

1 deliberations with a verdict of not guilty and tell
2 Deborah Dean that our justice system is not personal.

3 Thank you, Your Honor.

4 THE COURT: All right.

5 Mr. O'Neill, do you think you'll be very
6 long?

7 MR. O'NEILL: I don't think so, Your Honor.

8 THE COURT: All right.

9 MR. O'NEILL: I just have to pull one chart.

10 THE COURT: Ladies and gentlemen, we'll have
11 the rebuttal argument now by the Government and we'll
12 take our luncheon break and argue the instructions after
13 lunch.

14 MR. O'NEILL: What did I tell you, ladies and
15 gentlemen? Someone else's fault. It's always someone
16 else's fault. Now it's my fault, it's Miss Sweeney's
17 fault. It's now the prosecutors. That's why we're
18 here. Not the evidence that was brought forth. It's
19 now a personal attack brought by us. You would think
20 you would get mad about your integrity being attacked
21 when you just presented the evidence, because you might
22 remember in opening statement I told you what a
23 prosecutor does is present the evidence. We're merely
24 vehicles by which questions are asked, witnesses take
25 the stand, documents are introduced. Both Miss Sweeney

1 and myself.

2 But the problem is desperate times call for
3 desperate measures. When your back's against the wall,
4 when it's obvious the Government has put forth all this
5 evidence, the only thing you can do is lie. And when
6 that doesn't work, when the lies are shown to the jury,
7 it becomes a personal attack. And that's what it is.
8 Nothing more, nothing less.

9 You can't argue the facts of the case. So you
10 argue that someone is out to get you. That the
11 prosecution now is out to get you. Much like the FBI
12 was out to get you on that background check when you
13 asked for that background check because you wanted that
14 job. Much like a United States Senator from the United
15 States Senate was out to get Miss Dean because he didn't
16 want her for some reason to get the job that she was
17 seeking.

18 I told you during closing argument that
19 Miss Dean lied to you very clearly and that she lied to
20 you a series of times thereafter and, I repeat, you can
21 take her testimony and throw it in the garbage where it
22 belongs because someone --

23 MR. WEHNER: Your Honor, I object to that
24 continued characterization.

25 THE COURT: That's overruled. It's closing

1 argument. It's not facts, it's argument.

2 MR. O'NEILL: Since Mr. Wehner kept saying
3 that it was not garbage, that I should not have said
4 that, I'm saying that's where it belongs, in the
5 garbage. Because it was a lie, ladies and gentlemen.

6 And then you must -- as I said earlier, there
7 are two, two conflicting stories here, totally
8 different. Irreconcilable. One or the other is
9 correct. You must base it on what all the witnesses
10 said on one hand or Miss Dean's credibility on the
11 other, and that's what her whole case hinges upon, her
12 veracity, her honesty, her credibility. But she lied to
13 you.

14 And I'd like to show you at this time since it
15 was put into evidence and never shown to you, the
16 documents that show that, and judge for yourself, ladies
17 and gentlemen. This is a contract of sale for the
18 Watergate apartment owned by Gordon Dean and it is dated
19 April 20th, 1987, nine days before Lou Kitchin writes a
20 check to Miss Dean for \$4000. This is Government's
21 Exhibit 556. And you'll see it bears Gordon Dean's
22 signature, dated April 24th, 1987. Then what we have
23 here is the purchaser's settlement statement dated June
24 10th, 1987. It's a closing. They move in after the
25 closing. And you'll see the purchase price, 135,000.

1 All the necessary signatures. And here's the seller's
2 settlement statement that the seller gets at the time,
3 likewise dated June 10th, 1987. Unequivocal proof that
4 Miss Dean lied to you.

