Prosecutor Probing \$300,000 Donation

By Lawrence Meyer Washington Post Staff Writer

Despite the dismissal of the by Louis C. Wyman, the Re-that it's not terminated." publican contender for the disputed New Hampshire Senate embassy in Luxembourg, deseat, a source close to the case said yesterday.

The contribution was made told a reporter. by Ruth Lewis Farkas before her appointment as U.S. am Farkas' testimony confirmed bassador to Luxembourg

Senate proceedings are under way to determine whether federal grand jury here that Wyman or Democrat John Durkin is entitled to the disputed seat.

Although the special prosecutor wrote a letter to several members of Congress during the 1974 campaign saying that "the investigation has not uncovered evidence which would support the bringing of any criminal charges against Congressman Wyman," a spokesman for Special Prosecutor Henry S. Ruth Jr. declined yesterday to say whether that plicit understanding that an statement was still valid.

Ruth's aide declined to comdespite a reporter's pointing out that a failure to motivation in this," Wyman respond would be widely interpreted as an indication that the situation had changed since that letter was written. The aide also declined to say whether the investigation into contribution continuing.

Another source, however, said that he had authoritatively "been told pretty much" that Mrs. Farkas' husband, George, would be recalled as witness by the special prosecutor this month. George Farkas is the millionaire founder of

Alexander's department store in New York.

Milton S. Gould, the Farkas' last Watergate federal grand lawyer, said in a telephone injury, the Watergate special terview yeserday that "I have prosecutor is still investigat- no indication that this matter ing a \$300,000 1972 Nixon cam- is over. To the contrary, I paign contribution arranged have substantial indications

> Farkas, reached at the U.S. clined to comment. "I'm not answering any questions," he

> A source familiar with the a report in The New York Times that Mrs. Farkas told a she had given \$300,000 to Richard M. Nixon's re-election campaign in 1972 with the explicit understanding that she would receive a diplomatic post in return.

> Mrs. Farkas, according to a source quoted by the Times, testified that Wyman had "tricked" and "seduced" her and her husband into the contribution, leading them to believe that it was legal.

> Wyman has denied any exambassadorship would given in return for the contribution. "I suspect political

likely to have a runoff elec- Givers Fund," tion up here," Wyman said.

mony to the federal grand said that that story was "a lot jury appears to conflict with of c-... According to this her earlier testimony before source, the agreed-upon figure the Senate Foreign Relations was always \$300,000. Committee, which she told on March 13, 1973, that her "There was never talk of contribution "had nothing to any money except \$300,000," do with getting an ambassador- the source said. ship or not."

A source close to Wyman, a former prosecutor, said yesterthat Wyman's "prosecutorial would sense never have allowed such a quid pro quo to occur." This source said that Mrs. Farkas "knew that she wanted an ambassadorial post and that she was expected to contribute."

At a meeting Wyman arranged with chief Nixon fundraiser Maurice H. Stans on May 23, 1972, this source said, Mrs. Farkas offered to give a "substantial amount" of money to the Nixon campaign, citing a \$250,000 contribution to a New York hospital as her idea of substantial. Wyman, this source said, returned from the meeting "amazed," commenting, "This woman

said in New Hampshire. "I talks of a quarter of a million, don't know how this happens dollars as though it were a to come out, but we are very contribution to the United

A source familiar with the Mrs. Farkas' reported testi- Farkas' testimony, however,