barker?

Mr. STANS. It was well after the Watergate event of June 17.

Mr. EDMISTEN. Now, shortly after that, did you have any discus-
sions with Mr. John Mitchell or anyone at the White House concerning
any of these checks during the week immediately following?

Mr. STANS. I don't recall any specific conversation with John
Mitchell, but I do recall a conversation with Fred LaRue and subse-
quently with Robert Mardian.

Mr. EDMISTEN. What did you talk about?

Mr. STANS. As I recall it, it was the morning of the 23d of June,
which was 6 days after the Watergate affair. I received a phone call
from Fred LaRue, saying, "Do you know Kenneth Dahlberg?"

And I said, "I certainly do."

He said, "Well, his contribution ended up in a bank account of one
of the fellows who was arrested."

I said, "Dahlberg didn't make a contribution."

He said, "Well, it is his check."

So he came down and we discussed it and concluded that, in some
manner or other, Dahlberg's check must have reached the bank
account of Bernard Barker.

We called Dahlberg and discussed it with him, got him to Wash-
ington on that same day, met with him, and he met with LaRue and
I think with Mardian, and got all the facts of the transaction in hand.
It was clear that neither Dahlberg nor I nor Hugh Sloan had anything
to do with the checks, that check or the Mexican checks, entering the
Barker bank account. They could only have gotten there through the
hands of our general counsel, Gordon Liddy, who had taken them into
his custody.

Mr. EDMISTEN. Mr. Stans, I am going to skip along, I don't want
to encroach on the committee. At one time did you approve or consent
to giving Mr. Fred LaRue $80,000?

Mr. STANS. Yes, I did. Would you like to know the background of
that?
Mr. Edmisten. Yes. When was that?

Mr. Stans. The same day of June 23, Mr. Sloan had balanced out his cash account, something which I had asked him to do as early as April 10 but which he couldn’t do because he was waiting for the return of the proceeds of the various checks we were discussing. He showed a balance of $81,000 of cash on hand and expressed some concern about it because he was going on vacation and under the tense situation that was building up he didn’t want to hold the cash in his custody. We discussed it and concluded that the funds were of a nature which did not classify them as funds of the current committees, that they were more properly funds of earlier committees, that they were not part of what we had to account for in an audit by the General Accounting Office, and that we should get legal advice.

At that time it was understood within the committee that Robert Mardian had been brought to Washington to work on legal matters that were current at the time, and I went to him for advice. His advice, after he learned the description of the money, was to get the money out of the office and out of the campaign and he suggested that I give it to Fred LaRue. Fred LaRue was the right-hand man of John Mitchell, assistant to Mitchell as campaign director. On that advice I gave the money, my half of the money to LaRue and Sloan later gave his half of the money to LaRue. I neglected to say that when Sloan expressed concern about having that much money in his custody, I agreed to divide it with him so that there would only be about $40,000 in each parcel, and I took one and put it in my desk and he took one parcel and took it home. I gave mine to LaRue rather promptly, at the first opportunity. Sloan went on vacation to Bermuda for about 10 days, and gave his money to LaRue upon his return.

Now, there is some uncertainty as to whether that money passed through Mardian’s hands in each case. I can’t recall whether I gave the $40,000 that I had directly to LaRue or gave it to Mardian to give to LaRue. Sloan did give his $40,000 to Mardian and Mardian gave it to LaRue.

Mr. Edmisten. Do you know what happened to that money in the end?

Mr. Stans. I do not know specifically what happened to that money. Subsequently I received some funds for several purposes from Fred LaRue. Whether it was part of the same money or other money, I have no way of knowing, and only he could tell.

Mr. Edmisten. Now, Mr. Stans, in late June or early July did you receive a call from Mr. Herbert Kalmbach requesting money from you?

Mr. Stans. On the 29th of June I received an urgent call from Mr. Kalmbach. He said he was in Washington at the Statler-Hilton Hotel, that it was extremely vital that he see me right away, and he wanted me to come over there, and I did. I dropped everything and went over there to see him. He said, “I am here on a special mission on a White House project and I need all the cash I can get.”

I said, “I don’t have any cash to give to you. Will you take a check?”

He said, “No, I can’t take a check, it must be in cash, and this has nothing to do with the campaign. But I am asking for it on high authority.”

