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Robert G. Crist: We will begin by identifying for the record the year when you first were in the capital on a full-time basis.

Genevieve Blatt: My full-time years began in 1945 when I became a deputy state treasurer. My term ended in 1949 at which time the tenure of all Democratic officials around here ended. All Democratic state-wide candidates had lost in that year. Expecting to go back to Pittsburgh, I had already shipped some things, when much to my surprise my intentions were changed by Mayor David Lawrence, Democratic National Committeeman for Pennsylvania. He was very much worried about the party; we had only a handful of members in the House and fewer in the Senate and none in State offices. He called and asked if I would mind “sticking around for a little while.” I hated to see Democratic State Committee activity cease. I was Secretary of the State Committee.

That “little while” turned into a long, long time. 1950 was coming up, and I thought “I bet we can get [control of] the state back, but if we let the party headquarters collapse, we never will.” They had no money, of course, typical, so I volunteered to stay around a month or so to see if we could get organized. I thought it was worth a try to get back in there. It could happen, if we could raise a little money.

Then I ran for Auditor General [1952] while George Leader was running for State Treasurer. We lost.

George Leader: A moral victory!

Blatt: Two years after that, George ran for Governor and I for Secretary of Internal Affairs, much to my dislike. The Republicans had removed the incumbent, Bill Livingood, and I defeated Gaynelle Dixon [Republican National Committeewoman from Butler County], their candidate. I then served three terms through 1966. Then to Washington for two years and back here as a Deputy Attorney General in 1968
and then to practice law with the Philadelphia firm of Morgan, Lewis and Backius in 1969. After that I began a term as Judge on the Commonwealth Court in 1972. When my term ended in 1983, I became a Senior Judge on that Court, and I have been here ever since.

A. James Reichley: What did you do in Washington?
Blatt: I was Assistant Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity under Sargent Shriver, having been appointed in 1966 by President Lyndon Johnson.
Leader: I arrived in Harrisburg early in 1951 as a state senator. But not full-time, we had sessions every other year, and they were sometimes short. I ran for governor against Lieutenant Governor Lloyd Wood. "Gen" and I were drafted to run for the two fiscal offices in 1952. Judge Guy K. Bard resigned to run for the Senate seat of General Edward Martin. General Eisenhower was heading the Republican ticket. Not a good year for Democrats. Truly drafted! We were really quite pleased with ourselves. Although we lost by 120,000, Ike won by 600,000. In 1954 I ran for Governor [to succeed Governor John Fine] and was considered a throw-away candidate by most of the knowledgeable people. Senator Joe Clark said "George is a nice fellow; I hate to see him be the sacrificial lamb." The GOP had a 907,000 registration majority. I felt that we needed about 500,000 Republican votes to win and got them.

Reichley: Was Governor Fine unpopular?
Leader: His sales tax was unpopular. He had the capacity to be an excellent governor, but between the effects of the death of Mrs. Fine and his falling out with M. Harvey Taylor [President Pro Tempore of the State Senate and GOP State Chairman], he lost power. Harve, you know, had control of the state insurance program and the premiums that were derived from them. Harve was spoiled. He had about $350,000 to $450,000 annually to distribute as patronage. Harvey boasted he took no commission. That was correct. What he did not say was that he had a nice dip on the profit-sharing and the over-ride turned over to him by the insurance carriers! He also had the Pennsylvania Railroad money and Sun Oil money. So he had plenty of financial resources; consequently he "owned" the General Assembly before the members even got there.

Raymond P. Shafer: Fine was vilified by some Republicans for his actions [including support of General Douglas MacArthur for president] at the 1952 national convention.
Crist: I guess you are speaking of when he belatedly attempted to jump on the bandwagon for Ike? In front of the TV cameras he waved desperately for recogni-
tion at the convention so that he could switch the winning number of delegates away from MacArthur. Chairman Joseph Martin did not recognize him and Pennsylvania could not insert the votes and appear the kingmaker. We just looked silly!

**Blatt:** [After the election] Governor Fine made a hospitable offer to us. He provided us space in the Capitol for our inaugural committee, and he appointed one of our men, Andrew Bradley [subsequently the first black person to be appointed to the cabinet of a Pennsylvania governor], a C.P.A., to work with us in the budget office to show us where we stood financially as a Commonwealth. He also gave us space for the Inaugural Committee in the State Capitol and did many other things to ease the transition to the Leader Administration.

