

April 3, 1973

responsibility of this many people and with the responsibility of these institutions, ought to be made to be consistent at least in his professional viewpoint as to what he wants to do. I asked him at the first hearing why do you want this job. I thought it was a good question, he said it was a good question and his answer and I'm paraphrasing it now was that he would like to have the opportunity to work in these various areas so that through these various disciplines he could perfect or affect the things he believed in. Now this is a noble purpose but I am suggesting that in order to affect that purpose you have to be a good administrator and I am going to say that I don't care how many awards Dr. Anderson got in the Army, I think many of us here have received various awards in the Army and I'm not suggesting that that makes us good administrators or makes us good for anything as far as civilian life is concerned. You cannot make the application right across the board from Army to that of civilian and I have happened to have had a medical basic training myself and I dealt with many medical service officers. Now the point is this, that when you analyze what did we learn through our sessions, through these three committee meetings, we learned that there were many people who had deep serious reservations about Dr. Anderson as the Director of the Department of Institutions. Senator Frank Lewis unfortunately is not here this afternoon. He got up this morning and said that there was no serious reason why we should turn him down that there was no case made not to confirm Dr. Anderson. I beg to differ with Senator Lewis, even in his absence, and that is that we feel, those of us who were in the minority, we felt very seriously that there had been many reasons proposed to the committee. Now I'd just like to give you just a few of them. Here's Dr. Albert Schreckenger, formerly faculty member of the graduate school of social work, now retired. He's talking about Dr. Anderson, this is to the committee now. The position at issue gives to the person who occupies it a strong influence on public policy as well as on his implementation. In his book Dr. Anderson makes it clear that he recognizes practically no other influences on a person's behavior than his own free will. With his own logic he concludes from his philosophical stance that mental health problems and services should be reserved only for people who cannot be held responsible for their behavior. He considers as responsible for their behavior and therefore ineligible for mental health services those persons who have been traditionally classified as suffering from emotional disturbances, personality disorders and addiction to alcohol or other chemical agents. Now Senator Lewis this morning said we shouldn't bother ourselves with philosophical discussions. I say that maybe Dr. Anderson did us a great, a great benefit by writing this book because he added to a lot of our confusion, but at the same time he showed where he stood and maybe for this we should give him great credit. As Dr. Schreckenger said that in keeping with this restrictive concept of mental illness, Dr. Anderson would be likely to advocate public policies that would leave responsibility for dealing with all the people that would be excluded from mental health to other private or public agencies, particularly through those in the areas of law enforcement and criminal justice. And now you see where I am interested in this because the Judiciary Committee for quite some time has been studying the entire area of criminal justice and what is to be included in the criminal justice system. Now I want to stress right here that we do not need an administrator of institutions who believes that this particular area is, should be included in our criminal justice system. It should be outside the criminal justice system and all people who study this thing will agree--the people that have studied it nationally will agree that the trend is all in that direction.