Mr. Edmisten. What high authority did he say?
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Mr. Dash. Was that on June 25?
Mr. Sloan. Yes, sir.
Mr. Dash. When did you return?
Mr. Sloan. It would be on July 3.
Mr. Dash. On or about July 4, did there come a time when you did something with the $40,000 that you had taken home with you?
Mr. Sloan. Yes, sir. I was at home and got a call from Fred LaRue, who indicated to me that he was aware that I had this cash in my possession and would I bring it in to him, which I did, and returned home.

Mr. Dash. Did you learn from Mr. Stans whether he did likewise?
Mr. Sloan. Yes, sir. I believe—I am not sure what his travel schedule was, but I believe the first opportunity, probably the next day, I indicated to Mr. Stans that I had had this call. I assumed Mr. LaRue must have talked to Mr. Stans to know that I had it. I asked Mr. Stans was this in fact what he wanted me to do with it? He said: "Yes, that is precisely right, that is what I did with mine."

Mr. Dash. On the next day, July 5, did Mr. Magruder get in touch with you again?
Mr. Sloan. Yes, sir.
Mr. Dash. Could you tell us briefly what he wanted to talk to you about and the circumstances of that conversation?
Mr. Sloan. If I can go back for a minute to the earlier Mardian meeting before I went to Bermuda, because it is pertinent to this particular item. I on that occasion had indicated to Mr. Mardian that Mr. Magruder had made this suggestion to me that it might be necessary to perjure myself, and I had indicated to Mr. Mardian at that point in time—I understood Mr. Mardian essentially to have taken over the investigation from Mr. LaRue at this point. I said I just did not want to have any further dealings with Mr. Magruder if things are going to be done that way.

By way of background, during the period of time I was in Bermuda, Mr. Mitchell's resignation was announced, Mr. LaRue's resignation had been announced. My reaction to that announcement, particularly Mr. Mitchell's, was that, well, somebody was taking action and was probably cleaning out the committee and starting over, as should be done.

I had a call from Mr. Magruder during the day, on the 5th of July. He said he wanted to get together with me, would I like to do it then, would I like to have a drink with him after work. It was a very busy day, since I had just gotten back. I said, well, let's do it after work.

We went to the Black Horse Tavern, I believe. He had dinner and I just had a cocktail because I was expected at home.

He said, you know, we have to resolve this LaRue matter. He said, what we should do is you and I should go down to see the U.S. attorney, Mr. Harold Titus. He said, I will tell Mr. Titus that I authorized the payments to Mr. LaRue and you merely have to confirm the fact that you did make those distributions under my instructions.

Then he said, but we have to agree on a figure. This time, the figure was even less than the time before; it was $40,000 or $45,000.

No resolution was made on that occasion.

Mr. Dash. What did you say to him?
Mr. Sloan. I was a little flabbergasted, I guess, and I just told him I would think about it and let him know the next morning.
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Mr. Dash: Did he mention his name?

Mr. Larue: No; he did not mention his name but, as I recall, during this meeting determined that we would use a code name, Mr. Rivers, for this person.

Mr. Dash: I think you have since learned that Mr. Tony Ulasewicz was Mr. Rivers?

Mr. Larue: That is my understanding, yes, sir. We also discussed how we would or how Mr. Rivers could establish contact with the defendants, and it was decided that probably the best way would be for him to try to contact some of the attorneys who were working for the defendants at this time.

Mr. Dash: Did you arrange any kind of a relationship that you and Mr. Kalmbach would have if you wanted to call each other about this?

Mr. Larue: Yes, sir.

Mr. Dash: Any kind of a code arrangement?

Mr. Larue: Yes, sir.

Mr. Dash: Will you tell us about that?

Mr. Larue: Mr. Kalmbach indicated that this was, this would be necessary, that this would be a very secret operation, and that we should conduct our business by pay telephones, and that we would use the code name Bradford.

Mr. Dash: Were you Mr. Bradford?

Mr. Larue: That really wasn't, I think, determined, at least not to my knowledge and consequently we both ended up with the code name Bradford.

Mr. Dash: In other words, when you called Mr. Kalmbach you asked for Mr. Bradford and if he asked for you, he would call for Mr. Bradford and you both would know what you were talking about?

Mr. Larue: That is correct.

Mr. Dash: Did you learn of what problems Mr. Rivers was having with the lawyers?

Mr. Larue: Yes; that subsequent, a subsequent telephone conversation I had with Mr. Bradford—Kalmbach—

Mr. Dash: How often did you really use that name so as to fall into the habit of calling Mr. Kalmbach, Bradford?

