

55

C O N F I D E N T I A L

2705 S. W. English Court,
Portland 1, Oregon,
March 27, 1953.

Mr. D. H. Nucker, Executive Officer,
Office of Territories,
U. S. Interior Department,
Washington 25, D. C.

Dear Mr. Nucker:

Thank you for your letter of March 17, 1953. Hereafter I will use Government stationery in all my official correspondence.

Ever since I have been here, I have frequently thought that it would be desirable to have an arrangement whereby I could write to someone like you or Mr. Davis or Mr. Flakne at your home address if I had something special which I did not want to dictate here or mail to your office. Of course, you know that I have written numerous letters myself at home, but even then felt reluctant to mail them to your office for fear that some wrong person might get hold of them. I would like to know if such an arrangement would meet with the approval of Mr. Davis and you. You have my home address.

There is seldom a dull moment here, and every time you relax for a moment and think that things are going smoothly, something else pops. Recently we had a little employee upheaval, something like this. There was a certain female attendant here during about the past two years who was very unpopular with most of the rest of the employees. She quit and they were all happy. Then several weeks later, Mr. Lazelle rehired her, whereupon eleven other female employees called at Mr. Lazelle's home one evening to inform him that if she staid, they would leave. In most cases it would have meant that their husbands would have left with them. Mr. Lazelle called Dr. Thompson over, who they said came storming in in a rage and verbally insulted and abused them and sent them home. The meeting was to be held over the next night when he was going to bring the protested attendant with him to defend herself. Thatnsameneyening Dr. Thompson called Mr. Coe in Washington to ask his advice and I hear was told to use his own best judgement. The next day three women and their husbands left. They were short at least two attendants already and maybe it was three or four. The next evening Dr. Thompson took the matron, Mrs. Hockenberry, to Mr. Lazelle's house with him, but the protested attendant did not show up or had refused to go with him. Three of the eleven women of the previous evening came and were told that the protested attendant was going to stay and that the rest could take it or leave it. Mr. Coe called Dr. Thompson that night or the next morning to inquire how things were. I gradually found out a few things about the affair during the next couple days by questioning most of them. That weekend they operated with six to ten attendants short. By the following Monday morning the protested attendant too had quit. I would have asked that she be relieved, but she beat me to it. This was two weeks ago. They are still in the process of hiring attendants to make up the deficit. I think Mr. Lazelle and Dr. Thompson were all wrong and acted in a

very shortsighted, impulsive and stubborn manner. Mrs. Hockenberry had to go along with them. It was really another case of Dr. Thompson fronting for and backing up Mr. Lazelle. The rest of them are still here, but are very uneasy and tense. The protesting group even included the one registered nurse, who would have quit if the protested attendant had not done so. Dissatisfaction and unhappiness is the rule among the employees and the reason they give for it is the highhanded and arbitrary manner of Mr. Lazelle, Dr. Thompson and Mrs. Hockenberry. Mr. Coe and his inner circle or little family would probably blame me.

This gave me an idea and here it is. I knew that the turnover was great as a result of firing and quitting. I asked for figures and learned that during 1952, 110 people were hired and 102 either quit or were fired, and that in 1953 to March 17th 29 were hired and 36 left, and that did not include three parttime stenographers and one medical student. The medical student did not get fired and neither did the three parttime stenographers. I did not have the courage to have the figures broken ^{down} into how many quit and how many got fired, because being suspicious of my reasons and motives and on general principles, Mrs. Mickelson was very reluctant about giving me what she did. I suppose if we wanted to we could have the figures broken down. How does this look to you?

Miss Viesco has informed me that she has been assured that there will be another contract.

It would be interesting for you to drop around and have a look at the current construction and other work that is being done, and have a general look-see at and about everything in general. Of course, it would be better if it were not announced or given any advance publicity. The parole ward patients have an outdoor toilet with cans while the basement is being put under the building.

