

\$15,000. Father Sicking fights poverty at a disadvantage, it would seem. He is without adequate funds while in his heart and mind is a very comprehensive program that could be most constructive if implemented: I came away from Cincinnati convinced that the war on poverty will not be won between the hours of 9 and 4 by paid program workers but rather will be won by people like Father Sicking who, when 4 p.m. arrives, stay with and live with the poor. The Father Sicking's have the confidence of the people while there is considerable doubt when it comes to paid poverty program employees.

I would recommend that more of the war on poverty be channeled through groups, individuals and agencies who are working in the field—the Salvation Army, the missions, the community councils, the Father Sicking's. I also feel that the program will be much more successful if a higher emphasis is placed on training for job skills rather than the make-work projects.

One of our most effective witnesses was Willard Dudley, the able director of the Ohio Bureau of Unemployment and the Employment Services, who indicated how full-time, comprehensive programs were being shortchanged while make-shift, short duration programs were receiving massive Federal grants to accomplish limited objectives with, unfortunately, limited hopes for success. His testimony alone was an indication of how the glamor programs like poverty attract many unworkable or less advisable projects because "there is where the money is."

Representative AYRES and myself now believe even more that the poverty program should be investigated thoroughly before the Congress considers giving it a new lease on life. We should go into the field and hear what the people are thinking and not listen merely to those bureaucrats who can come to Washington and applaud their own efforts. Many other aspects of the poverty program could be discussed at this time but I offer these brief remarks as an initial report on our hearings. Again, I say that men like Father William Sicking, full-time poverty warriors, are what is needed to help combat the blight which we all know exists. They, far more than the high paid, part-time poverty employees will bring us a solution to the problem.

I now yield to my colleague the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. CLANCY].

Mr. CLANCY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to thank my colleagues Mr. WILLIAM AYRES and Mr. JOHN ASHBROOK for coming to Cincinnati to conduct public hearings on the effectiveness and administration of the poverty programs in our city and for going out among the poor to hear their views.

I could not agree more with the observations just made by Mr. ASHBROOK, and in particular his comments with respect to the work being done by Father William Sicking.

The articulate testimony of the Rev. William Sicking was most helpful and enlightening. Father Sicking is director of De Porres Center in the West End,

pastor of St. Paul Church on Pendleton Street, and has been a trustee of Cincinnati's antipoverty agency—the Community Action Commission—since the CAC was founded in 1964.

I have known Father Sicking not only as a great spiritual leader, but as a personal friend for 35 years. To know him is to admire him. His dedicated work with the poor and the underprivileged is well known throughout the Greater Cincinnati area. His many friends and I applaud him for his dedication and his interest in seeing to it that if there are Federal programs to assist the poor, the poor themselves benefit more and the professional workers less.

Father Sicking is not an armchair commentator on conditions in the ghetto. He has a working residence in a poverty area and has been able to get the reaction and thinking of poor people. He knows at first hand the hunger, unemployment, disease and overcrowding in substandard housing where crime and violence thrive.

Father Sicking told the members of the congressional committee that "grass-roots poor people laugh at the antipoverty program."

The following excerpt from his testimony should also be of interest to my colleagues:

"CAC? Never heard of it," they (the poor) say. Those who have heard of it call them "big shots" who are telling us to raise ourselves by our own bootstraps, only we don't have any boots.

And: "If it weren't for us poor people, those guys (poverty program employees) wouldn't have a job and be pulling down those fancy salaries."

Father Sicking concluded his testimony with five specific recommendations which merit consideration. I am convinced that as a result of our hearings in Cincinnati and hearings that could possibly be conducted in other communities, constructive legislation providing for an improved poverty program, with increased emphasis on more jobs, will be forthcoming.

PROPOSED NEW CHESAPEAKE BAY PARALLEL BRIDGE AND THE J. E. GREINER CO.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. LONG], is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, legislation now pending before Congress would authorize the location of certain toll projects in Maryland. H.R. 11627 would authorize a Baltimore Harbor Tunnel and three bridges across the Chesapeake Bay—one in the Baltimore area, one in southern Maryland and one parallel to, and duplicative of, the present span.

My bill, H.R. 3135, would exclude authorization for this parallel bridge, which was rejected by the voters of Maryland in a referendum last November. Despite this rejection by the voters, the Maryland State Roads Commission is pushing ahead with its plans to build a second bridge alongside the existing Chesapeake Bay Bridge.

And closely associated with the State Roads Commission in pressing for this rejected bridge is the J. E. Greiner Co., a consulting engineering firm of Baltimore, Md., which for decades has been a dominating factor in the location and planning of roads and bridges in Maryland. As early as January 31, 1964, the Greiner Co. recommended that—

First priority be given to the construction of a second bridge adjacent to the existing bridge at Sandy Point.

It is significant that this report was issued over the signature of J. E. Donnelly, one of three partners in the Greiner Co.¹ It is significant also that the State roads commission has just recommended to the Maryland Board of Public Works that Greiner be awarded the contract to supervise the design and construction of a parallel bay bridge.

This contract is about to be awarded. The parallel bridge will be so costly that it will use up, possibly by the year 2000, any money or borrowing capacity that might have been available to build a bay bridge in another location, such as in Baltimore or in southern Maryland. The contract to build this bridge would thus determine the future population, traffic, and economic patterns of Maryland for decades to come.