5 Mr. Wehner read certain parts of the
6 transcript to you during his closing argument, and what
7 did he read to you, ladies and gentlemen? He read to
8 you a passage in which on cross-examination Miss Dean
9 said, well, Gordon had mentally moved away before that
10 at that time and maybe there was going to be another
11 apartment, and you remember he read that at the very
12 beginning of his closing arguments today. Well, that's
13 fine. But that was on cross-examination when I started
14 pressing her on the issue about the apartment, what's
15 going on with the apartment. He didn't read to you what
16 she said on direct examination. Let me read that to you
17 at this time, and you'll remember the direct examination
18 when Janet Whitman testified, when Miss Withington
19 testified the first time, and they never asked her about
20 when it was sold or anything like that.

21 Let's read that testimony. And this is from
22 Mr. Wehner to Miss Dean.

23 "Question: When you received -- subsequent to
24 that date when you received the check, did you discover
25 Mr. Kitchin was not going to buy an apartment?"

1 "Answer: Before he gave me the check?"

2 "Question: No, after, subsequent."

3 "Answer: Oh, after. Well, at a certain
4 point, in June of that year, he had, he and I had plans
5 to have dinner, I think, and he came to my office a
6 couple of hours early, and I said, well, I can't leave
7 right now, because I have to pick up my car, and I've
8 already made arrangements to do that.

9 And he said, well, I'll come with you to pick
10 up your car.

11 I said, well, it's out in Rockville, but if
12 you want to, come along.

13 And so he came with me. And I remember Hunter
14 Cushing had agreed to give me a ride out there after
15 work. So Mr. Kitchin got in the car with us, and we
16 went out, picked up my car. And we were driving down
17 Wisconsin Avenue," she remembered very precisely, "and I
18 was discussing with him basically where -- what I had
19 bought and what we were doing and the fact that my
20 brother was getting antsy about, you know, had he signed
21 a contract.

22 And I was like, you know, you are so slow
23 about this. Are you going to do it, or are you not
24 going to do it or whatever?

25 And he said, Deborah, I talked to mu wife

1 about it and she's decided that we really don't need to
2 by an apartment in Washington. Maybe we'll do it next
3 year.

4 And I remember exactly where the car was when
5 he said that. It was, we were driving down Wisconsin
6 Avenue, and it's just where Tenley Circle, the Tenley
7 Theatres are, we were right there. And I pulled the car
8 over to the side lane, and I said, I can't believe this.
9 I mean, I was pretty upset with him because he had
10 yanked me all over Washington, D. C., and I had done all
11 this work for him, and now he's telling me that he had
12 finally discussed it with his wife and that she decided
13 he wasn't going to do it this year.

14 And I pulled the car over, and I said, well, I
15 said, I'm going to give you the money back that you gave
16 me."

17 And then it goes on for another page.

18 Well, what does she say? She says the fact
19 that my brother was getting antsy about, you know, had
20 he signed a contract, and she told you, ladies and
21 gentlemen, that was on June 15th, 1987, that was a lie.
22 That was an attempt to get you to believe her story, but
23 it couldn't be true. On June 15th Mr. and Mrs. Crane
24 are living in that apartment. They signed a contract
25 for that two months earlier, on April 20th. Nine days

1 before the loan to Lou Kitchin.

2 And then I went over a series of things the
3 other day, yesterday, you might recall. A series of
4 additional mistruths that she told on the witness stand
5 about no Mod Rehab dealings with Kitchin. Never had
6 it. Sherrill Nettles-Hawkins said they did have.

7 No idea Mitchell was a consultant. But that
8 was his occupation.

9 Shocked that Mitchell made any money. Al Cain
10 told you, the Special Agent from HUD, that conversation
11 never ever happened.

12 She denies that Lance Wilson sent the 600 to
13 Joe Strauss in Puerto Rico. Special agent Bowie had to
14 come in here and say that's exactly what she told me.

15 Not close to Mitchell until after she left
16 HUD. In fact, the record shows she was calling him
17 Daddy five years earlier.

18 Denied the HUD driver ever drove her to
19 lunch. The records show that he did.

20 Again, the reason she would lie about that,
21 she was in a trick bag. Either she lied to the Senate
22 about using it for personal reasons or she lied to you
23 about Mitchell doing business with her.