**Leader:** He permitted my friends from the Fels Institute, under Steve Sweeney, to go into all departments, boards, and commissions and do an in-depth study. They were very cooperative. We got reports on their strengths and weaknesses. I took the reports to the department heads as a starting point. This process saved us six months to a year in getting the new administration underway. The thing I marveled at was how cooperative the people in the departments were. Certainly if Governor Fine had put the word out that they were not to cooperate, he could have stopped us cold. With the governor's support, we were able to develop a fantastic series of reports.

Governor Fine called me in and said "Senator, I'm going to give you some advice. Obviously you may take it or not. But I'm going to give it to you anyway. Don't surround yourself with yes men." He pointed to a nearby office and said "That man did not disagree with me in four years, and I certainly could not always have been right."

Taking that advice, I surrounded myself with a lot of people who were not "yes men." But sometimes when their answers shook me I would think "This is ridiculous." Another of his suggestions had to do with the inaugural ball. He suggested that we see Adjutant General "Bridgie" Weber for advice. We drew on him, and he did a fantastic job.

**Crist:** Part of his instructions were, remembering the rowdiness of the most recent Democratic inaugural ball, 1935, to place a state policeman in each of the score or more entrances to the Zembo Mosque. Dancing there, my wife Christine remarked to me: "It's like exercising in a prison yard!"

**Leader:** I then ran against Congressman Hugh Scott for the United States Senate. I lost primarily because I did poorly in Allegheny County.

**Shafer:** Is that the last time you ran for public office? I thought you ran for the constitutional convention.
Leader: No, I ran for Governor David Lawrence’s seat as National Committeeman after he died, but I lost. I did not run for the Constitutional Convention because I was living in Montgomery County at the time. This is a strongly Republican county and my chance of winning were somewhere between zero and minus ten.

Shafer: But I persuaded you and Bill [Scranton] to head the committee for the new state constitution, and you worked very diligently and were responsible for getting it off the ground.

Leader: Ray, you had the good judgment to advocate the convention before you took the oath of office and to do so on a non-partisan basis. All of the rest of us tried to do so and got the usual partisan treatment. I had tried to do this and failed. Governor Fine also tried and failed.

Reichley: Governor Scranton also tried to get approval for a constitutional convention in 1963, but we failed. We then established a Commission to prepare article by article revisions of the constitution. Although we lost on the convention, several of the revised articles were passed by the General Assembly and approved by the voters.

Shafer: We were successful in getting the voters to ratify by dividing proposed changes into four sections. Therefore, people could vote on each proposal individually. In this way the opposition was split. Persons opposing financial change, for example, were separated from others who were against court change. There was much opposition. Even the Chief Justice of Pennsylvania was against it! We were very firm in [opposing] discussion concerning a graduated income tax.

Blatt: Ray, do you remember that you and I long before 1968 wrote a state constitution?

Shafer: Yes, when we were both in college. I came in from Allegheny and you from Pitt as part of the Intercollegiate Conference on Government.

Blatt: Don’t forget that! And we headed the “Vote Yes” Committee for the new State Constitution when it was put up for approval, too.

Crist: The constitutional amendments which voters approved (separate from the “Con-Con” proposals) had to do with permitting governors to have two successive terms, making the legislature a continuing body and abolishing the Department of Internal affairs. All non-controversial.

Shafer: I was elected to the Senate in 1958 from Crawford County and Mercer County. Then [as a freshman senator] I ran for lieutenant-governor in 1962 and for governor in 1966. I was the last of the one-term governors. I did not remain in Harrisburg after that.

Reichley: Weren’t you about to run for Congress the year you were elected lieutenant governor?
Shafer: No, but I did announce for Congress in 1962. However, Bill [Scranton] called and said he had been talked into running for governor and asked me to run for lieutenant-governor with him. I asked how long I had to respond. He said “call us back in an hour.” Our opponents in the primary were supposed to have been Judge Robert Woodside for governor and Frank Hilton for lieutenant-governor. The candidates of George Bloom, GOP state chairman, also called and urged me to run. I filed and the rest is history.

