

Defense Summation Terms It Preposterous to Think **He Would Commit Crime**

By MARTIN ARNOLD

With sarcasm and solemnity, evangelistic fervor and laugh-ter, the lawyer for Maurice H. Stans summed up his defense yesterday in an oration to the jury that lasted nearly five hours.

It was a selective and emotional defense, with its thrust not so much to countering the testimony in this trial, but rather to creating for the jury the notion that it was prepos-terous to suppose that "that honorable man"-Mr. Stanswould commit a crime.

The lawyer, Walter J. Bon-ner, depicted Mr. Stans as a man so accustomed to handling vast sums of money--"balancing \$66-billion of your money" when he was President Eisenhower's budget director-that it is incredible to think that he was impressed by a \$200,000 campaign contribution from Robert L. Vesco, the financier. Mr. Bonner comp¹eted his

Continued on Page 24, Column 1

Continued From Page 1, Col. 1

summation, which had started at 2:30 P.M. at 7 P.M., in almost a buyying tone as he shouted at the jurors, "Decide if you can walk back in here and say to him (milter) and the him: 'guilty.' And then go back home and see if you can live with yourself and your God and say that that man is a liar and

"Can you call that man a per-Jurer?" Mr. Bonner said. "Not before God nor man. Can you do that? He is not an obstructor of justice. He is not a conspiraor justice. He is not a conspira-tor. He is a good, decent and honorable American. I want you to bring in a verdict of not guilty, and I want you to restore to him his good name." Then, after the jury had filed out, Mr. Bonner, who appeared to be in near tears, fell into Mr. Stanc's arms and embraced him

Stans's arms and embraced him. Mr. Stans, the former Secre-tary of Commerce, and John N. Mitchell, former Attorney Gen-eral, are accused of attempting eral, are accused of attempting to impede a Securities and Ex-change Commission investiga-tion of Mr. Vesco in return for a secret, \$200,000 cash contri-bution by Mr. Vesco to Presi-dent Nixon's re-election cam-paign. Both former Cabinet members were leaders of the campaign. Mr. Bonner described Mr.

Stans as a man of "integrity," "honor" and "character" who could not be bought off with a \$200,000 contribution, who had once turned down a \$1-mil-lion campaign contribution lion campaign contribution. "That's a hell of a fixer; some fixer," Mr. Bonner said. "You know, ladies and gen-

tlemen, disease is something we normally associate with the medical profession, but there is client apply named it from the stand just a few days ago. He called it 'Vescoitis,'." Mr. Bon-

called it 'vescoitis,' 'Mr. Bon-ner began. "It was conceived in the test tubes of the prosecution, and it has permeated the life of my client, and if I may speak for a moment of Mr. Mitchell, for a full year," he continued. "It has permeated this courtroom." Mr. Vesco. pow a furitive

Mr. Vesco, now a fugitive, and 41 others are accused of defrauding investors of \$224million.

million. Through the weeks of this trial, Mr. Bonner said, he had tried to "help cure that dis-ease, to kill it and to stamp it out, so that we will have no more of it." Mr. Bonner, about 6 feet tall, wears hid suits and wears his

wears plaid suits, and wears his eye glasses perched atop his curly dark-brown hair. He is given to emotionalism in the court, as a tactic.

A Soft Beginning

Starting softly, Mr. Bonner said that his client "has been treated in this courtroom as though his heart and mind and though his heart and mind and soul were wrapped up with and dedicated to a man named Robert Vesco." "It is not true," Mr. Bonner shouted. "You have learned that he met him once." At times Mr. Bonner acted like a Southern evangalist preacher, stepping away from the lectern, and throwing his arms outward and upward.

the lectern, and throwing his arms outward and upward. "What was he supposed to do when somebody brought up Vesco's name," the lawyer shouted, his arms extended. "Shall he adhesive tape his mouth, cut out his tongue?" There has been testimony in this trial that Mr Stans pre-vailed on G. Bradford Cook, then counsel to the S.E.C., to "get the commission to delete get the commission to delete all mention of the \$200,000 from its formal charges against Mr. Vesco. Mr. Stans has denied this

Mr. Stahls has denied this, and said that instead it was Mr. Cook, a Nebraska man hoping for Mr. Stan's support in making him chairman of the S.E.C. who kept bringing up Mr. Vesco's name to Mr. Stans. "Ucluse Mr. Stang: mouth

Mr. Vesco's name to Mr. Stans. "Hell no, Mr. Stans's mouth should not be taped," Mr. Bon-ner said, his arms still extended. "It wasn't Stans who brought it [Vesco] up. Hell no, it was this precious boy from Nebraska who had it all and wanted more."