It is significant, further, that the Greiner Co. scarcely stands to lose money from this contract to design the parallel bay bridge. In 1965, Greiner Co. estimated its fee for this work at \$5.1 million² even though it had done the design for the present bridge in the same location, a design which is presumably still available to assist the Greiner Co. in designing the parallel bay bridge. This fee was based on 10 percent of construction costs. Because construction costs will have risen since 1965, Greiner's fee, on this 10-percent basis, could be \$7 to \$10 million.

In view of the importance of this contract to build a parallel bay bridge, the competence and integrity of the consulting engineering company should be beyond reproach.

A real question now arises whether this is true of the J. E. Greiner Co. I hereby place in the Record an account of a criminal trial in which J. E. Donnelly, partner in the Greiner Co., was a defendant, and of a civil suit against the Greiner Co. itself. The record of these trials contains vital information concerning the practices of the Greiner Co. in another State—information that should serve as a warning to the people of Maryland of how their money may be wasted on a project which they have rejected and which, I have repeatedly argued, has been undertaken partly for the aggrandizement of the Greiner Co.

The cast of characters in this criminal trial includes:

The J. E. Greiner Co., as a company, and two of its top officials;

¹ Location Studies, Chesapeake Bay Crossings, State Roads Commission of Maryland, January 1964.

² Location Studies, Chesapeake Bay Crossing, prepared for the State Roads Commission of Maryland, J. E. Greiner Company, January, 1965.

H11940

The chairman, secretary-treasurer, finance director, and two other officials of the Pennsylvania Turnpike Commission, to which the Greiner Co. was consulting engineer;

The president and general manager of the Manu-Mine Research & Development Co. whose plans were endorsed by the Greiner Co.

This cast of characters is tied together in an interesting web of business and family relationships. Five of this nine-member cast eventually were sentenced to prison. Another was involved in a civil suit running into the millions of dollars.

Here is the sequence of events:

In December 1953, the J. E. Greiner Co. was named consulting engineer of the Pennsylvania Turnpike Commission for the northeastern extension of the Pennsylvania Turnpike.

In 1957, in connection with this project, J. E. Donnelly, partner in the J. E. Greiner Co., was indicted on a "charge of conspiracy to cheat and defraud the Pennsylvania Turnpike Commission" of "millions of dollars."⁸ This is the same J. E. Donnelly who signed the 1964 Greiner Co. report recommending a parallel bay bridge.

G. Joseph Hudert, a Greiner Co. engineer, was indicted at the same time on the same charge.⁴ Both men are still officials of the Greiner Co.

The Pennsylvania Turnpike Commission dismissed the J. E. Greiner Co. as the Turnpike's consulting engineer and brought a \$7.7 million civil negligence suit against the Greiner Co. in the U.S. District Court of Maryland.⁵ Defendants Donnelly and Hudert were not convicted of the criminal charge, but the Greiner Co. paid the Turnpike Commission in order to settle the civil suit out of court.⁶

To indicate further the seriousness of the case in which the Greiner Co. was involved, five of the nine defendants standing trial for criminal conspiracy and three related charges were convicted.⁷ Three of the men were top officials of the Pennsylvania Turnpike Commission: Thomas J. Evans, chairman; James F. Torrance, secretary and treasurer; and Paul J. McNeill, finance director. Two others convicted were: Charles W. Stickler, president and principal stockholder of the Manu-Mine Research & Development Co., and Clayton A. Landside, Manu-Mine's general manager. Manu-Mine President Stickler was also a nephew of Turnpike Chairman Evans, while Chairman Evans' son, Richard H. Evans, was Manu-Mine's vice president until his death several months before the return of indictments in these cases.⁸

The criminal cases and the civil proceedings arose because of Manu-Mine's estimates for, and performance of, mine drilling and slushing work on the northeastern extension of the Pennsylvania

Turnpike, for which Greiner was the consulting engineer.⁹

Manu-Mine had claimed that mine drilling and slushing were needed because a portion of the northeastern extension was to be built in a region containing inactive coal mines. The cavities of these mines, claimed Manu-Mine, had to be found by blind drilling and then slushed, that is, filled in with silt. This would provide the necessary firm subsurface support for the road.

Defendant Donnelly of the Greiner Co. was present during a February 28, 1955, meeting at which the Pennsylvania Turnpike Commission awarded the mine drilling and slushing contract to Manu-Mine. Donnelly later admitted that he knew of the family relationship between Manu-Mine President Stickler and Turnpike Commission Chairman Evans.¹⁰

At the 1957 criminal trial, the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania's expert witnesses testified that 95 percent of the drilling and slushing work was unnecessary because nearly all the coal mines had filled in naturally and presented no threat to the road's stability. The extent to which the work was both unnecessary and overpriced can be judged by the testimony of Daniel H. Connelly, deputy secretary of the Pennsylvania Department of Mines, that Manu-Mine had billed the turnpike commission \$7.5 million for one part of the drilling and slushing work which should only have cost \$82.9 thousand at most,¹¹ or only 1 percent.

