

MONDAY, APRIL 28, 1969

Editorials

# Broadmeadows? Ha, ha

Some Delaware Countians have strange values. Taxes infuriate them, public assistance angers them, and sex education drives them wild.

But the Delaware County Prison, from which at least two dozen convicts escaped last year, is a joke.

Two weeks ago, 45 prisoners in one cellblock apparently planned to depart by chopping a hole in the wall. They might have made it, too, except that the first prisoner to try to squeeze through got stuck.

Where did the tools come from to make the hole? Where were the guards while all this was going on? Oh well, heh heh.

The very next day, a Philadelphia man, serving 90 days for shoplifting, was sent to work at the county courthouse (under what security measures, we wonder?) and didn't show up back at the prison until 9:30 p.m. Prison officials didn't know where he'd been. Oh well, heh heh.

Last and least, the district attorney's office, at a hearing related to the vicious attack on two young men in Media, pointed out that both victims have received telephone threats.

Lawyers for three suspects in the attack said that their clients couldn't be blamed for the calls because they were in Broadmeadows.

"They have phones at the prison," replied the Media justice of the peace.

Is he suggesting prisoners have free access to telephones, in order to keep in touch with the family, threaten witnesses, and place horse bets? Oh well, ha, ha.

Things are so funny at this prison that a great television series could be produced, fashioned after "Hogan's Heroes," of course. This could be a low-cost production with no need for a director, producer or actors. Simply place a couple cameras at strategic locations in Broadmeadows. Presto: instant "Gable's Goodfellas."

Well, if many countians want to treat the prison as a joke, far be it for us to spoil their fun.

We'll even add some "funnies," selected from official state reports of inspections conducted at the prison last year:

"Numerous panes of the cellblock windows were broken — throughout the prison."

"Most of the cells were untidy, and cluttered with excessive clothing, magazines, books and pin-ups. Many of them contained perishable food, such as bread and sugar, and also certain articles that should be considered as contraband."

"The toilets in 12 cells were broken or otherwise out of order."

"... guards are not stationed within the cellblocks at any time. Nor is one posted in the hospital area where two inmates work as hospital attendants and are stationed there and have the run of the section."

"Their rooms contained table forks and knives, a Polaroid camera, a money bank, a cap-gun with caps, a portable television set, and excess clothing and newspapers."

(EDITOR'S NOTE: That's right, a money bank and cap-gun with caps.)

"In many of the regular cells, in all cellblocks, wire coat hangers, wire pliers, loose bed link-springs, glass jars, table forks, broken handles of table spoons, tin soft-drink containers and can openers were found."

"Such articles can be used as assault or suicide weapons and should not be permitted in the possession of prisoners."

"In addition, various kinds of junk were found in all the exercise yards. Also, in one of them, an empty pint vodka bottle was found; it was clean and appeared to have been emptied recently."

Well, so much for some of the humorous conditions at this prison, jammed with some 250-275 persons.

We'll get serious some other time — perhaps when more Delaware Countians come to realize that their preoccupation with "law and order" should also extend to the prison which is supposed to be rehabilitating those who have broken the law.

When we do get serious, we'll quote state reports on other prison conditions — privileges based on favoritism, inadequate correctional treatment, inmates moving to job areas "on their own" because there were only three farm guards, a total personnel roster of only 29 guards (including five captains and two lieutenants), the need for more supervision personnel with better training and incentive. But for now — and until the inevitable major tragedy occurs — keep laughing, folks.

## Grapes for GIs

By FRANK MANIEWICZ  
and TOM BRADEN

COACHELLA, Calif. — Here on the California desert, 75 feet below sea level, where every wind brings a sandstorm, Coach Chavez and his Farm Workers Union are preparing a strike call against the major grape growers.

It will be supported according to their plan by a nationwide boycott.

And 3,000 miles away in Washington, buyers for the Department of Defense — per-

haps unwittingly — are busy breaking both strikes and boycott.

THE CHAVEZ struggle to organize the farm workers is difficult to understand without one crucial piece of information.

It is that almost all of the social legislation passed for the benefit of the working man in the past 30 years has—intentionally, in order to get the votes of rural representatives—left the farm workers without protection.

The National Labor Relations Act, for instance, as amended

by Taft-Hartley 20 years ago, gave virtually every other kind of worker the right to form a union, if a majority of those workers vote to form one.