Mr. Larue: He indicated that Mr. Rivers was having considerable difficulty establishing a contact through the lawyers, and as I recall at that time we had a discussion of this problem and decided that Mr. Rivers had tried to effect a contact with Mrs. Hunt.

Mr. Dash: Now, after your first meeting with Mr. Kalmbach and the arrangements were made, did you again meet with Mr. Kalmbach in Mr. Dean's office sometime in the middle of July 1972?

Mr. Larue: Yes, sir.

Mr. Dash: Mr. Dean was present at that time?

Mr. Larue: That is correct.

Mr. Dash: Could you tell us what was said at that meeting, what the purpose of the meeting was?

Mr. Larue: My recollection of that meeting, Mr. Dash, is Mr. Kalmbach had secured from Mr. Rivers a—some specific amount of money that would be necessary or would be required to meet the commitments, there were specific amounts for attorney fees at this time, and, as I recall specific amounts of money that would be required for maintenance of their families.
Mr. Dash. Did you provide any special instructions concerning how much money was to be given to which person?

Mr. Larue. No, sir; Mr. Dash. I would have had no way to have any knowledge of this, and I think Mr. Kalmbach has testified that I, you know, that I furnished this information, I think Mr. Kalmbach is just mistaken in this. I had no way to have this information. I have never discussed, never talked to any of the defendants and don't know any of them other than Liddy.

Mr. Dash. Did you give Mr. Kalmbach any money at that meeting?

Mr. Larue. Yes, sir; as I recall, I think at that meeting, I gave— as I recall I gave Mr. Kalmbach approximately $20,000.

Mr. Dash. Approximately $20,000. And what was the source of that money, Mr. Larue?

Mr. Larue. Around the first of July, the period of July 1 through July 4, 5, or 6, I received $11,000 in two different, from two different sources. I received approximately $11,000 from Mr. Sloan, who was the treasurer for the finance committee. I received approximately $10,000 from Mr. Mardian who gave me this money, was passing this money to me from Mr. Stans.

Mr. Dash. Was this all in cash, Mr. Larue?

Mr. Larue. Yes, sir.

Mr. Dash. Do you recall the denominations of the bills?

Mr. Larue. I can't say they were all $100 bills but predominantly $100 bills; yes, sir.

Mr. Dash. What role did you have after this particular meeting with Mr. Dean and Mr. Kalmbach. Did you assume any particular role while Mr. Kalmbach was carrying on this particular mission?

Mr. Larue. Well, yes, sir, I had numerous telephone conversations with Mr. Kalmbach. I would say my role would be a concurrence with Mr. Dean and with Mr. Kalmbach on the deliveries of money.

Mr. Dash. Would it be fair to say you were sort of a conduit at this point?

Mr. Larue. During this period of time, Mr. Dash, I had sort of, you know, numerous conversations on this subject with Mr. Dean, with Mr. Kalmbach, reporting conversations from Kalmbach to Dean, reporting conversations I had with Dean to Kalmbach.

Mr. Dash. Now, did you report to Mr. Mitchell on your meeting with Mr. Kalmbach and Dean?

Mr. Larue. Not to my recollection; no, sir.

Mr. Dash. To anyone else?

Mr. Larue. Not to my recollection; no, sir.

Mr. Dash. Did you meet with Mr. O'Brien during the summer of 1972?

Mr. Larue. Yes, sir; I met with Mr. O'Brien many times.

Mr. Dash. Could you tell us about how often and what was discussed at this time at these meetings?

Mr. Larue. I met with you know, Mr. O'Brien. I wouldn't say on a daily basis, but Mr. O'Brien had been retained by the committee as a counsel representing us in civil litigation, and we had just numerous conversations, Mr. Dash.