24 She said she didn't know Nunn until she left
25 HUD. Yet told other people she knew him as a young

1 girl.

2 Only work at Global to run a party when in
3 fact she wrote Director of Public Relations.

4 Only knew Shelby for five years -- excuse me,
5 stated she didn't know Shelby until her time at HUD.
6 When in fact she had said she had known him for five
7 years.

8 It goes on, ladies and gentlemen. One after
9 the other --

10 MR. WEHNER: Your Honor, I object to the
11 mischaracterization, and the continuing
12 mischaracterization, of the testimony of Miss Dean.

13 THE COURT: All right. It's overruled. It's
14 closing argument. The jury's recollection will control.

15 MR. O'NEILL: And I'll keep going, ladies and
16 gentlemen, because I won't miss a step with objections.
17 This is something I've done for quite sometime and I'll
18 be able to continue.

19 They were lies, ladies and gentlemen. Lies,
20 blatant attempts to cover up what had occurred, to sway
21 you.

22 You've heard several times about the
23 Government's witnesses. Mr. Wehner says it's the
24 Government's witness, the Government called this
25 person. Let's make no mistake about this. Andrew

1 Sankin is not my friend. Richard Shelby is not my
2 friend. These are people who were called by the
3 Government because they worked at HUD at that time, who
4 were colleagues of Miss Dean or were friends of
5 Miss Dean. They're not people that I know. The
6 Government calls who is available at that time. We go
7 back, just like the documents,, you cull through the
8 documents, Mr. Sankin is not in my calendars. You will
9 get the calendar entries that are in evidence. You will
10 see it's Miss Dean's calendars in which Mr. Sankin
11 appears, in which Mr. Shelby appears, Mr. Broussard and
12 a host of other people that you've heard about, not
13 mine.

14 I don't vouch for the credibility of these
15 witnesses, nor does Mr. Wehner. It is you, the jury,
16 that determines what is believable, what is credible,
17 whether the defendant is guilty as charged or not. That
18 is your function, ladies and gentlemen. And His Honor,
19 when he instructs you on the credibility of the
20 witnesses, will tell you, you judge whether that person
21 was credible, whether they've made misstatements and if
22 those misstatements were made, do you think -- we all
23 misstate, I misstate quite often when I go to speak and
24 maybe speak too fast and the words come out wrong,
25 that's one thing, but when someone purposely misstates

1 what they're saying, such as my brother is antsy on June
2 15th, when there is no more apartment, and all the other
3 misstatements that I've just gone through, if those are
4 purposeful, you will hear, you can just disregard her
5 entire testimony based on what His Honor reads you on
6 the law. That is the state of the law. If you find a
7 witness incredible you do not have to believe a single
8 thing that witness says.

9 So you as the jury can throw her testimony in
10 the garbage. That is up to you. It's what you decide.
11 You again are the judges of the facts.

12 Mr. Wehner has talked about reasonable doubt.
13 I won't go into that because it's a concept that His
14 Honor must instruct you on, and that's the applicable
15 law in this case and every criminal case in this
16 country, in every courtroom throughout these 50 States.
17 That is the rule of law that applies in each and every
18 criminal case; it's the Government must prove the
19 defendant guilty beyond a reasonable doubt and in this
20 case, ladies and gentlemen, the Government has proved it
21 beyond all doubt.

22 You've heard the evidence. The evidence that
23 the Government produced through all the witnesses,
24 through all the documents, and on the other side you
25 have a series of misstatements, of falsehoods, of lies.

1 They don't balance up. They're not even close, ladies
2 and gentlemen. They can't be.

3 Yesterday when Mr. Wehner started on his
4 closing argument he talked about the fact that we said
5 there was a code, a coded reference to a number of units
6 and that we weren't able to prove that. Well, ladies
7 and gentlemen, we cited Mr. Greer's testimony, that
8 Mr. Greer knew nothing about a code.