BUT THAT protection is not available to farm workers.

Hostile growers refuse to call an election or permit the NLRB to intervene — all the while loudly claiming that Chavez union represents only a small percentage of the grape workers.

The strike is for recognition and a contract, something other workers have had for years.

AGAINST that background, the strike began two years ago in California's Central Valley and spread here last year. And to support the strike, Chavez union is persisting with a nationwide boycott of the strike's supporters.

Some of the larger table grape growers here say privately—that the boycott is beginning to hurt in two ways.

First, it has cut domestic grape sales by as much as 20 per cent.

Second, wholesale buyers in numerous cities have taken advantage of the boycott to force lower prices for those grapes they do buy.

THUS IT COMES as a grim surprise to Coach Chavez that now—when a patriotic demonstration across the nation seem about to make the growers view for the first time—their grapes as a liability in the United States—Delaware is shipping eight times as many California table grapes to the troops in Vietnam as in any previous year.

The figures are astonishing. In fiscal year 1967-68, for example, 555,000 pounds of grapes went to Vietnam. In the previous fiscal year, 468,000 pounds were shipped.

And those Americans who support the boycott with their food budget are breaking it with their taxes.

BUT in the first six months of this fiscal year, over 2 million pounds went to Vietnam, and the Department of Defense estimates that the total will be over 4 million pounds by July 1.

That is 8 pounds of table grapes for every American in this country.

It is enough to suggest that Gen. Creighton Abrams had abandoned search-and-destroy tactics in the favor of Bacchante.

TOTAL DEFENSE purchases of California table grapes are also vastly increased. From under 7 million pounds worldwide last year, they will climb to over 18 million this year.

Congressional critics of the Pentagon should be pleased to know that at U.S. bases around the world, our weapons systems may not be delivered on time, the new helicopter may never be tested, and the M-16 rifle, the wanted U.S. delivery capsule, may be in the air.

First, it has cut domestic grape sales by as much as 20 per cent.

Second, wholesale buyers in numerous cities have taken advantage of the boycott to force lower prices for those grapes they do buy.

On the civilian side, the increase is equally sharp.

PRIVATE shipments of Vietnamese imports, which have the approval of all the stimulus of the Department of Agriculture, were up 130 per cent in 1968 over 1967, according to the fruit and vegetable division of the Foreign Agricultural Service, news, a hoived of social action.

What seems clear is that Gen. Creighton Abrams has a great deal more influence in the Pentagon than they have in the supermarket.

And those Americans who support the boycott with their food budget are breaking it with their taxes.



## Our readers write

# Keep raw sex out of schools

To The Times:

In regard to the Chichester School Board meeting that I attended April 23, I had gone with the assumption that, as an adult dealing with adults over sex education in our district, we would meet in the auditorium with the superintendent of schools, board president and members sitting at a table to conduct a regular business meeting.

Instead, we found one board member standing up front and the other members scattered in the audience, some of whom got up and walked out.

I had written a letter asking for the opportunity to be heard. I presented material to the board and have a discussion after my presentation with the members, all of the members.

BUT SOMEHOW a meeting was not called to order. Instead, President Robert Lee Bennington stood up, made some statements and then called for me to make my report.

But some things got out of hand and everyone was trying to say what they had to say and when it became obvious that I wouldn't be presenting any facts that I had gathered, my wife became very emotional and presented some facts of her own, for which I am glad.

So please let me just summarize for you a little of the material available against this SIECUS outfit and their staunch supporters for which 150 to 200 people (conservative estimate) attended the meeting.

WE ALL HAD one common question to ask, "Where and how does our school district stand on sex education?"

We were all concerned, to say the least, about the welfare of our children and what was to be taught to them through the school system.

With the type of material available to the school, through organizations such as SIECUS and SIECUS-influenced printers and distributors, we had a right to be upset.

Mary Calderone, Isadore Rubin, Lester Kirkendall and William Genna, who calls himself "reformer" and is director of the Commission on Marriage and Family Life of The National Council of Churches, have compiled a collection of sex teaching guides that reach the lowest depths of morality.

IN FACT, they have no moral issue, absolutely none, and put no restraint on free practice of sexual or homosexual acts.