Kenneth B. Lee: I came into the legislature in 1957. I was majority leader in 1963, minority leader in 1965 and speaker in 1967, then policy chairman while in the minority. Then I was back in the speakership in the ’70s. I succeeded Albert W. Johnson, who left the legislature to run for an unexpired Congressional term.

Reichley: I was in Harrisburg a relatively short time, four exciting years, 1963-67, the administration of Governor Bill Scranton.

Crist: In summary, we cover about thirty years. Let’s concentrate on twenty of these, 1950-1970. What were the highpoints and the lowpoints; what should go on the gravestone? Putting it another way, what were your biggest accomplishments and greatest disappointments?

Leader: I am proud, first, of our reforming the mental health program which I considered to be in abominable shape. Part of the success there was that Secretary [of Welfare] Harry Shapiro took it out of politics. We converted the old mental health hospital boards, pools of patronage, into advisory boards and professionalized the system. Second, I am pleased with the Pennsylvania Industrial Development Authority, which grew out of some ideas we developed in the 1954 campaign. Third, little noticed and forgotten now is that we enacted compulsory education for handicapped and crippled children. We went from 50,000 to 250,000 children in just five years. Our lowpoint was that we took seventeen months to get our tax program through. Now this would not be unusual. Last year about thirty-four state governments did not pass budgets in time to start the fiscal year. Those years I would have died of embarrassment if we had not had a budget in time to start the new fiscal year.

Shafer: I am very proud of several highlights of our administration. One of the greatest accomplishments was a new constitution for Pennsylvania. It has been highly acclaimed and a model for other states. We worked very hard on that, including our getting Governor Leader and Governor Scranton both to head the committee promoting the Constitutional Convention. They joined me in announcing our drive for voter support on a referendum on the May 1967 primary ballot. The result was a 240,000 vote majority for calling a convention.
Blatt: You should be given great credit for that.

Shafer: A second major accomplishment was the matter of economic growth. There were 50,000 new jobs created in each of my four years in office. Pennsylvania enjoyed the lowest unemployment rate, the highest per capita income, and the largest influx of new business for any comparable periods in the history of the Commonwealth.

Crist: Unemployment dropped to 2.5 per cent in 1969.

Shafer: A third important accomplishment had to do with education. To supplement the state college system we built seven community colleges and increased state aid to local education to fifty per cent. Our biggest disappointment was in not getting a one per cent income tax in place. The legislature wanted our programs but refused to raise the taxes to pay for it.

I regret that the General Assembly rejected our proposal for a constitutional amendment to reform the legislative branch, one aspect of which was to reduce the size of both the Senate and the House.

Lee: As to the delays in the tax programs, the governor's mistake was his timing in a tour of the state seeking citizen support for tax proposals.

Shafer: I agree. The timing was incorrect.

Lee: You just cannot support increased taxes while legislators are seeking re-election. And while I think of money, I am reminded of the time when a very prominent Democrat furnished me with a list of "bag men" in each of the departments. I went to see Governor Milton Shapp about this. I suggested that he get rid of thirty-five or forty people whom he had brought into the picture. Shapp said "Give me the names." I reminded him that none of these were Democratic county chairmen but rather personal and business friends of his. I said, call me in when they are gone. I thought he was going to come over the desk at me.

Blatt: I guess that I am proudest of the fact that as Secretary of Internal Affairs I was finally able to recommend the abolition of the department. It had grown to be a collection of disparate units. There really was no reason, except that the constitution so provided, why the head of Internal Affairs should be an elected official. The better of the units were reassigned to other departments; the Bureau of Municipal Affairs, for example, went to the new Department of Community Affairs. The Bureau of Land Records was shifted to the Governor's Office and then to the Pennsylvania Historical and Museum Commission.

Crist: The image of the department was poor in the years before you took over, Judge Blatt. We all remember when the Secretary and his driver both enrolled in
Dickinson Law School and spent three years attending class in Carlisle during normal state government working hours.

Shafer: Bill Livingood was not the only state official to go to law school during his term in office.

Blatt: No, he was not I'm afraid. But, more than that he was always running for governor, which was one reason that he and Governor Fine never got along. It was also a reason why the Department of Internal Affairs never was really doing its job.

Shafer: But you finally got the department abolished.

Blatt: Not really abolished, but its bureaus were shifted to other departments of the state government, so that work went on.