Defendant Donnelly of the Greiner Co. testified at his trial that:

The Greiner Company did endorse the program of slushing as developed by Manu-Mine.¹²

Greiner Co. also issued a report challenging the Pennsylvania State Department of Mines' pretrial criticisms of Manu-Mine. This report was signed by defendant Donnelly,¹³ despite the fact that:

First. Admittedly neither Donnelly nor anyone else associated with the Greiner Co. had experience in mining engineering;

Second. The Greiner Co. had not sought the advice of disinterested experts in mining engineering;¹⁴

Third. Donnelly admitted he had not consulted the State department of mines before signing his report;¹⁵ but had consulted with Manu-Mine.¹⁶

Fourth. Donnelly testified he had not visited any of the mines in question nor observed Manu-Mine's operation before preparing the report.¹⁷ In fact, he testi-

fied: "I have never been in a mine."¹⁸

Donnelly testified that his report was prepared at the request of G. Franklin McSorley, who succeeded Evans as chairman of the Turnpike Commission.¹⁹ McSorley was later convicted of criminal misbehavior in public office.²⁰

The civil suit filed by the Pennsylvania Turnpike Commission against the Greiner Co. charged Greiner's negligence in giving every phase of Manu-Mine's plans its "complete and unqualified approval" and in advising the Commission that Manu-Mine's proposal was proper and reasonable, when it was actually wholly unnecessary and exorbitantly expensive.²¹

In sum, the people of Maryland have rejected the parallel bay bridge. The Commonwealth of Pennsylvania not only dismissed this consulting engineering firm which now wants to supervise construction of this parallel bridge, but instituted civil suit against the Greiner Co. and charged two of its top officials with criminal conspiracy.

I call on Governor Agnew and the State Roads Commission of Maryland to abandon their plans to build a parallel bridge and to turn down the award of the engineering contract to the Greiner Co. Both this project and the Greiner Co. are by now thoroughly discredited. I urge Congress to join the voters of my State in rejecting the parallel bay bridge.

(Mr. LONG of Maryland asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

THE UNITED STATES SHOULD RE-NEW ITS NATO MILITARY AID TO GREECE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HELSTOSKI). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PUCINSKI] is recognized for 1 hour.

(Mr. PUCINSKI asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, earlier this month it was my privilege to be the guest of the Pan Arcadian Federation at its convention held in Athens, Greece.

Mr. Chris Mitchell, president of the Pan Arcadian Federation, had invited me to address his gathering and visit the homeland of many of my constituents.

I was most grateful for this kind invitation because it did give me an opportunity to see Greece. But equally important, it afforded me an opportunity to see what effect the revolution of April 21 had on the people of Greece.

I was in Athens for 10 days, and during this period I had made a very exhaustive study of the present situation in Greece.

I had talked to most of the present military leaders who constitute the current Government of Greece. I talked at great length with the new Prime Minister, Constantinos Kollas, and with all of the Ministers, including Gen. Stylianos Patakos, who is Minister of the Interior. I talked with a number of civilians who

⁸ Dauphin County Reports, Vol. 72, 1958, Twelfth Judicial Circuit of Pennsylvania, Page 34.

⁴ Dauphin County Reports, Vol. 72, Page 34.

⁵ Civil Action No. 10250, U.S. District Court for the District of Maryland.

⁶ Minutes of meeting of Pennsylvania Turnpike Commission, November 18, 1957.

⁷ Dauphin County Reports, Vol. 72, Page 34.

⁸ Dauphin County Reports, Vol. 72, Pages 35 and 36.

⁹ Dauphin County Reports, Vol. 72, Pages 35 and 36.

¹⁰ Transcript of criminal trial in the Court of Quarter Sessions of Dauphin County, Pennsylvania, Nos. 216, 218, 220 and 221, January Sessions, 1957, Page 5678.

¹¹ Dauphin County Reports, Vol. 72, Page 45.

¹² Transcript for Nos. 216, 218, 220 and 221, Dauphin County (see earlier reference), Page 5674.

¹³ Transcript, Pages 5646 and 5551.

¹⁴ Dauphin County Reports, Vol. 72, Pages 49 and 50.

¹⁵ Transcript, Page 5684.

¹⁶ Dauphin County Reports, Vol. 72, Page 49.

¹⁷ Transcript, Page 5687.

¹⁸ Transcript, Page 5638.

¹⁹ Transcript, Page 5641.

²⁰ Dauphin County Reports, Vol. 72, Page 241.

²¹ Civil Action No. 10250, U.S. District Court of Maryland.

remain in the Government in key positions.

I had extensive discussions with former members of the Parliament who today oppose the present regime and were very frank and forthright to me in their criticism.

I had a 2-hour conversation with former Prime Minister, George Papan-dreou, who is presently under house arrest in his villa in Athens. Mr. Papan-dreou, speaking in halting English, was very frank in his conversations with me, and said he found my visit most welcome.

I spoke extensively with publishers of Greek newspapers who are now operating under rigid rules of censorship, and they were extremely frank in their conversations with me.

I talked at great length with the American representative to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, stationed in Athens.

I talked to a number of American observers and businessmen who were in Greece at the time of the revolution and who, since April 21, have had an opportunity to carefully review the actions of the present Government and the attitude of the Greek people toward this Government.

I spent countless hours in discussions with Greek businessmen, labor leaders, financiers, and just plain ordinary citizens in the streets and villages.

I discussed the present situation with our own American diplomatic representatives.

