

# PROSECUTOR BARS WYMAN'S REQUEST

**NY Times**  
AUG 29 1975  
Asserts Candidate Is Under  
Inquiry in Farkas Case

By CHRISTOPHER LYDON  
Special to The New York Times

WASHINGTON, Aug. 28—The Watergate special prosecutor declined today to give Louis C. Wyman, the Republican Senate candidate in New Hampshire, the clean bill of health he requested.

On the contrary, Henry S. Ruth, the prosecutor, said in a letter released today that Mr. Wyman's role in obtaining Ruth L. Farkas's Ambassadorship in Luxembourg "is still under investigation by this office."

Mr. Wyman's closest associates believe that the former 5-term Representative, now engaged in a rerun of his 1974 Senate race against John A. Durkin, a Democrat, is in fact a target of the grand jury inquiry into what Dr. Farkas and her husband are describing as an illegal sale of her diplomatic post.

Some of Mr. Wyman's friends have reluctantly concluded that he is in serious danger of indictment, possibly before the Sept. 16 special election in New Hampshire.

"He doesn't have to be told" [that he is a target], a Wyman associate commented after Mr. Wyman reappeared voluntarily before the Watergate grand jury two weeks ago. "It's obvious he's been targeted."

Mr. Wyman has long acknowledged that he devoted months of effort during the first term of the Nixon Administration to getting the Ambassadorship for Dr. Farkas and to helping arrange a \$300,

000 contribution from the Farkases to the Nixon re-election campaign of 1972.

At the same time, Mr. Wyman and his friends all insist that he did no wrong and intended none and that there is no solid evidence to convict him of any criminal charge.

Mr. Wyman's general defense, in more than a year of public debate about the Farkas case, has been that while he helped arrange both the contribution and the diplomatic appointment, the two were never explicitly exchanged. It was always understood, Mr. Wyman says, that the money for the Nixon campaign simply established Dr. Farkas's "eligibility" for

an Ambassadorship.

A political ally of Mr. Wyman's commented that when Dr. Farkas finally won her post in Luxembourg in 1973, Mr. Wyman "expected a sizable contribution" from the Farkases for his 1974 Senate campaign. But in fact, Mr. Wyman has repeatedly emphasized, he never asked for or got any campaign money from the Farkases. George Farkas, the Ambassador's husband, is the founder of Alexander's department stores in Manhattan and elsewhere.

Mr. Wyman was reliably reported to be worried about evidence before the grand jury—in the form of letters, diaries

and telephone logs—that he devoted extraordinary zeal over many months to the cause of Dr. Farkas's Ambassadorship.

In one letter to the White House that the grand jury has seen, Mr. Wyman declared, in effect, that he was putting 20 years of Republican service on the line in her behalf.

But the reason for his intense effort, Mr. Wyman has told associates, was a combination of political considerations—not any hope of personal gain for himself.

Mr. Wyman's political explanation of the case is that Benjamin Mates, a Manchester, N.H., manufacturer who first

introduced Mr. Wyman to the Farkases, had the power to dissuade Wesley Powell, a Republican former Governor of New Hampshire, from entering the 1974 senate campaign against Mr. Wyman. And so Mr. Wyman pushed Dr. Farkas's appointment, one Wyman associate recounted, "primarily to impress Ben mates."

When the Nixon White House rebuffed and later delayed Dr. Farkas's nomination, the Wyman associate continued, Mr. Wyman pushed all the harder "just to prove to himself that he could make contact with the White House."

During the first Wyman-Durkin Senate campaign last

fall, Leon Jaworski, then the Watergate special prosecutor, issued a statement that the investigation of the Farkas case "has not uncovered evidence which would support the bringing of any criminal charges against Congressman Wyman."

Earlier this week Mr. Wyman asked Mr. Ruth, who is Mr. Jaworski's successor, to reaffirm that statement.

Mr. Ruth avoided doing that, but he also noted, in a letter that Mr. Wyman's lawyer here made public, "I hope it is understood by all concerned that the existence of an investigation cannot fairly support an inference of wrongdoing on the part of anyone."