Recently some cows were sold at the annual Oregon Holstein auction.

In the letter of March 18th referring to the address of Mrs. Eva Parker, daughter of Mrs. Anna Johnson Erikson, Camden was correctly copied from the commitment papers the first time, or at least was there that way, but it should not have appeared that way on my report, because we had already received a filled out questionnaire from another relative in which it was correctly stated as Canton, but Mrs. Mickelson copied it as Camden, and I did not proof read it close enough to catch it. However, I did not dare state it this way in the letter I dictated to her, because she would have hated me and might even have refused to write it. I frequently have to do something like that to avoid friction and resentment in working with her. She likes to edit my letters. Along with others, she is usually offensively on the defensive, ready to argue about anything, suspicious, paranoid, talks in terms of "we", is critical and reluctant, takes everything very personally and subjectively, is always ready to do battle for good old Wayne and dear old Morningside, etc. To most letters from your office she has comments like "what brought that on", "we have nothing to hide", "what are they up to now", "I'm disgusted with the whole mess", etc. I hope you appreciate how difficult it might be for me to dictate some of my replies or how I must be careful what I say in the presence of such reluctant, critical, defensive, etc., assistance. At least, it sometimes is not a relaxed, comfortable or congenial situation in connection with some subject matter like my letters of March 20th and 23rd. Anyone hired and paid like she is would be coached and required to be just like she is or else. That doesn't make it easy for me or good for us. You see why I should have my own independent clerical help.

52

131 52

You will like this one too. The hospital report form from the USPHS for 1952, was made up and filled out by Dr. Thompson and Mrs. Mickelson like this. Superintendent, one, physician implied, to be represented by Mr. Coe. Clinical director, one, me. Staff physician, one, Dr. Thompson. Clinical assistants, two, graduate physicians implied, represented by the senior medical student who spends some of his spare time here and the junior medical student who fills in for the senior some times. Dentists, two, they come one or two evenings a month and pull a few teeth. Psychologist, one, called occasionally to do a few psychometric examinations at ~~\$5.00~~ the rate of three for \$10.00. Laboratory and x-ray technician, one, we have none. OT aides, seven, actually we have only one, the other six are just attendents. RN, one, that is right, but state law here requires that even a nursing home have one RN in charge. Supervisors, 15, that actually represents the around the clock ward charge attendents. Attendants, 50, that varies. Matrons, 2. Industrial ~~and~~ instructors and supervisors, 14, that represents the people who boss the patients around on the farm, in the hog and cattle barns, in the laundry, the carpenter, etc. House-keeper, one, that represents the attendant who herds the women who make attendents beds and clean their quarters around at any one time. Clerks, 2. Other personnel (food handlers, laundry, farm maintenance), 7. Total, 109. They were just kind of made up. It was implied that they were all full time employees though. Added was, consulting physicians, 18, you know how that works. Part-time physician, one, he only came two forenoons a week for a short time. Some of it does not even make sense, but they thought it looked good and would really fool 'em. Even if it were all true, it would still be deplorably sub-standard.

If you were me, what would be your reaction, and what action would you take, if a patient came to you and told you that he had told the carpenter (a fellow by the name of Jack Pollard) that he was going to tell Dr. Keller about the way he treated him, and the fellow told the patient that "he cant' touch me, I'm too high up". I know what I would like to and should do, but they would scream, and who would back me up. He is a disagreeable, tyrannical sort of fellow, who is generally disliked, but is ace high with Lazelle. Some people think that Coe should be watching the pair, instead of turning the place over to them. Others around here think they are "too high up" too. By now, it should'nt even be necessary for me to mention any of the names.

Generally considered, things have gone on and are going on about as usual. I try to do the best I can and be as objective as possible.

I think it would be nice if you wrote me a personal letter and let me in on some of C's activities, etc., etc., etc.

With best wishes and personal regards, and same to my other friends there,
I am

Sincerely yours,


G. F. Keller, M. D.