Mr. Speaker, I took an extensive helicopter flight over northern Greece and personally viewed the extensive damage done to a large number of villages by the recent earthquakes. I saw some 6,500 Greek families living in canvas tents and badly damaged homes—many without roofs—fearful of what will happen when cold weather sets in very shortly.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I visited the island of Yarros, which is about 1 hour's helicopter flight from Athens and which houses the prison of some 2,500 political prisoners.

I believe that I am the only foreigner to have ever visited this island, and I took along with me my own State Department translator. I personally heard the prisoners addressed by General Patakos, and I had an opportunity to see firsthand the conditions which exist on the island and the attitude of the prisoners.

Mr. Speaker, I can assure my colleagues in Congress that my search for the truth in Greece was most exhaustive, and I am grateful to the Pan Arcadian Federation for making possible this personal observance of the present situation there.

From my extensive conversations and personal observations, I have come to the conclusion that:

First. It is in the interest of the United States for our country to resume shipment of important military aid to Greece as part of our NATO defense structure.

Second. It is in our national interest for the United States to provide the people of Greece with disaster relief of at least \$15 million to help the victims of the earthquake avoid extreme hardships when winter hits their canvas tents.

Third. It is in the interest of the United States to press for restoration of parliamentary government in Greece, and this can be done by giving the present Government of Greece technical assistance to meet many of the civilian problems which the generals, by the very nature of their military background, will find difficulty in solving; we should help this Government develop a democratic base for restoration of constitutional government.

Fourth. It is important for the United States to help King Constantine press the present military regime to restore parliamentary government to Greece as quickly as possible.

Mr. Speaker, I do not want my observations or my remarks ever to be construed as condoning a government which would deny its people basic civil rights.

But neither would I ever want to be blinded by the realities of life, and one of those realities is that the military regime presently is in control of Greece.

Furthermore, this regime has stated publicly and unequivocally that it supports America's position in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization and will keep Greece in NATO.

Our Nation cannot, and must not, ignore the fact that the crisis in the Middle East is not over. The Soviet Union continues to have her evil designs for the destruction of Israel. We may need Greece as our most reliable base if the situation in the Middle East should worsen. During the recent crisis, Greece stood with us and helped relocate Americans from the Middle East.

Whether you like it or not, the present Government of Greece is there; it is a reality; and, on the basis of my most honest and sincere studies, right now this Government has the popular support of the people of Greece.

There are those who would challenge this statement and I respect their views.

But the fact remains that if an election were to be held in Greece today, responsible people in Greece—including the most bitter critics of the present regime—told me that the present military government would be overwhelmingly elected because it has restored order out of chaos in this country.

I know there are those who will seriously question this conclusion, but the fact of the matter is that the people in the streets of Athens and in the villages told me that conditions had gotten so intolerable in Greece prior to April 21, that a revolution was inevitable.

Many people told me that when the revolution finally occurred on the morning of April 21, and the military leaders took over, the general reaction of the people of Greece was: "What took them so long in coming?"

As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, one of the leaders of the revolution told me:

Congressman, we didn't even have to stretch; we just yawned and 8½ million people rolled over into our lap.

It is a matter of fact that not a single shot was fired and not a person was killed in this bloodless revolution. It is also a matter of fact that the conservative press had been predicting this revolution for some time before April 21.

I can find no comfort in the fact that NATO tanks were rolled into the streets of Athens on the morning of the revolution, nor can we ignore the fact that the present rulers of Greece have instituted a whole series of repressive moves, from severe censorship of the press to suppression of the constitution, and the Parliament to a literal substitution of judicial process with a system of military courts.

Nor could anyone ever seriously defend the limitations on assembly imposed by this regime which require that whenever more than five people meet, the names and addresses of all those attending a meeting—including even a family reunion—must be supplied to the local police and permission must be obtained for such a meeting. I have been assured this limitation will be dropped very shortly, and even now is not being enforced.

I am sure it is of deep concern to all of us that the new slander law in Greece imposed by the Government makes every citizen subject to arrest and prosecution if he speaks out in any manner and criticizes to any degree the present Government.

These are police tactics which we, as Americans and free people everywhere, find contemptible and repugnant to our way of life.

But the military leaders hasten to assure visitors to Greece that these measures were necessary to restore order, and will be removed just as quickly as possible. A casual visitor to Greece would not know the military rule the country. There are no soldiers in the streets or hotels, people walk freely in the streets; the restaurants and night clubs are operating as usual. Visitors are treated with exceptional care and courtesy.

The military rulers of Greece have assured King Constantine that they will have the Constitution rewritten as quickly as possible and presented to a plebiscite—perhaps even this year—and that elections of delegates to the Parliament will be held as quickly as possible.

I am aware of those who argue that in the last 4 months, during which this military regime has governed Greece, it has not shown any evidence that it intends to keep its pledge to restore parliamentary government.

In my judgment, Mr. Speaker, fair play dictates a corollary observation, and that is, that in these same 4 months, the military has not shown any evidence that it does not intend to keep its pledge.

It is easy enough for us Americans—deeply set in traditions of democracy—to insist that the Government institute constitutional rule in Greece before any further assistance is given. I would subscribe to this doctrine, but I think it is important to know that in a country whose northern border has three nations under Communist rule—the fear of its leaders are justified.

Greece has Albania, Bulgaria, and Yugoslavia on her northern border. History has shown us there is no "second chance" with communism.