9 I'd like to show you Government's Exhibit 39
10 just briefly and show you if you don't believe that
11 there was a code, and you might remember what I said
12 yesterday about why would a person like Mr. Martinez pay
13 425,000 on Arama and 219,000 on South Florida unless he
14 couldn't be assured of the units. Look what he's
15 saying, "Please note that while we submitted 219 units
16 which is as close as we could come to the 200 number,
17 there are eight different buildings, this should present
18 no problem because when the funds are set aside in the
19 HUD Central Office in Washington, since they do not know
20 the exact bedroom mix of the units, the funds are set
21 based on all the apartment being two bedrooms. Our mix
22 is 24 efficiencies, 153 one bedroom, and 42 two
23 bedrooms, therefore, there is ample room to support this
24 proposal.

25 Notwithstanding the above, if we could get

1 that the fund availability is for 219 units it would be
2 much better, since then there would be no confusion as
3 to whose proposal it is."

4 Of course it's a code. He has to know the
5 exact amount. He's going to shell out \$129,000 and if
6 he's paying that, he's going to make sure he gets those
7 units.

8 Mr. Wehner also began with yesterday saying
9 there's not one piece of evidence, not one document to
10 show Miss Dean did not tell the truth, that she lied, as
11 the Government said. You'll have the opportunity, like
12 with all the other documents, look at these closing
13 April papers. Look at the dates on them. They
14 unequivocally show that she lied to you, ladies and
15 gentlemen, on that stand, under oath.

16 Mr. Wehner is in a very tough position, ladies
17 and gentlemen. Because he cast in his opening statement
18 to get a level playing field, and that's what happened
19 here. We picked a jury. You recall it took a lot of
20 time to pick a jury. We picked a jury that could be
21 fair to both sides, had nothing to do with this case and
22 could listen dispassionately, but it wasn't this jury
23 that hasn't provided a level playing field, and I
24 believe that you will to both sides, it's his client by
25 telling you falsehoods you're in a position where you

1 can't believe a word she said. And that prevents you
2 from listening to them, and as His Honor will instruct
3 you the law is clear on that, if you don't believe them
4 you can discount that testimony.

5 That's what creates an uneven playing field.
6 The evidence creates it. The playing field is even when
7 the trial begins. It always is. You've heard no
8 evidence. But as the evidence stacks up on one side and
9 not the other over time as you continually hear one
10 witness after the other and then you hear a totally
11 incredible story on the other side, of course you're
12 going to come for some determination once you
13 deliberate. That's the whole jury process.

14 We talked about consultants again this
15 morning. No one has ever said that the use of
16 consultants is illegal, and I might be beating a dead
17 horse at this point but the problem is I just want to
18 make sure on this point, consultants are legal. They're
19 used in a variety of different businesses. They're even
20 used in the housing field.

21 What's wrong in this case is that these people
22 were influence peddlers who had no knowledge whatsoever
23 of the housing industry, and by themselves they can do
24 nothing. They need a corrupt public official on the
25 inside to give them what they want. Without that person

1 they're powerless. That's what this case is about.

2 It's not about going to lunch and talking with
3 friends. It's about directing awards of Government
4 monies, of taxpayers' monies to those friends simply
5 because they can benefit you and the whole system will
6 benefit you and your family and your friends. That's
7 what the case is about. Not about having lunch.

8 Mr. Wehner mentioned the 19 units for a
9 battered women's shelter, as I did, during closing
10 argument, and you will remember and you'll see it in
11 evidence, there's a note from Sam Pierce saying if we
12 can, please do so. He's not directing anybody. He's
13 not telling anybody. He's putting his input in.

14 When you go through the evidence look and see
15 if there's any notes like that on the projects in this
16 indictment for which Miss Dean is being charged. You're
17 not going to see those notes. Those notes don't exist.

18 You heard six days of testimony about all of
19 those other projects being funded. All around the
20 country. All their political backing. It is a
21 non-issue. It has nothing to do with this case.