Mr. Dash. Did any of those conversations have to do with the needs of the defendants in the criminal cases?
Mr. Dash. In that manner?
Mr. Kalmbach. That is correct. That was the end-all. There were several telephone calls, but the final wrap-up on it was that he refused to receive the funds.
Mr. Dash. Who was contacted next, which lawyer?
Mr. Kalmbach. I think Mr. O’Brien was contacted and again with the same result.
Mr. Dash. He refused to receive the funds?
Mr. Kalmbach. Yes, sir.
Mr. Dash. And then who next was approached?
Mr. Kalmbach. I think then it was Mr. Bittman, and Mr. Bittman—I think this may have been when the name Rivers was used, Mr. Dash, but my recollection would be that Mr. Bittman received $25,000, probably sometime during the second week of July 1972.
Mr. Dash. Did you follow any usual procedure that Mr. Ulasewicz would make the contact and pay the money, he would call you and then you would call Mr. Dean and tell him it had been accomplished?
Mr. Kalmbach. Or Mr. LaRue.
Mr. Dash. Or Mr. LaRue. Were all these phone calls booth to booth?
Mr. Kalmbach. Yes, sir.
Mr. Dash. Even when you spoke to Mr. Dean?
Mr. Kalmbach. Yes; that is correct.
Mr. Dash. Or Mr. LaRue?
Mr. Kalmbach. That is correct.
Mr. Dash. What other lawyers were supposed to receive money, to your recollection, Mr. Kalmbach?
Mr. Kalmbach. Well, after the disbursement to Mr. Bittman, I think there was—most of the remaining funds went to Mrs. Hunt who, in fact, was the person who did the distributing thereafter and she distributed to these other attorneys.
Mr. Dash. Mrs. Hunt?
Mr. Kalmbach. Yes.
Mr. Dash. Now, when you next—when did you next return to Washington, after this first series of meetings, where you received this money and met with Mr. Ulasewicz, when did you next return to Washington?
Mr. Kalmbach. Well, the next time that I was back in Washington involved in this assignment, Mr. Dash, was, I think it was, on July 19.
Mr. Dash. What happened at that time? What brought you back?
Mr. Kalmbach. Well, at that time, I think I was asked to come back, I think by either Mr. Dean or Mr. LaRue, and to meet with Mr. Dean and Mr. LaRue in Mr. Dean’s office in the Executive Office Building.
Mr. Dash. Did you receive any money from Mr. LaRue at that time?
Mr. Kalmbach. Yes, sir, I did.
Mr. Dash. How much was that?
Mr. Kalmbach. Oh, some $40,000 was received from Mr. LaRue at that time.
Mr. Dash. Where did you receive it?
Mr. Kalmbach. In Mr. Dean’s office.
Mr. Dash. Did you receive any additional instructions at that time?
Mr. Kalmbach. I may have, Mr. Dash. I am not certain as to that.
Mr. Dash. What did you do with this money, this $40,000, was this in cash by the way?

Mr. Kalmbach. Yes, it was in cash.

Mr. Dash. Do you know the denominations of cash?

Mr. Kalmbach. I think it was primarily $100 bills.

Mr. Dash. What did you do with this new supply of money?

Mr. Kalmbach. I took these funds and I think I went to New York late that afternoon, stayed at the Regency Hotel, and gave the funds to Mr. Ulasevich, who came to my room in the Regency, probably around 8:30 or 9 that evening.

Mr. Dash. Now, you returned the following week, did you not, Mr. Kalmbach, to Washington?

Mr. Kalmbach. Yes, sir, I did.

Mr. Dash. Now, why did you return, when did you return, and who did you see?

Mr. Kalmbach. About this time, Mr. Dash, I was being urged—you will recall from my testimony that the funds that were given to me by Mr. LaRue were not solicited by me, they were simply given to me to be given to Mr. Ulasevich. About this time, I was asked by either Mr. Dean or Mr. LaRue to raise additional funds. I began to have a degree of concern about this assignment.

Mr. Dash. What began to cause you to have that degree of concern? Was it the nature of the covert operations, was it the fact that you were paying this money to defendants? Could you give us a little description or basis or background of that concern?

Mr. Kalmbach. I think the primary reason for my concern was the secrecy and the clandestine, covert nature of this activity.

Mr. Dash. Sort of like a 007 operation.

Mr. Kalmbach. Like a James Bond scenario.

Mr. Dash. And you were part of that whole scenario?

Mr. Kalmbach. Yes, sir.

Mr. Dash. The President's personal attorney?

Mr. Kalmbach. And it was very distasteful to me and it had created this degree of concern. The concern was sufficient to make me certain in my own mind that I wanted to talk to John Ehrlichman.

Mr. Dash. Why?

Mr. Kalmbach. One, I wanted John Ehrlichman to confirm what John Dean did in fact have the authority to direct me to undertake this assignment.

Second, I wanted him to assure me as to the propriety of this assignment. In any event, I requested a meeting with John Ehrlichman.

My records indicate that I met with him in his office at 3:30 on July 26.

Mr. Dash. Could you describe that meeting for us—

Mr. Kalmbach. Yes, sir.

Mr. Dash [continuing]. What you said to him and what he said to you?