You do not have any time to be wrong when you have three neighbors who would like to plunge you into the Communist orbit at the first opportunity.

September 14, 1967

Mr. Speaker, among the people I discussed all these matters with, I found that even the most bitter critics of this Government admit the Constitutional Revision Committee is made up of fair people, and there is a confident feeling throughout Greece that this Constitutional Revision Committee will present a series of meaningful and helpful recommendations for strengthening the Constitution of Greece; for strengthening it in such a manner that another coup like the one experienced on April 21 will be impossible, but, at the same time a Constitution that will give Greece vastly more protection against Communist encroachment.

I spent 2 hours with former Prime Minister Papandreu. It is very clear that Papandreu has nothing but contempt for the present Government, and this is certainly understandable. George Papandreu believes that the ills of Greece could have been solved in the election of May 28, but he himself admits he does not think he would have won a majority, and admits he would have had to rely on help from splinter parties in Greece in order to form a government. The Communists, it is generally agreed, would have emerged as one of the biggest splinter parties in the May 28 elections.

The senior Papandreu defends his son, Andreas Papandreu, who is now awaiting trial for treason. It will be recalled that the King had deposed George Papandreu as Prime Minister in 1965 when he tried to make his son Andreas Minister of Defense. It is a known fact that Andreas Papandreu recommended pulling Greece out of NATO. This was one of the main subjects of dispute within the Government and the reason King Constantine deposed his Prime Minister.

George Papandreu admits both he and his son were critical of NATO because the NATO command told them NATO would not help Greece if she was attacked by Turkey for trying to recapture Cyprus. NATO insisted it could help only when a nonmember nation attacked Greece. Both Papandreus insisted they did not need NATO under those conditions and threatened to pull Greece out of NATO, the Prime Minister said.

Papandreu says he would never have agreed to work with the Communists, that he would never have agreed to a coalition government if the coalition was with the Communists, but those within the Government insist that after 2 years of being deposed as Prime Minister, Papandreu would have been willing to agree to form a coalition government with the help of the Communists, and the price of such a coalition would have been the withdrawal of Greece from NATO.

I talked with responsible newspaper publishers in Greece; men who today must submit page proofs before publication to a censor, men who find this system contemptible, and men who find the Government very despotic, but men who have admitted that prior to April 21 the Greek press was intolerable and completely irresponsible.

One of the leading publishers of Greece told me if I had asked him on April 19 whether it was true about the low state

of affairs of the Greek press he would have had to tell me, "Congressman, I am ashamed to admit I am a member of the Greek journalistic profession."

This publisher, who yearns for the day when he can again see a free press in Greece, said that the Government had asked him and all other publishers to submit by September 10 a memorandum on how the censorship could be lifted from the press of Greece and still retain some sense of responsibility among the publishers of newspapers in Greece.

This publisher said that the publishers would submit such a list.

I talked to people on the street who told me prior to April 21 the situation in Greece was completely intolerable and unbearable in terms of corruption.

Papandreu himself said that toward the very end, before the revolution, members of the Parliament reached a new low in corruption and in personal dishonesty.

The man on the street, the cabdrivers, the truckdrivers, the people in the hotels and the villages, told me that prior to April 21, the obtaining of a simple certificate, a birth certificate, a license, or other official document required the payment of substantial sums of money by the people to public officials. Graft and corruption was the order of the day.

These were the conditions that created the situation which led to the revolution on April 21. These were the conditions which permitted the military to take over without firing a shot.

I must say that from all the evidence I saw, this whole mess has been cleaned up and the people approve of the strict measures.

Mr. Speaker, in my judgment, the great danger to Greece today is if the present Government fails, we will be in a very dangerous situation. It is entirely possible that this Government may fail. In my discussions with these military people I found a serious unawareness of the practical problems of government.

These are military men who have dealt with military problems and have resolved them in a military way. Very frequently they do not understand the complex nature of dealing with people and their problems.

There is a fear in Greece that if this Government should fail, civil war may very well ensue in Greece. It may well force Greece out of NATO and throw the nation to the Communists.

I can think of nothing more disastrous to the interests of America than to see Greece forced out of NATO or for NATO to lose this very important bastion on the Mediterranean. It would give the Soviet Union access to the Mediterranean and probably force our 6th Fleet out of the Mediterranean. It would give the Soviet Union control over the Middle East and ultimately the gateway to Africa. This is a prize that the Communists have coveted for the last two decades.

So, Mr. Speaker, I say while my heart is heavy and I certainly sympathize with all those who cannot accept the present military rule of Greece, I say that we must view this problem on a broader basis. Above all we must view the prob-

lem of Greece and her role today in terms of what she means to the United States and what she means to the stability of Europe, to NATO and the free world.

I believe that we Americans should exert every pressure to restore democratic rule to Greece. While we are doing this we should not weaken our NATO structure. I share with our NATO allies the concern that military equipment should go to a military government and be used against her people, but it seems to me we ought to recall this is not the first time America has dealt with military governments. This is not the first time that we have dealt with a government that was not completely to our liking. This is not the first time we have recognized and dealt with governments that did not fit into our particular American mold of democracy. The realities of life require that we face up to the fact that we need Greece and Greece needs us.

It is my hope, Mr. Speaker, that when we view the great earthquake damage in Greece and all of her other problems, America ought to carefully reconsider our policy of withholding military aid to Greece as our NATO ally.