22 In this case there are several distinct
23 projects that I listed yesterday and for brevity's sake
24 I won't go over them again. Those are the specific
25 ones. Look through the documents, and remember in your

1 recollections through the course of this testimony have
2 you heard anything or seen anything to suggest that
3 Sam Pierce asked for those to be funded?

4 And furthermore, Miss Dean will tell you and
5 has told you on the witness stand she didn't tell
6 Sam Pierce about John Mitchell's involvement with these
7 other people because she didn't know it. So Sam Pierce,
8 also, he's not involved in this case. It's what she
9 did.

10 You recall he ran the honor system. He relied
11 on other people to work and do their jobs properly and
12 when people do not do their jobs properly that's when
13 you have a problem here. When you have a public
14 official who uses a public office for private gain.

15 Mr. Wehner talked about the perjury counts.
16 And you'll see I've listed them, counts five through 12
17 in the indictment, and you'll get a copy of the
18 indictment and what those words are.

19 Mr. Wehner talked about 1987 and "that goes
20 solely on information provided by Secretary for
21 Housing." That's not true, ladies and gentlemen,
22 because once again we have that handwritten list,
23 Government's Exhibit 202. That's in Miss Dean's
24 handwriting, and you heard, just like we saw at the very
25 beginning of my closing argument yesterday, the

1 Government's exhibit 28, the letter to Louie Nunn at
2 Global Research, referencing a conversation with John
3 Mitchell. The defendant had to admit that that letter
4 existed because we had it, but she denied being involved
5 in that, saying Maurice Barksdale gave me that
6 information. Just like this. This is a handwritten
7 list of the various projects, the amounts funded, and in
8 fact on Metro-Dade, the exact bedroom configuration.
9 It's in her handwriting.

10 So she says to you, well, yes, this is mine,
11 this is my handwriting, but Thomas Demery is the one who
12 told me this and I wrote it down very quickly.

13 Well, you remember Michael Dorsey's testimony,
14 a witness testifying for the defense. He said that
15 Miss Dean did speak during that meeting and was saying
16 who was behind the project.

17 In her own handwriting she has the bedroom
18 configurations and the number of bedrooms, and then it
19 says "letter. They are funding 203 units to Metro-Dade
20 before Metro-Dade even asks for them." Is that the way
21 this program was supposed to operate? Is that the way
22 it's supposed to run?

23 There are four separate counts of perjury,
24 four separate counts of concealment. There is no sense
25 going into all of them because the Government contends

1 that each of those was a lie and a misstatement in much
2 the manner as you've seen during the course of this
3 trial. The defendant's statements change as they
4 benefit her. If she would lie on such trivial little
5 matter as to how long she knew Rick Shelby, what do you
6 think she'll do when faced with serious criminal
7 charges? And you've seen what she did.

8 There is no doubt, as we said, about that
9 \$4000.

10 I'd like to talk about the message to Lance
11 Wilson from John Mitchell. The Government has never
12 said that other people didn't write to John Mitchell.
13 First of all, we don't know what project we're talking
14 about here. Arama is not mentioned and, of course,
15 Maurice Barksdale is the Assistant Secretary at the
16 time. We know that. Mr. Barksdale testified.

17 But you might recall Government's Exhibit 18,
18 and this is the document that says -- has a little
19 handwritten note on top of Miss Dean's letterhead and it
20 says to Daddy.

21 And there's a memo from Philip Abrams, and you
22 recall she identified the handwriting on the upper
23 lefthand corner as being that of Lance Wilson. So Lance
24 Wilson is helping her out here, giving her information.
25 She's passing it on to John Mitchell.

1 Is that a defense to this charge? No, ladies
2 and gentlemen. Because count one has three projects.
3 Arama being the first, South Florida, the second, Park
4 Towers, the third. Lance Wilson isn't even in the
5 Department of Housing and Urban Development at any time
6 when those three projects are funded.