This is not restricted to married couples either, and is even suggested as the proper thing for an unmarried person as long as he or she can justify the act as possibly strengthening their relationship.

They read into their early growing character-building years of a child, teaching and showing them the full facts of sexual relations, all done with no morals or no restrictions emphasized. The moral they assert is that the end justifies the practice.

THE SCHOOL BOARD suggested to us that they had circulated some questionnaires and had received a response in favor of some sex education, yet none present had been questioned.

What did the questionnaires respond to as to what was to be taught? Was this obscene material put out by SIECUS explained to these people or just the question "yes" or "no" asked?

I am sure we could all agree to a good, wholesome health class with good, wholesome moral teachers as a child reaches puberty, but absolutely none before.

As he or she can justify the act as possibly strengthening their relationship.

They read into their early growing character-building years of a child, teaching and showing them the full facts of sexual relations, all done with no morals or no restrictions emphasized. The moral they assert is that the end justifies the practice.

THE SCHOOL BOARD suggested to us that they had circulated some questionnaires and had received a response in favor of some sex education, yet none present had been questioned.

What did the questionnaires respond to as to what was to be taught? Was this obscene material put out by SIECUS explained to these people or just the question "yes" or "no" asked?

I am sure we could all agree to a good, wholesome health class with good, wholesome moral teachers as a child reaches puberty, but absolutely none before.

As he or she can justify the act as possibly strengthening their relationship.

They read into their early growing character-building years of a child, teaching and showing them the full facts of sexual relations, all done with no morals or no restrictions emphasized. The moral they assert is that the end justifies the practice.

THE SCHOOL BOARD suggested to us that they had circulated some questionnaires and had received a response in favor of some sex education, yet none present had been questioned.

What did the questionnaires respond to as to what was to be taught? Was this obscene material put out by SIECUS explained to these people or just the question "yes" or "no" asked?

I am sure we could all agree to a good, wholesome health class with good, wholesome moral teachers as a child reaches puberty, but absolutely none before.

As he or she can justify the act as possibly strengthening their relationship.

They read into their early growing character-building years of a child, teaching and showing them the full facts of sexual relations, all done with no morals or no restrictions emphasized. The moral they assert is that the end justifies the practice.

THE SCHOOL BOARD suggested to us that they had circulated some questionnaires and had received a response in favor of some sex education, yet none present had been questioned.

What did the questionnaires respond to as to what was to be taught? Was this obscene material put out by SIECUS explained to these people or just the question "yes" or "no" asked?

I am sure we could all agree to a good, wholesome health class with good, wholesome moral teachers as a child reaches puberty, but absolutely none before.

As he or she can justify the act as possibly strengthening their relationship.

They read into their early growing character-building years of a child, teaching and showing them the full facts of sexual relations, all done with no morals or no restrictions emphasized. The moral they assert is that the end justifies the practice.

THE SCHOOL BOARD suggested to us that they had circulated some questionnaires and had received a response in favor of some sex education, yet none present had been questioned.

As he or she can justify the act as possibly strengthening their relationship.

They read into their early growing character-building years of a child, teaching and showing them the full facts of sexual relations, all done with no morals or no restrictions emphasized. The moral they assert is that the end justifies the practice.

THE SCHOOL BOARD suggested to us that they had circulated some questionnaires and had received a response in favor of some sex education, yet none present had been questioned.

What did the questionnaires respond to as to what was to be taught? Was this obscene material put out by SIECUS explained to these people or just the question "yes" or "no" asked?

I am sure we could all agree to a good, wholesome health class with good, wholesome moral teachers as a child reaches puberty, but absolutely none before.

As he or she can justify the act as possibly strengthening their relationship.

They read into their early growing character-building years of a child, teaching and showing them the full facts of sexual relations, all done with no morals or no restrictions emphasized. The moral they assert is that the end justifies the practice.

THE SCHOOL BOARD suggested to us that they had circulated some questionnaires and had received a response in favor of some sex education, yet none present had been questioned.

What did the questionnaires respond to as to what was to be taught? Was this obscene material put out by SIECUS explained to these people or just the question "yes" or "no" asked?

I am sure we could all agree to a good, wholesome health class with good, wholesome moral teachers as a child reaches puberty, but absolutely none before.