While I was in Greece, five of our NATO nations, including Greece, held maneuvers in northern Greece. Just across her borders, the Communist member of the Warsaw Pact were holding similar maneuvers in Bulgaria. Let no one kid you—there are powerful Communist forces at play in this area, and NATO needs all the help it can get.

As far as economic assistance is concerned, I flew over village after village in northern Greece and saw these people living in canvas tents. These people are concerned because they have severe winters in the mountains and are heading toward the colder months. They have very serious problems of housing their families and children and I am sure there will be great suffering this winter.

Mr. Speaker, America has a long tradition of extending humanitarian help to mankind. We ought to help these Greek people and we ought to help them immediately.

Even George Papandreu, the most severe critic of the present Government in Greece, said that insofar as assistance to the victims of the earthquake is concerned, the United States of America ought to do its share to alleviate their suffering for the Greek people are among our best friends.

So, Mr. Speaker, I hope that we would seriously consider responding to our traditional role as a humanitarian nation, particularly since the Greeks have traditionally been our friends.

I might add that as I flew over Greece, I saw the results of our foreign aid. I saw the results of our economic assistance, I saw the great electric powerlines; paved roads and farm-to-market roads; and I saw the various irrigation projects. I saw fertile fields where before there was barren land. These projects have survived 13 different governments of Greece since World War II.

I say when we invest in the people of Greece, the harvest of this humanitarian

September 14, 1967

investment will come back to us many-fold. Governments come and go, and they have come and gone in the past in Greece over the last 13 years. But the progress that we have built in Greece with American help today stands as an indestructible bond between the people of Greece and the people of the United States of America, a bond of friendship and loyalty that I am sure will transcend all time.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I flew to the Island of Yarros, and I visited the prison there. It is an hour's helicopter flight from Athens. There had been about 6,500 political prisoners on this island since April 21. Most of them were charged with some form of Communist activity since the civil war in 1947, and many of them had already previously served sentences for this activity. Some 4,000 have been released and have been sent back to their home. Of the 2,500 remaining, 227 were women of various ages.

I saw the general talking to these people, telling them, "Look, you do not belong on this island; we do not want you here; what we want you to do is to make an oral declaration, or sign a statement that you will not conspire with the Communists to overthrow this government and then you are free to go home."

Mr. Speaker, I recall one incident in particular. There was a young mother in a room with three other women. She was a mother of three children. She herself was about 28 years old. The picture of her three children was over her cot on the wall.

The general said:

You do not belong here; your children need you; why do you not go home and be a good mother to them; leave the politics to others; you be a good mother. All you have to do is to make an oral statement that you are not going to conspire with the Communists to overthrow this Government, and we will have you home tonight. I cannot tell you what to think. If you want to think Communist, this is your privilege. No one can look into the depths of your mind, but we can ask you not to conspire with the Communists to overthrow this Government.

Mr. Speaker, the young woman put her feet up on the bed and she looked the general in the eye and said:

I was born a leftist; I think leftist; and I will die a leftist; thank you but I am going to stay here.

After talking to about a thousand of these people, it is difficult not to believe that this particular group are hard-core Communists who consider their imprisonment a sacrifice to their cause.

Mr. Speaker, I do not want American foreign policy to be dictated by the 2,500 people who are on that island at the present time. I saw the personal efforts which we being made to urge these people to leave the island; more than 4,000 have responded and have been released. I had my own interpreter there so that there would be no mistake about what was being said. I am convinced that every effort is being made to let these people go home. However, these people obviously believe in their cause with a fervor. They are entitled to their beliefs, and I believe the Government has made a serious blunder in arresting them in the first place. I could not defend their arrests, but the fact of the matter is that

these people are the victims of a revolution in which the military believes with the same fervor that they were saving Greece from communism.

So, Mr. Speaker, when we hear about 2,500 prisoners on the Island of Yarros, they are living under conditions similar to many prisons in our own country. They sleep on canvas cots. The food is reasonable. The dormitories are clean. These people feel they are making a great contribution and great sacrifice to their cause, and they made no secret in proclaiming this to the general when he visited them.

One of the interesting aspects of this visit was the firmness with which these prisoners talked to the general. They openly argued that they should be released but not a single person offered to make the declaration not to conspire against the Government.

I am the only foreigner who has visited the island. It is my belief that most of these people will accede to the pledge not to conspire against the Government and will be released.

So, Mr. Speaker, it would seem to me that we have an obligation to review the situation in Greece. I believe that certainly we ought to study all the aspects of the situation. I believe that we should help King Constantine, who was here just the other day.

King Constantine is holding these leaders to their promise that they will restore constitutional government as quickly as possible. King Constantine said "All I want from you is time, understanding and patience."

It seems to me that the alternative to working with these people is to isolate them; to isolate these military leaders, and let them compound their errors and with each error tighten the noose around the people.

History shows that every revolution begets another revolution. Every revolution provokes another revolution. This was a bloodless revolution. No one can predict what its successor may be like.

In my judgment it would be a mistake to isolate these people. I feel perhaps the better policy would be to try to work with them and continue to apply American pressure to make sure that they keep their pledge of restoring parliamentary government to this country.

One thing is certain, Mr. Speaker, for better or worse, this Government in Greece is on record as standing with us against communism. Who can say what any other government born out of civil war may do as regards its relation to us.