7 Again, politicians. Mr. Wehner said you can
8 see hundreds of pieces of paper in which politicians
9 back projects. And that's true. You will see that.
10 But what does that have to do with this case? What do
11 these politicians -- that is not what this case is
12 about.

13 You've heard the consultants were being paid
14 big money by the developers. If all they needed was a
15 politician, and they're a constituent of that
16 politician, to write a letter and that would have had an
17 effect, don't you think they would have done that and
18 saved hundreds of thousands of dollars on each project?

19 That doesn't make sense. It is not credible
20 to believe that just because someone sent a letter, it
21 got funded.

22 President Reagan, a lot was talked about some
23 project in which President Reagan announced the awarding
24 of units, I believe it was in New Jersey, and I don't
25 remember the State any more. Andrew Sankin is not

1 President Reagan. Andrew Sankin was, as we said, this
2 guy out of school just recently, who made \$250,000 and
3 in Deborah Dean's own words he was on the family
4 payroll. That's why he received those units. It's not
5 Ronald Reagan we're talking about in these charges.

6 Other projects are non-issues. We're talking
7 about these specific ones. Much like if there was a
8 \$50,000 kickback, Mr. Wehner said you'll hear evidence
9 of it. If there was a \$50,000 kickback she'd be charged
10 with it. That is not one of the charges. It's a
11 non-issue. There are 12 charges that you the jury must
12 determine the guilt or non-guilt of the defendant. Not
13 everything in God's creation.

14 And the Government has never called the
15 defendant the devil incarnate. We are simply saying she
16 misused her position. She misused the public trust in
17 her time at HUD and then when it was discovered, when it
18 was detected, she lied about it. That is what's at
19 issue here. Not everything else. The devil incarnate?
20 It's a non-issue.

21 I just would like to mention Mr. Wehner said
22 things might have been different if the Government's
23 exhibits 27, 28, 29, that were shown at the same time,
24 well, you might recall they were shown to Governor Nunn
25 at exactly the same time, and you might also note since

1 they're numbered 27, 28 and 29, when you get them they
2 will be one right after other, that's exactly how we
3 showed them. That's the order they're in.

4 Mr. Wehner mentioned something about the
5 conspiracies and saying, well, some of the people said
6 they didn't know certain things. Jack Brennan didn't
7 know that John Mitchell was involved in Arama. Well,
8 isn't that the hallmark of conspiracy? Secrecy? Where
9 people don't know it?

10 Remember Martin Fine, the developer for Park
11 Towers? He said he did not know John Mitchell was
12 involved. The consultant he hired, Eli Feinberg, he did
13 not know Mr. Mitchell was involved. And both of those
14 testimonies were unimpeached. Nobody ever contended
15 that they did know. So the evidence is neither
16 individual knew, and Mr. Fine paid \$225,000, 50,000 of
17 which went directly to John Mitchell, and he didn't even
18 know he was involved. His role was secret. That's what
19 conspiracies are about.

20 Mr. Wehner talked about the \$4000. And the
21 fact that he has shown that that is really what happened
22 because they have a bank stub. Well, to believe this
23 you'd have to believe that Mr. Kitchin gave her \$4000 to
24 decorate an apartment he never owned, aside from the
25 fact that we found these documents later on to

1 absolutely disprove the claim that she was trying to
2 sell it as of June 15th. So she'd have to prove that
3 the apartment that he never owned he was going to have
4 decorated and that this \$4000 check was written when she
5 has no funds whatsoever to pay it with.

6 And he told you that the FBI had time to
7 analyze this and they would have shown that it was
8 false. Well, that's not in evidence. There's no
9 evidence here that the FBI had time to analyze that
10 check stub. Or that they looked and made sure that the
11 ink was two years old or three years old or whatever.
12 That is not in evidence. It's the evidence on which you
13 must base your decision, ladies and gentlemen.