Mr. Kalmbach. Yes, sir. As I have stated, the reason for the meeting was to get the assurance as to Mr. Dean's authority and as to the propriety.

Mr. Dash. Also, at this time, you were being asked to go out and to raise some additional funds on your own, were you not, Mr. Kalmbach?

Mr. Kalmbach. Yes, sir; and this would be the first time, Mr. Dash, that I would be going to an outside contributor. I know that the secrecy
Mr. Kalmbach. Mr. Dash, I had no background knowledge at all. This is just the impression that I received and I thought that frankly, it was, again, a very humane thing.

Mr. Dash. So in a real sense, you took your so-called moral standard from Mr. Ehrlichman's statement that it was appropriate?

Mr. Kalmbach. Well, Mr. Dash, I think it is more that I had such trust in Mr. Dean and Mr. Ehrlichman that I, if I were advised by them, assured by them, in my mind, there was no possibility that there would be any improperity?

Mr. Dash. Impropriety?

Mr. Kalmbach [continuing]. Any impropriety; no, sir.

Mr. Dash. Now, at that time when you had been reassured by Mr. Ehrlichman, did you pick up any additional money from Mr. LaRue while you were in Washington?

Mr. Kalmbach. Yes; I recall that I picked up approximately $30,000 the next day that Mr. LaRue gave to me in his office at 1701 Pennsylvania Avenue.

Mr. Dash. Did you have any additional instructions with regard to that money?

Mr. Kalmbach. I may have, Mr. Dash. I don't recall.

Mr. Dash. What did you do with that money?

Mr. Kalmbach. I called Mr. Ulasewicz, who came down to Washington, and stayed at the Statler-Hilton, and I gave him those funds in his room at the Statler-Hilton.

Mr. Dash. All right. Now, you then had returned to California, did you not?

Mr. Kalmbach. Yes, sir.

Mr. Dash. Did you raise that additional amount of money that you were asked to raise?

Mr. Kalmbach. Yes, I did. I called Mr. Thomas V. Jones sometime between, I think it was August 1 and August 5, I am not certain as to the date, and indicated that I would like to come by and see him. He had earlier indicated to me that he would have funds for me if there was any special need.

Mr. Dash. Did he—who, by the way since you have named him, who is Mr. Jones?

Mr. Kalmbach. He is chairman of Northrop Corp., in California.

Mr. Dash. And has he been a political contributor to Mr. Nixon, the President?

Mr. Kalmbach. Yes, sir, he has personally.

Mr. Dash. And when he indicated to you earlier if you needed any help he would provide those funds, was that in the area of contributing to the President's reelection campaign?

Mr. Kalmbach. Yes, sir.

Mr. Dash. All right. Now you called him and told him what?

Mr. Kalmbach. I called him and I think I reminded him on the telephone of his earlier statement to me, and he indicated immediately that he would be glad to see me, and we worked out a time that was mutually convenient. I went to his office, in Century City in West Los Angeles, I think it was in mid-afternoon and met with him there, and we had a 15-minute meeting or thereabouts, and he took from his desk a package, and handed it to me. I put it in my briefcase, and left his office and went back to Newport Beach.
a discussion of the need for support money in exchange for the silence for the men in jail and if the CIA could not do it they would have to find money somewhere else. Mr. LaRue indicated that Mr. Stans had only a small amount of cash. I believe he said $70,000 or $80,000, but more would be needed. After some discussion which I cannot recall with any specificity at this time, Mitchell asked me to get the approval of Haldeman and Ehrlichman to use Mr. Herbert Kalmbach to raise the necessary money. Before I departed the meeting I remembered that Mr. Mitchell, in an aside for my ears only, told me that the White House, in particular Ehrlichman, should be very interested and anxious to accommodate the needs of these men. He was referring to activities that they had conducted in the past that related to the White House, such as the Ellsberg break-in.

I conveyed this request to Haldeman and Ehrlichman and they told me to proceed to contact Mr. Kalmbach. I called Mr. Kalmbach on June 28, and told him that Haldeman, Ehrlichman, and Mitchell had requested that he come back to Washington as quickly as possible. He told me he would take the next flight.