We have the pledge of King Constantine, an honorable man, who says he will continue pressuring his Government for restoration of parliamentary government.

We have something much deeper, Mr. Speaker. We have a tradition among the Greek people themselves. The most colossal mistake this Government could make would be to try to renege on its pledge to restore parliamentary government to the people of Greece.

The Greeks originated democracy.

The Greeks have a long and stubborn history of struggle for freedom and democracy.

The Greeks were the first ones in 1947 who, against great odds, stood up to the Communists, and suffered great losses to protect their country for freedom.

Mr. Speaker, I will stake my hopes and my confidence on the people of Greece. I am confident the people of Greece will force this Government to keep its pledge to restore parliamentary government.

But the problem today before us as Americans is not to let our NATO defense become so weak that this Government will have to either drop out of NATO or we will be an open target for Communist aggression.

It is my hope that we will help King Constantine return Greece to its traditional role as the cradle of democracy.

It is my hope also that we Americans are going to look soberly at this problem of helping the economy of Greece and helping Greece militarily. By giving Greece NATO help, we are not condoning denial of constitutional government to that country. The indisputable fact of the day is that in this troubled world, with great trouble in the Middle East, with great trouble in Europe, with great trouble in Asia, I submit, Mr. Speaker, America needs Greece today a great deal more than Greece needs us.

THE LATE HONORABLE PETER A. CAVICCHIA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. MINISH] is recognized for 15 minutes.

(Mr. MINISH asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks, and include extraneous material).

Mr. MINISH. Mr. Speaker, it is my sad duty to inform the membership of the passing of the Honorable Peter A. Cavicchia who served with distinction in the 72d, 73d, and 74th Congresses as the Member from the present 11th District of New Jersey which it is now my honor to represent.

Mr. Cavicchia, who died September 11 at the age of 88, was a man of great ability and integrity with a deep dedication to the democratic principles of his adopted land of America. He was the only Member of Congress born in Italy, and his life and works are eloquent testimony to the contribution that immigrants have made to our Nation.

Coming to the United States as a child with his parents, Mr. Cavicchia graduated from American International College with a B.A. degree in 1906 and received his LL.B. from New York University in 1908. The degree of doctor of laws was conferred by the American International College in 1929. His profound interest in education was reflected in Mr. Cavicchia's long service as a member and president of the Newark Board of Education, as professor of law and trustee of the University of Newark—now Rutgers University—and as trustee of American International College.

Mr. Cavicchia's warm and compassionate spirit caused him to give generously of his time and talents to many humanitarian activities. He was a

founder and trustee of Columbus Hospital in Newark and served as president of the Italian Welfare League. Mr. Cavicchia was also ex-grand venerable, Order of Sons of Italy of New Jersey; knight officer of the Crown of Italy; member of F. & A.M. Tri-Umilar Lodge 119. He was a life member of the East Side Presbyterian Church, Newark, of which his mother had been one of the founders.

Among Mr. Cavicchia's legislative achievements in the House of Representatives was sponsorship of the landmark Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation Act. As in all his endeavors, Mr. Cavicchia devoted himself wholeheartedly to his duties as Member of Congress and was held in high esteem and respect by his colleagues on both sides of the aisle and by his constituency whom he served so well and faithfully.

Mr. Cavicchia had a full and rich life, and his community, State and Nation benefited immeasurably from his dedicated service. We mourn the passing of this wise and good man, and take inspiration from his memory. I extend my deepest sympathy to his devoted wife, to his daughter Priscilla, his sons Eugene and Paul, and his grandson Peter A. II, now in military service, who were a source of pride and joy to him.

I should like to insert at this point in the Record the article from the Newark Evening News of September 12, 1967, and the article from the Washington Post of September 14, 1967, about this great American:

[From the Newark Evening News, Sept. 12, 1967]

PETER A. CAVICCHIA: FORMER CONGRESSMAN IS DEAD AT 88

Peter A. Cavicchia, who served as Republican congressman from Newark for six years during the 1930s, died yesterday in Clara Maass Hospital. He was 88 years old and lived at 140 Roseville Ave.

Mr. Cavicchia was elected representative from the old 9th Congressional District in 1930 and re-elected in 1932 and 1934.

In 1936, he was again nominated by the Republican party for his congressional seat, but was defeated in the landslide in which President Roosevelt carried every state except Maine and Vermont.

Mr. Cavicchia, who was proud that he was the first Italian-born congressman, settled in Newark in 1888. After attending Newark public schools, he worked as a messenger boy and factory hand.

At the age of 21, Mr. Cavicchia enrolled in the American International College in Springfield, Mass., where he received a bachelor of arts degree in 1906. Two years later, he was graduated from the New York University Law School.

Mr. Cavicchia served his law clerkship in the office of former Gov. Franklin Fort. He was admitted to the New Jersey bar as an attorney in 1909.

He was one of the founders of the Mercer Beasley Law School and was a professor there for several years before the school became part of the University of Newark, now Rutgers University.

In April 1917, Mr. Cavicchia was appointed inheritance tax supervisor for Essex County, a post he held for many years.

Between 1918 and 1920 and 1922 and 1931, Mr. Cavicchia served on the Newark Board of Education. He was a president of the board from 1924 to 1926.