Acting Out All Parts

On other occasions, Mr. Bonner was like the narrator of a children's fairy story recording, acting out all the parts himself; Mr. Stans, John W. Dean 3d,

other persons who have testi-fied at this trial.

'Can you believe Dean?" Mr. Bonner asked. "Hell, he wouldn't even tell you" the truth about his conversations with Mr. Stans. It is the defense's constans. It is the defense's con-tention that Mr. Dean, then counsel to the President, ad-vised Mr. Stans not to tell the S.E.C. about the \$200,000 secret contribution. Mr. Dean has de-big this on the witness stand

contribution. Mr. Dean has de-nied this on the witness stand. "That's the same John Dean who pleaded guilty, but whose sentence was deferred, who hopes his cooperation in this case" will get him a light sen-tence in the Watergate case, Mr. Bonner said. "I give you John Dean and I give you Mau-rice Stans. You have your choice. It's all yours." At one point Mr. Bonner ex-pressed fear that the jurors might not like President Nixon, and therefore might be preju-

might not like President Nixon, and therefore might be preju-diced against Mr. Stans, so he warned them sterly: "You are not here to judge Richard Nixon. You are here to judge Maurice Stans. He raised \$60-milion to re-elect President Nixon, a man you may not like, but the fact remains over 60 ner cent of the people voted per cent of the people voted

for him." The Vesco contribution was given to Mr. Stans on April 10, 1972, thre days after a new law 1972, thre days after a new law requiring that contributions of more than \$100 be made public. It is the defense contention that the contribution was prom-ised before April 7, and there-fore it was, in fact, completed before April 7. Mr. Bonner quoted to the jury the campaign contribution law, and the sections he quoted stipulated that a contribution could be counted on if it had

could be counted on if it had been "promised."

been "promised." "That man is anything but a dammed fool," Mr. Bonner said of his client. "For God's sake, if he were involved in a fix, he sure as hell would have sent someone to get the money down to D.C." "Can you believe a man so

meticulous could be that slop-py?" That he would say, 'Ah me, we'll let it go until next week' when he faced that new

law? He believed in good comscience it was a pre-April 7 contribution, on advice of coun-

sel," Mr. Bonner said. There has also been testi-mony that in an effort to hide the Vesco contribution it was listed merely under the initials "J.M."—for John Mitchell— rather than under Mr. Vesco's name

name. "If "If you were involved in a conspiracy with the former At-torney General, would you put

torney General, would you put it [the contribution] down un-der J.M.?" Mr. Bonner asked "Is he a madman?" He also told the jury that it was unthinkable that a man like Mr. Stans would accept a contribution in return for a favor, the lawyer listed sev-eral large contributions that Mr. Stans had turned down, includ-

eral large contributions that Mr. Stans had turned down, includ-ing one of \$1-million. "You don't play games with Maurice Stans because he'll tell you what to do with your con-tribution," Mr. Bonner shouted. Mr. Stans headed the financing

of the President's campaign and Mr. Mitchell, for a time, headed the campaign itself. The summation for the Stans lefense was scheduled for yes-terday morning, which meant that the Mitchell defense sum-mation would have been in the that the Mitchell defense sum-mation would have been in the afternoon. Under this scheduling, the Government summation would have taken place this morning, oflowed by the judge's charge to the jury. Then the case would have been given to the jury for its deliberation. However, the defense did not want the Government to have the impact of having its sum-mation alone on a day, 'so the defense spent yesterday morn-ing arguing over the admission of evidence in this case. This meant that Mr. Bonner was forced to give his summation in the afternoon, and that Peter Fleming Jr., Mr. Mitchell's law-yer, will sub up this morning, with the Government summa-tion following this afternoon.