I met Mr. Kalmbach at the Mayflower Hotel on June 29. We first met in the coffee shop, but could not find sufficient privacy to talk, so we went to his room. I had always been very open in my dealings with Mr. Kalmbach, and I knew that he had stated, after he completed his fundraising activities prior to April 7, 1972, that he did not wish to engage in any further fundraising activities, so I told him everything I knew about the case at that time, including my concern that it might involve the President himself, but I did not know that for a fact. I also told him that Haldeman, Ehrlichman, and Mitchell felt it was very important that he raise the money. I told him that per Mitchell’s instructions he should contact Fred LaRue as to the amounts needed and the timing. I knew that Kalmbach was not happy with this assignment, and he said he was undertaking it only because Mitchell, Haldeman, and Ehrlichman had so requested. I do not know if Mr. Kalmbach discussed this with any of these persons, but given the nature of the request, I did not expect him to take it on my word alone. I had never before given instructions to Kalmbach to raise any money or never passed on any similar instructions to him.

Subsequent to our meeting, Kalmbach informed me he was departing to raise the money, but he wanted Tony Ulasewicz to handle any deliveries because Mr. Ulasewicz was the only man he would trust. He said that he did not have his telephone number and requested that I call Jack Caulfield and request that Mr. Ulasewicz call him in California. I called Caulfield and made the request, but I did not tell Caulfield the reason Kalmbach wanted to have Mr. Ulasewicz call him.

Within a week or so, Kalmbach returned to Washington and requested that I meet him in Lafayette Park, which I did. He said that I could report to Haldeman and Ehrlichman that he had raised the money and, in fact, he said he had it in his briefcase with him, to the best of my recollection. He told me he was en route to meet Mr. Ulasewicz, but wanted me to know the job was done. Following that meeting and several days later, as I recall, he called me and said that he had asked Fred LaRue to come to my office to give him the details of who was to get how much. I recall that such a meeting did occur in my office, but I was on and off the telephone while LaRue and Kalmbach were going over the figures and I have absolutely no recollection of the
details of their discussion. I know that LaRue had the figures on a
sheet of paper and Kalmbach wrote them down in his own code on a
small piece of paper which he placed in his wallet. I have no further
knowledge of how or when or to whom delivery was made. Mr. Kalmbach
merely told me later that it had been done and I passed this on to
Ehrlichman and Haldeman.

Senator Baker. Mr. Dean, before you do, it is the wish of the
chairman—he had to go to the floor of the Senate to attend other
business—that we continue until about 12:30 and then recess for lunch,
if that is agreeable to you. I think you might have time to just finish
this sequence and then recess for lunch.

Mr. Dash. There is a break on page 97.

Senator Baker. We will see how far the witness can go until—

Mr. Dean. The witness only has the first part of his statement.

Senator Baker. I understand there is another part of about 150
pages or thereabouts. We are anxious for you to go as far as you can,
so you have been reading for 2½ hours, almost, so another 10 minutes,
I think, and then we will break for lunch.

Mr. Dean. Fine.

DISCUSSION OF MITCHELL AND MAGRUDER REMAINING AT THE
REELECTION COMMITTEE

I would like to return once again to the period of June 21 through
June 30 in the matter of Mr. Mitchell and Mr. Magruder remaining
at the reelection committee. As I had indicated, I had frequent dis-
cussions with Ehrlichman and Haldeman, in which I would report
back to them on information they had requested or report information
I had received. It was sometime during the last 10 days of
June that I recall a meeting in Haldeman’s office in which they
asked me for my recommendation regarding removing Mitchell and
Magruder from the reelection committee. This discussion preceded my
contacting Kalmbach. At that time I repeated my knowledge of the
meetings which had occurred in Mitchell’s office in January and February
when Liddy was presenting his proposal. I told them I did not
know for a fact that Mitchell had ever approved Liddy’s plans, but
Magruder had recently inferred to me that Mitchell was aware of the
operation. I told them I had never discussed it with Mitchell himself
and the only observation I could make was that the Watergate matter
appeared to be consuming most of Mitchell’s time, which might dis-
trict him from the campaign.

With regard to Magruder, I repeated what Liddy had told me re-
garding Magruder’s pushing him into doing the break-in at the Demo-
cratic National Committee. I also said that I thought there was a
real chance he could be indicted, although Mitchell and Magruder
thought that the matter might be stopped at Liddy. Accordingly, I
told them I did not think I could make a recommendation regarding
Mitchell, but I did recommend that Magruder be removed in a grace-
ful manner that would not unduly jeopardize him. They thanked
me, and told me they would take my recommendations under advis-
ment. The next time I heard anything about this subject was when it
was publicly announced that Mr. Mitchell was resigning. I was some-
what startled that Magruder was remaining. It was clear that
Magruder was the only link back to the White House, and Magruder