In 1929, Mr. Cavicchia was defeated in his first bid for public office, trailing seventh on

the ballot as a candidate for the Newark City Commission.

His political career became successful the next year when he was elected to Congress. He ran on a platform which, among other things, urged an end to prohibition.

During his first term in Congress, he was voted by Washington correspondents as one of the most cultured men in the 73rd Congress.

Mr. Cavicchia served on the War Claims and Banking and Currency Committees in the House. As Republicans continued to lose seats during the Roosevelt era, Mr. Cavicchia quickly became minority leader of the War Claims Committee.

He was one of the original sponsors of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation Act, which insured at the time savings accounts up to \$10,000.

Mr. Cavicchia was asked by the Republican party to run for Congress again in 1938, but he refused.

From 1943 to 1954, Mr. Cavicchia served as a member of the Newark Planning Board. His later years were devoted to his private law practice.

Mr. Cavicchia was an ex-grand venerable of the New Jersey Order of the Sons of Italy and last June received a 50-year membership pin from the Tircuminar Lodge of Masons.

In March 1965, Mr. Cavicchia traveled to Washington to take part in the dedication of a tablet in the Italian Embassy, which bears the names of prominent Italian-Americans. A dinner was held that evening with President Johnson present.

Mr. Cavicchia was a trustee of Columbus Hospital in Newark and the American International College.

He leaves his wife, Mrs. Elsie Del Negro Cavicchia, principal of the Alexander Street School in Newark; two sons, Eugene of East Orange and Paul of Newark; a daughter, Miss Priscille J. Cavicchia of South Orange, and a grandson.

Services will be Thursday at 8 p.m. at the Charles J. Rotondo & Sons Home for Funerals, 279 Roseville Ave.

[From the Washington Post, Sept. 14, 1967]

PETER CAVICCHIA: EX-MEMBER OF CONGRESS DIES AT 88

BELLEVILLE, N.J., Sept. 13.—Peter A. Cavicchia, a native of Italy who became a New Jersey Representative in Congress, died Monday at Clara Maass Memorial Hospital here. He was 88.

Mr. Cavicchia was the first Italian-born Representative from New Jersey. He served in the 72d, 73d, and 74th Congress, but was replaced by a Democrat in the Roosevelt landslide of 1936.

Born in Roccomandolfi, Campobasso, Italy, he came to Newark in 1888, and lived there most of his life.

He graduated from the American International College in 1906, and obtained his law degree at New York University.

He was elected to Congress in 1930 after a primary battle. He also sat on the House Banking and Currency Committee in his second term, and became one of the sponsors of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act.

Mr. Cavicchia married Annabel Auger in 1910. She died in 1936, and in 1938 he married Elsie Del Negro, with Mayor Fiorello H. La Guardia of New York officiating.

Survivors are his wife, principal of the Alexander Street school in Newark; and two sons, Paul of Newark and Eugene of East Orange.

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, I want to join my distinguished colleague [Mr. MINISH] in paying tribute to our former colleague, the Honorable Peter A. Cavicchia.

Former Congressman Cavicchia served in Congress with distinction and courage,

and it was my privilege and pleasure to count him as my friend for many years.

He served on the Banking and Currency Committee while in Congress and was one of the leaders who developed the pioneering legislation which created the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation. Following his career in Congress, he continued to be active in civic affairs in Newark, N.J., serving as chairman of the Central Planning Board of Newark for more than 10 years.

I have known Peter Cavicchia's fine family for years, and my deep sympathy goes out to his dear wife Elsie, his daughter Priscilla, and his sons Paul and Eugene in their sad loss.

DEBORAH HOSPITAL—MODERN DAY MIRACLE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HELSTOSKI). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. CAHILL] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. CAHILL. Mr. Speaker, in the heart of the New Jersey pines at Browns Mills, Burlington County, is one of America's leading cardiac and pulmonary centers, Deborah Hospital. Mr. Speaker, Deborah is indeed a modern day miracle, representing as it does a working partnership of medical science and philanthropy. The expansion and development of this outstanding institution without reliance on any type of financial aid except that received from contributions and endowments, is, in this day and age, a miracle in and of itself. And yet, Mr. Speaker, that is the fact.

In the short time since 1958, when Deborah emerged from sanatorium status into that of a full specializing hospital, nearly 5,000 heart patients—men, women, and children—have been studied and treated at Deborah, with 625 being treated during the year 1966. All of these patients and all who preceded them have received their hospitalization and their medical expertise through the generous contributions and endowments of charitable citizens. For Mr. Speaker, Deborah is financed primarily through the efforts of thousands of volunteers, mostly women, in more than 250 Deborah chapters throughout the United States.

Mr. Speaker, Deborah was founded in 1922 by Mrs. Dora Moross Shapiro and her husband, Solomon, who were then looking for some creative medium through which they might share their wealth with others. They decided at that time that no cause was more urgent or worthy than the treatment of tuberculosis. In accordance with the best medical theories and practices of that time, Mrs. Shapiro and a group of New York volunteers selected the centrally located New Jersey Pinebelt, far from the smoke and dust of the cities as their hospital site. And thus, Mr. Speaker, was Deborah, named after the Old Testament prophetess, founded.

From the very beginning two cardinal principles were followed: there would be no discrimination because of race or religion; and no person would be turned away because of their inability to pay for care. From this humble beginning, Deborah grew throughout the years.