As he or she can justify the act as possibly strengthening their relationship.

They read into their early growing character-building years of a child, teaching and showing them the full facts of sexual relations, all done with no morals or no restrictions emphasized. The moral they assert is that the end justifies the practice.

THE SCHOOL BOARD suggested to us that they had circulated some questionnaires and had received a response in favor of some sex education, yet none present had been questioned.

What did the questionnaires respond to as to what was to be taught? Was this obscene material put out by SIECUS explained to these people or just the question "yes" or "no" asked?

I am sure we could all agree to a good, wholesome health class with good, wholesome moral teachers as a child reaches puberty, but absolutely none before.

As he or she can justify the act as possibly strengthening their relationship.

They read into their early growing character-building years of a child, teaching and showing them the full facts of sexual relations, all done with no morals or no restrictions emphasized. The moral they assert is that the end justifies the practice.

THE SCHOOL BOARD suggested to us that they had circulated some questionnaires and had received a response in favor of some sex education, yet none present had been questioned.

As he or she can justify the act as possibly strengthening their relationship.

They read into their early growing character-building years of a child, teaching and showing them the full facts of sexual relations, all done with no morals or no restrictions emphasized. The moral they assert is that the end justifies the practice.

THE SCHOOL BOARD suggested to us that they had circulated some questionnaires and had received a response in favor of some sex education, yet none present had been questioned.

What did the questionnaires respond to as to what was to be taught? Was this obscene material put out by SIECUS explained to these people or just the question "yes" or "no" asked?

I am sure we could all agree to a good, wholesome health class with good, wholesome moral teachers as a child reaches puberty, but absolutely none before.

As he or she can justify the act as possibly strengthening their relationship.

They read into their early growing character-building years of a child, teaching and showing them the full facts of sexual relations, all done with no morals or no restrictions emphasized. The moral they assert is that the end justifies the practice.

THE SCHOOL BOARD suggested to us that they had circulated some questionnaires and had received a response in favor of some sex education, yet none present had been questioned.

What did the questionnaires respond to as to what was to be taught? Was this obscene material put out by SIECUS explained to these people or just the question "yes" or "no" asked?

I am sure we could all agree to a good, wholesome health class with good, wholesome moral teachers as a child reaches puberty, but absolutely none before.

As he or she can justify the act as possibly strengthening their relationship.

They read into their early growing character-building years of a child, teaching and showing them the full facts of sexual relations, all done with no morals or no restrictions emphasized. The moral they assert is that the end justifies the practice.

THE SCHOOL BOARD suggested to us that they had circulated some questionnaires and had received a response in favor of some sex education, yet none present had been questioned.

What did the questionnaires respond to as to what was to be taught? Was this obscene material put out by SIECUS explained to these people or just the question "yes" or "no" asked?

I am sure we could all agree to a good, wholesome health class with good, wholesome moral teachers as a child reaches puberty, but absolutely none before.

As he or she can justify the act as possibly strengthening their relationship.

They read into their early growing character-building years of a child, teaching and showing them the full facts of sexual relations, all done with no morals or no restrictions emphasized. The moral they assert is that the end justifies the practice.

THE SCHOOL BOARD suggested to us that they had circulated some questionnaires and had received a response in favor of some sex education, yet none present had been questioned.

## Greater diversity

# 33 new Cardinals set

By RICHARD L. WORSNOP

Thirty-three new Roman Catholic Cardinals will be invested at a secret Vatican consistory today.

The College of Cardinals will become almost twice as large as at the accession of Pope John XXIII in 1958.

For more than 400 years before then, the college had been limited to 70 members, but John XXIII increased it to his first three years as pontiff.

When the 33 Cardinals — designate appointed by Pope Paul VI — are invested, membership will reach an all-time high of 134.

THE NEW Cardinals represent 19 different countries. The largest number, eight, are from Italy, as is customary.

In addition, there are four new American Cardinals, three Frenchmen, two Spaniards, two Brazilians, and one each from China, the Malagasy Republic, South Korea, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Scotland, Mexico, India, the Congo (Kinshasa), West Germany, Guatemala, Canada, Ecuador, and the Philippines.

The increasingly cosmopolitan makeup of the College of Cardinals is no accident.

The Second Vatican Council had called for new viewpoints in the church government.