You have mentioned Governor Shapp. I always like him personally. But, thinking of him, I find an analogy I cannot fail to make. I apologize to any of you who are Ross Perot admirers, but he [Shapp] was a businessman who thought that he would buy the nomination and election. He put in a lot of money, his own money. He had the idea that as a businessman he could run matters just by giving orders, and all would work out. And he would give those orders only to people whom he trusted, right or wrong. He inserted his own business people, right or wrong. I am opposed to the thought that if you’re good in business you are able to handle a governmental office. It is an entirely different atmosphere. Not only do you not fit into the governmental atmosphere, no one understands you. It’s bound to be a terrible fiasco.

Leader: Perot is getting rank and file people. Shapp did not get the state party’s endorsement. They asked me to run against him, and I declined. Bob Casey tried and lost. Bob was hard to sell. I raised money for him. Milt Shapp got the leftovers, all the people money could buy and got himself an organization of riffraff.

Blatt: Which you, George, would not tolerate.

Reichley: He surrounded himself with rascals, who were the only people he could get to support him when he was running, and then he unwisely kept them after he was elected.

Lee: About sixty were indicted.

Leader: The support of Shapp was different. Perot is attracting the dissatisfied, not the disreputable. Shapp, unfortunately got the disreputables.

Reichley: Perot is picking up some operators. Of course, at the national level it is on a different scale. When DeGaulle took office in France in 1958, it was a similar situation. But, he had the wisdom and toughness to get rid of the disreputable ones when he got in.
Shafer: A wag said recently, as to the expert pair [Hamilton Jordan and Ed Rollins] Perot has hired from the Reagan and Carter administrations, “The Carter man will come up with screwy ideas; the chap from Reagan will get everybody to forget them.”

Reichley: The Scranton administration had so many accomplishments it is hard to pick just one. If Governor Scranton were here, I think he would say that his greatest success was reviving the State’s economy, building on some of the work of Governor Leader. Completely reorganizing the State’s education system, civil service reform, and passage of strict strip-mining legislation were also important achievements. Our most exciting fight was for unemployment compensation reform, in which Ray as Lieutenant-Governor and Ken as Majority Leader were involved. The state’s unemployment compensation system had got heavily in debt to the federal government, and there were serious abuses that needed to be corrected. The unions hated the reform bill which the administration proposed and organized a march on Harrisburg. Governor Scranton was hanged in effigy. But we finally got the bill passed in a very hectic session.

Our greatest disappointment, though not directly connected to the state government, was losing the Republican nomination for President to Senator [Barry] Goldwater in 1964. We got in too late. Winning the nomination was really impossible after Goldwater beat Nelson Rockefeller in the California primary. But quite apart from not winning the nomination there was a real stridency at the convention in San Francisco that year which I found very disturbing.

Shafer: At the 1964 convention Jim Malone of the PMA with Bob Dugan came to me as head of the state delegation after the caucus had voted almost unanimously to support Scranton. As we were about to vote, Malone said: “Goldwater is going to be nominated. When Pennsylvania is called, I want you to announce all Pennsylvania’s votes to Goldwater.”

I said “You must be kidding. The caucus, including both of you, voted to support Scranton until he releases us.”

He said “You remember the terrible mistake Fine made in Philadelphia? We don’t want that to happen here.” I said “I am not going to change the vote. I will vote as the caucus instructed. If you wish to vote for Goldwater before Scranton releases you, you will have to take the microphone from my hand.”

He said “You’re finished in politics in Pennsylvania.” He didn’t show up and I voted as the caucus had instructed.

Lee: At that time the party was moving away from responding to the PMA, and Malone thought it was Scranton who was causing those bad feelings.
Reichley: He was very close to George Bloom.

Lee: As to accomplishments in my terms in the leadership of the House, the legislature strengthened itself and its leadership. Remember that the Assembly really cannot build a force or form a consensus among the citizens. It can sometimes shape the form of some issue, and it can sometimes stop something from happening, but it is impossible for the Assembly to make real change.

The General Assembly in the 'fifties was literally controlled by outside interests. Parties had some input, but other special interests had just as much input where it made a difference. While I was there, it went from that kind of legislature to a place where probably it should have stayed, less bound by special interests. My opinion is that now the legislators have so many "perks" and such large salaries that it is almost an economic necessity to be re-elected. Its actions therefore are tied in to re-election rather than to making tough decisions. It was not in my time an economic disaster to be defeated. It was therefore easier to get them to work in a positive direction than it is now.

