

payoffs to the burglars. The grand jury presumably has evidence of who that unnamed person was.

Despite the mass of detail, the handing up of the indictment and the sealed grand jury report took only twelve quick minutes in Judge Sirica's courtroom. When it was over, most of the defendants either refused comment or expressed their certainty that they will be cleared of all wrongdoing when all the evidence merges in the impending trial battles among high-powered attorneys.

The Defense View

The most likely defense tactics apparently will be to seek a change of venue from Washington, where the Watergate controversy is the hottest, and try to have the defendants' cases split off into separate trials. A mass trial affords prosecutors greater opportunity to introduce more evidence affecting each defendant. But the main strategy may be to try to discredit the accusing witnesses, many of whom have admitted

their own criminal roles. The defense attorneys may ask: How can anyone believe convicted felons who are making charges against others so that they can get away with the lightest sentences themselves?

President Nixon issued only a statement through his press office: "The President has always maintained that the judicial system is the proper forum for the resolution to the questions concerning Watergate. The indictment indicates that the judicial process is finally mov-

The Trials of the Grand Jury

Ever since the grand jury system started under Britain's King Henry II in 1166, it has been hailed as a guardian of the people and denounced as an oppressive tool of the government. Both descriptions can be accurate, for a grand jury is as good or bad as the people on it. The Watergate grand jury that handed up last week's historic indictment will be remembered as one of the best.

Convened on June 5, 1972, to hear evidence of crimes in the District of Columbia, the grand jury was shortly presented with the case of the Watergate break-in. On the evidence that federal prosecutors put before it, the 23-member jury indicted seven men accused of the burglary. Then, its work apparently finished, the jury recessed that September. Six months later it was called back to hear new evidence, and it has been hard at work ever since.

Some grand juries are merely rubber stamps for prosecutors, who use the institution's wide-ranging powers of subpoena to harass suspects against whom they have little real evidence. But several members of the Watergate grand jury have acquired such expertise and shown such diligence in questioning witnesses that they have become true partners of Leon Jaworski and the other prosecutors. Once last spring the jury members were so intent on their deliberations that they stayed in session until midnight, when they discovered that the cleaning people had locked them in. It took ten minutes of shouting and pounding before a janitor let them out.

This grand jury is a cross section of the people of Washington. It is made up of 13 women and ten men; 17 are blacks and six whites; only eight members are less than 40 years old. The dominant member is its foreman, Vladimir Pregelj, 46, who was appointed by Judge John Sirica. A native of Yugoslavia and a naturalized citizen, Pregelj (pronounced Pray-gull) is an economist for the Library of Congress. When the jury members asked President Nixon to testify before them, Pregelj wrote the request. Nixon refused to appear, and Pregelj planned to keep a photocopy of the reply as a historical memento. Carefully

he placed it in a newspaper to take home—only to misplace the newspaper.

The second most active member is Harold G. Evans, 42, a Postal Service clerk, who was elected deputy foreman by fellow members. Pregelj and Evans have asked about half of the questions posed by the jury. Others who have been active interlocutors include Lila Bard, 65, a retired Army officer; Enas Broadway, 62, an employee in the National Library of Medicine; George W. Stockton Sr., 55, a Defense Department supply technician; and Naomi R. Williams, 58 a retired teacher and elevator operator. The other members of the jury:

- ▶ Annie Bell Alford, 56, a part-time cleaner and maid.
- ▶ Ellen C. Brown, 66, a retired cleaning woman.
- ▶ Carolyn A. Butler, 31, a secretary-stenographer for the Department of Housing and Urban Development.
- ▶ Elayne Edlund, 45, a secretary for a consulting firm.

FOREMAN PREGELJ LEAVING COURT



WALTER BENNETT

- ▶ Clarence L. Franklin, 57, a taxi driver.
- ▶ Maurice P. Glover, 34, a receptionist for the U.S. Court of Claims.
- ▶ Dorothy M. Gray, 58, a housewife.
- ▶ George V. Gross, 49, an offset platemaker for the Government Printing Office.
- ▶ Wallace N. Hawkins, 35, a clerk for the Washington city government.
- ▶ Christopher C. Hopkins, 39, a mail handler for the Postal Service.
- ▶ Ruth W. Loveridge, 67, a secretary-receptionist for a private firm.
- ▶ Arthur McLean, 66, a retired plant foreman.
- ▶ Ethel M. Peoples, 39, a lunch clerk in the Washington city schools.
- ▶ Susie Ann Robinson, 59, a housekeeper.
- ▶ Kathryn Ann Smith, 37, a technical information specialist for the House of Representatives.
- ▶ Julie L. White, 39, who quit her job as a janitor at George Washington University to stay on the jury.
- ▶ Priscilla L. Woodruff, 30, occupation unstated.

Of the 23 original jurors, all have lasted the course so far. The burden has been more than most people anticipated, and lives and careers have been seriously interrupted. Government workers get full salary while on duty, in lieu of the standard jury fee of \$25 a day after 30 days of service, but some others receive only that meager stipend. "We are all affected," says Pregelj. "The hardship depends on how much you make and who employs you." Pregelj, though not suffering financially, says that because of his jury leave he has lost ground on the promotion list at the Library of Congress.

Unlike jurors in some celebrated trials, grand jurors are not sequestered and forced to live in hotel rooms. They are not supposed to talk about what goes on in their deliberations, but they can go home after duty; they can freely listen to the radio and watch TV.

The Watergate jurors seem aware that despite the hardships, they are privileged participants in history. Because of the restrictions on them, the story of their deliberations has not yet been fully told, but it is bound to be a remarkable account by a group of men and women thrust into history.