Pope Paul apparently is determined to implement that wish.

BEFORE World War II, Italians held a majority in the college.

Italy still has the largest single bloc of Cardinals — 41 — including those not yet invested — but Italians account for only 30.6 per cent of the whole membership.

The possibility thus arises that a non-Italian Pope might someday be elected. (The last was Hadrian VIII, a Dutchman, in 1323.)

THE UNITED STATES, with a prospective total of 10 Cardinals, has more than any other country except Italy and France.

The four newcomers are Archbishop Terence J. Cooke of New York, Archbishop John F. Dearden of Detroit, Archbishop John J. Carberry of St. Louis, and Bishop John J. Wright of Pittsburgh.

Bishop Wright will take a post in the Vatican Curia — the central governing body of the church — and probably relinquish his bishop's seat.

THERE HAVE BEEN 27 Cardinals of the United States so far (counting the four newly appointed ones), the first being John Cardinal McCloskey of New York in 1875.

The list reflects the nation's westward expansion.

The first five were all from the East—two from New York (Cardinals McCloskey and Farley), one from Baltimore (Cardinal Gibbons), one from Boston (Cardinal O'Connell), one from Philadelphia (Cardinal Daugherty).

The MIDDLE WEST was represented for the first time in 1924, with Cardinal Mundelein of Chicago. Of Cardinal Mundelein, he

was the first whose forbearers were not Irish.

Three of the four U. S. Cardinals created in 1946 also were of the Middle West — Stritch of Chicago, Mooney of Detroit, Glennon of St. Louis.

Cardinal McIntyre, invested in 1953, was the first from beyond the Mississippi.

THE NEW GROUP of Cardinals mirrors Paul's emphasis on pastoral activity. Past consistories tended to draw heavily from the papal diplomatic corps and the Vatican bureaucracy.

In contrast, 24 of the 33 new Cardinals are active heads of dioceses.

Eleven of the Cardinals, moreover, are from developing countries. Their presence should strengthen the voice of the so-called Third World within the Vatican.

GREATER diversity may also help to ease some of the internal strains besetting the church.

Paul must fervently hope that this will be the case.

In a gloomy Holy Week sermon, the Pope described the church as the victim of "a practically schismatic ferment."

## Letters

### welcome

The Daily Times welcomes letters to the editor on matters of public interest.

Name, address and phone number must be given before letters can be considered for publication.

All letters are subject to condensation.

No letters can be returned.

## Services for mentally ill remain inadequate

To The Times:

It might be unfortunate that my story on the recent public meeting to outline the county's Mental Health and Mental Retardation Plan reflected mainly the negative comments of Robert Woodson and others, including myself, regarding the plan.

But, it would be so only if the members of the current County Mental Health Board and staff take this criticism personally.

For our criticism is the result of decades of frustration, organization has recommended the expansion of residential and clinic facilities for treating the county's mentally ill, yet services remain critically inadequate.

NOW A county-by-county structure has been developed in Pennsylvania which promises to improve services.

Our county does an excellent job in illustrating the gaps and needs.

But our governor, in courageously seeking to raise the necessary taxes for these services, is largely ignored by both parties and booted in public meetings.

DESPITE the unpopularity of speaking out, our county is convinced that we must meet head-on the crisis that confronts us in mental health and other human services.

For the first time this year, our district board of directors as well as our regional board has endorsed the state income tax, as the latest way of increasing state revenues to meet the needs.

We hope that other individuals and groups who are similarly concerned at the prospective deterioration of our public services will also rally to support the governor in his efforts.

PETER A. BRIGHAM  
Director  
Delaware County District  
Health and Welfare Council  
13 South Avenue  
Media

## Income tax shifts burden

To The Times:

We believe the budget that Gov. Shafer has submitted to the legislature is a reasonable one if the people of Pennsylvania desire that the state keep abreast of future needs.

At the same time, we believe the best way to implement such a budget is a personal income tax.

Such a tax would move part of the burden of state taxes from the small and medium wage earner to high wage earners, who can better afford it.

We suggest that it would be easy for every wage earner to figure out for himself which would cost him more over a year's time, an expanded sales tax or a low rate income tax.

EDWARD G. BOYER  
614 Wilder Road  
Wilmington



"But, Samson, you get a deduction for being blind!"