14 And don't forget that \$4000 and the antique
15 store. No evidence yet of an antique store in 1987. In
16 fact, she couldn't remember exactly when she got it.
17 But it wasn't in 1987. But in 1987 we do know that only
18 12 days before the check from Lou Kitchin she bought a
19 piano for \$4500, and that, too didn't come out on direct
20 examination. That only came out on cross-examination.

21 Ladies and gentlemen, during his opening
22 statement Mr. Wehner told you that the Government is all
23 fouled up. All fouled up. That's exactly what he said.
24 He's wrong about that. The Government's not all fouled
25 up. Private individuals, certain individuals might be

1 when they don't do their job as they should. When they
2 don't properly perform a public function. When they
3 corruptly favor certain people. That's when Government
4 gets fouled up. Not all Government. Not everyone.

5 And he kept saying your Government, and that's
6 right. It is your Government. It's all our
7 Government. Not for a select few, not for certain
8 insiders who have access to high ranking public
9 officials like Mr. Shelby who Mr. Wehner mentioned who
10 said I didn't do anything wrong, and you might recall
11 that I had to go back at him in redirect and say didn't
12 you tell the grand jury, and this time I got that right,
13 you told the grand jury several years ago, didn't you,
14 that you were wrong, and he admitted that, yes, in fact
15 he had. He, too, was trying to tell you he had done
16 nothing wrong but he told the grand jury he had done
17 something wrong. That's what Mr. Shelby testified to.
18 He knew he had done something wrong. He knew he had
19 access to high ranking public officials.

20 Ladies and gentlemen, in the name of the
21 United States of America, I will be asking you to find
22 the defendant guilty as to each and every charge in the
23 indictment. All 12 of them.

24 In the Government's view the Government has
25 proven its case beyond all reasonable doubt, beyond any

1 and all doubt. There could be no doubt that the
2 defendant conspired with the people in counts one, two
3 and three, accepted that illegal gratuity or loan in
4 count four, and then lied and covered up and concealed
5 what she had done so she wouldn't be known for what she
6 had done. So people wouldn't -- it wouldn't become
7 public. Because she didn't want people to know how she
8 was using her office, using a public office for private
9 gain.

10 And by your verdict tell her no more. You
11 won't put up with corrupt public officials, people who
12 use their office, public office, for private gain, who
13 work for a select few and not for all of us, because it
14 is as Mr. Wehner said your Government, our Government.

15 She was a public official entrusted with
16 millions of dollars of taxpayers' money, for what
17 purpose? To provide housing for the poor. Is that the
18 way it worked? Did local priorities play any role in
19 this? No, ladies and gentlemen. It just depended on
20 who you knew and how it worked out. And I say millions
21 of dollars, Arama alone, the evidence shows, was over
22 \$28,000,000 and that's still being paid to this day.
23 They're 15-year contracts.

24 Think of the amount of money that went for
25 housing, and did it work the way it should have? The

1 way Mel Adams told you it could have if priorities
2 played a role? No. It worked the way a select few
3 wanted it to work.

4 When you are paid by the United States you
5 work for all of us. As Mr. Wehner said, it's your
6 Government.

7 Mr. Wehner asked you what would you have
8 Miss Dean do in the performance of her duty? What would
9 you ask of her? Honesty. Faithfulness. Undivided
10 loyalty. Remember what I said, it is we the people, by
11 the people, for the people. We, the people. It is all
12 of us. It is not if your prominent and powerful and you
13 belong to a select few. It is for all of us.

14 And, ladies and gentlemen, Miss Dean did not
15 work for all of us. She worked for herself, for her
16 family, for her own enrichment, and because of that she
17 is guilty. Not because of lunches and other matters.
18 It's because of her corrupt actions as a corrupt public
19 official.

20 Thank you.

21 THE COURT: All right, ladies and gentlemen,
22 what we're going to do is have a luncheon recess at this
23 time.

24 Again, the case is not submitted to you yet
25 for decision. You're not to discuss it or talk about it