Now there is almost no discipline. About the only discipline now comes from public opinion. Therefore news media are important. We have come from a time when, although people of course rise above all this in a crisis, the legislature was controlled by four or five entities—Sun Oil, the Pennsylvania Rail Road, the Pennsylvania Manufacturers Association, the Philadelphia organization and a sort of group of people in the Senate involving whoever was GOP chairman in Philadelphia, Mickey Watkins, Andy Gleason, Henry Lark, and Harve Taylor. And the caucus vote was totally public. The persons elected got commitments in advance. This was changed in 1963, the most positive thing that has happened in the legislative branch.

Reichley: Why in 1963?

Lee: The procedure for selecting leadership was changed in 1963 because the Republican members in 1963 made up their minds to do so.

Shafer: It happened in the Senate, too. Harve Taylor began to lose control and was defeated by Bill Lentz for his seat in 1964.

Lee: Bill Reiter [PRR Lobbyist] and Harry Davis [Sun Oil lobbyist] were still powers. But their guy was Harve.

Reichley: But county organizations were strong. If you could get the county leaders in some counties to go along you could get the votes of the members, although not always on the matter of leadership selection. On tough bills, yes.

Lee: But after 1963 it was different. I would never have been elected to a position of leadership without a secret vote. I was from the next to smallest county in the
State and had no nucleus of organization. I was only the second leader elected by the private vote. The first was Charles Agnew of Allegheny County. Al Johnson ran against Agnew but was defeated. The first secret ballot brought in Agnew. He died. Johnson then took over for three or four months.

**Blatt:** We have not referred to the administration of David Lawrence. A good governor. He balanced the budget and did many things for which he did not get credit. He built a stable and honest administration. He was successful in getting federal funding.

**Lee:** Nobody could question Lawrence's motives. He was in his twilight as an active politician and had a history of working with responsible people—Richard King Mellon, for example. He knew the system and individuals everywhere. He did not have to experiment. He had no hidden agenda.

**Reichley:** Didn't patronage play a bigger role then? All those jobs made the Governor more effective with the legislature.

**Lee:** You always had a built-in system back home that actually had some degree of control over the legislature. As the patronage system went down the tube, parties lost their clout. Discipline was harder to maintain.

**Shafer:** Lawrence had more control over the apparatus than I did or Bill did.

**Reichley:** Even under Scranton, although we passed civil service reform, patronage was still important.

**Crist:** The governor of Pennsylvania had 50,000 jobs to distribute and the president of the United States 5,000.

**Lee:** His strength was that Lawrence knew everyone who had been connected with the party for fifty years.

**Reichley:** The thing that finally changed the whole situation was the arrival of the unions in government.

**Lee:** All here believe in the two-party system. Anything you can do that will bring discipline is important. What the party system contributes is something we hope will happen again but probably will not. The one system that can bring about discipline is to get the money into certain channels. I never collected money myself. Instead, I tried to get all money to go to the State Committee. One house member would sign State Committee checks. Then the check would come from a house member and from the State Committee. We tried to give county chairmen a day's lead time so that he could get in touch and inform a legislator that money was coming. Thus, we could go to the State Committee and get some influence over the member or have the county chairman provide some other pressure.
Crist: Does that system work now?
Lee: No! That is one of the problems.
Leader: Now all are simply survivors.
Reichley: All are in business for themselves now!
Blatt: Every man for himself.
Leader: When you find 97% of the Congress re-elected now, it is no longer an election. Just a ratification. We're almost at the point where they were in the Soviet Union when they ran only one candidate. Effectively we have only one person running for most legislative jobs and for Congress. Your only vote is by contributing to one or more PACs, and they spend most of their time servicing the PACs. Frankly that's why most people think it is not necessary to vote and half do not vote. The survivors get their money from the PACs.
They run their offices with an organization that has only a modest amount of input as to policy. The staff figures all of that. The survivors start right out trying to raise the money they need for re-election. They are survivors. A Congressman recently said that when he arrived in Washington the senior members told him "You have only one job here. It is winning your next election." The staff does everything else.
Shafer: I agree. The weakening of Republican and Democrat party discipline has hurt the political process. We need better discipline within the two parties. Having the two-party system, with diversity within each, is very good for our country. Because we have had it, we have had more stability than any other nation. We must keep two parties strong, with each party ideologically heterogeneous. We can retain stability. How we get discipline is another problem.
In all of this the media pulls in another direction. Reporters want people to vote for the person not the party. They forget that there must be a team to get things done.
Reichley: I share these concerns. Very much so. But, I see the parties becoming more built around ideology in recent years. In spite of the weakening of parties in Congress, unity is rising partly because of the emphasis on ideology which Ronald Reagan brought into the system. Patronage and money controlled by the parties used to be the keys to discipline in the system. But those days are not coming back.
Lee: The only way parties—I'm not sure it will ever happen—can get control again will be if parties get control of the money. Funding should be through channels controlled by parties.
The larger the legislature gets, the easier it is to control individual legislators. You can control the House and 203 members on top issues better than you can the Senate with 50. It is hard for two or three persons to stop something in House. In the Senate one man can stop anything.

Reichley: Do you know how we got 203 members in the House? It began in 1964 when Craig Truax and I mapped out a reapportionment bill for you, Ken, and Stan Stroup [Republican leader of the Senate] to take into a reapportionment commission meeting. We worked all night using a base of 200 districts. Someone said that in order to prevent a tie we should not have an even number of seats in the House. So early in the morning as the sun was coming up we made it 201. At 7 a.m. Ken and Stan came in and took our map to meet with the Democrats. We went home to bed. In the afternoon we came back, and they said we got off to a good start, but asked why did we put in 203 districts. The fact was at 5 o'clock in the morning Craig and I had miscounted and put in 203 districts by mistake. In the negotiations over reapportionment that followed one fixed principle became that there should be 203 districts. Subsequently at the Constitutional Convention some favored reducing the size of the Legislature, but others insisted that it was historical practice in Pennsylvania to have 203 districts. So they actually wrote 203 districts into the Constitution.

Crist: Governor Leader, in your 1954 campaign for governor you heard that your opponent, Lieutenant Governor Lloyd Wood, was running on his record. Your reply was: "it was a long playing record, one of record taxes, record spending and record debt." Have you a comment?

Leader: I was two different people in my campaign. I was myself and I was a person invented by a chap who had written to the Democratic State Chairman, Senator Joseph Barr, saying how good he was. He was George Pennington, a former purple prose writer for the Hearst papers who had worked for a time for Jim Duff [Governor 1946-1950 and later Senator]. They had a falling out. We hired him. He was able to write in a style that moved our releases from the inside papers to the front page.

But, I was very nervous about that guy.

Blatt: Amen!

Leader: We had an understanding that he would say nothing bad about Jim Duff. He was the strongest Republican in Pennsylvania, and I was not running against him. I was running against mere mortals, not royalty, not Republican heroes. He wrote something the last week that rattled me. I cussed; I was so upset, I threat-
ened all sorts of things which I could not have carried out without going to prison. Our agreement was $400 per week but no obligation at the end. For whatever press media is worth in a campaign, he milked it dry. But, I did not select him as press secretary. Anyway, that quotation sounds like one from George Pennington. 

Reichley: Let me add a footnote to that campaign. It is a story told to me by Marty Brackbill, who was research director for the 1954 Republican campaign—as he was later for Scranton. On election night the State Republican leadership gathered in the Penn Harris Hotel to follow the returns. As they tallied them each item of bad news would be followed. As the bad news began coming in they began drinking heavily. After awhile no one in the group—state senators and party officials—was in shape to appear before the press to make a concession statement. So finally they pushed Marty, the only sober person in the room, out into the hotel corridor to concede the election to George Leader. And that was how the old Republican machine in Pennsylvania died.

Shafer: Lloyd Wood came to northwest Pennsylvania to campaign against you, George. Apparently a nice guy. He was also very shy. In Mercer County at a packed dinner, he came in a back door five minutes before he spoke and then left after his speech without shaking a hand.

Leader: A very personable man. Everybody on both sides of the aisle in the Senate, where he presided as Lieutenant-Governor, liked him. TV was his downfall. He looked too much like the cartoonists’ caricure of politicians, but there was no personal joy for me to beat him. He was one of the most likeable persons I have ever met.