

C O P Y

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
Office of the Secretary
Washington 25, D. C.

November 30, 1955

My dear Mr. La Farge:

The White House has sent to us, for study and reply, the letter which you addressed to President Eisenhower on November 10 concerning the present situation in the broad and complex field of Indian affairs.

After reading your letter, I find myself somewhat puzzled by many of the statements and assertions you have made. Let me be specific.

In one place, for example, you talk about "the sense of disappointment, even dread" which you feel prevails among "most" Indians today. Frankly, I am not sure whether any single individual is really qualified to speak on behalf of a majority of the 400,000 or so Indian people in the United States. But I do know that reports coming to us from Indian Bureau employees, who are in daily contact with thousands of Indians on the reservations, would not bear out the sweeping assertion you have made. These reports reflect, rather, a broad diversity of Indian opinion varying greatly from tribe to tribe and focused largely on local issues. They also reflect a widespread and warm appreciation of the forward-looking programs that have been initiated and the positive results that have been achieved by the Bureau of Indian Affairs during the past two years under the leadership of Commissioner Glenn L. Emmons.

You also talk about "the present administrative tendency to see the solution of the Indian problem in the dispersal of Indian communities." As Commissioner Emmons and others have repeatedly emphasized, this is not the policy of the present Administration. We believe in freedom of movement and freedom of choice for the Indian people. We believe also that the problem of a rapidly growing Indian population on a fixed, and largely inadequate, land base will lead many Indians in the future, as it has led many in the past, to seek a livelihood away from the reservations. Our primary concern is to assist this voluntary movement and guide it along constructive channels. But we are not seeking a solution by trying to break up Indian communities. In fact, we have vigorously opposed legislation in the present Congress which would have this effect.

The solution, you say, lies "in the elevation of Indian communities to the level of health and well-being enjoyed by other communities in our country." This, of course, is the policy which Commissioner Emmons has been advocating -- and carrying out -- since he first took office in August 1953. He has said many times that he would like nothing better than to create a vigorous local economy on each reservation which would provide adequate support for the whole population. He recognizes, as I do, that in many areas this will not be feasible because of inherent limitations in the quality of the land resources or other apparently insurmountable limiting factors. Nevertheless, it has been and still is a central item of Indian Bureau policy to assist the Indians, to the fullest possible extent, in making effective use of their available resources and in raising their living standards to the level characteristically enjoyed by their non-Indian neighbors.

In the light of these facts, I find it particularly difficult to understand what is meant by your statement that present policies have tended to worsen the situation in regard to Indian economy and "the wellsprings of Indian initiative." I know of no factual evidence whatever that would support this assertion.

On the second page of your letter you have quite a bit to say about the Indians' "inherent right to retain, if they wish, their identity as Indians and as tribal groups." Of course, they have such a right and nobody in this Administration, to my knowledge, has ever attempted to deny it.

In similar vein you state that "it does not grant a man freedom or equality to deprive him of his rights." This is a rather self-evident proposition but I am not aware that there has been any such deprivation. In fact, I would emphatically repudiate the implication clearly running through your remarks that there has been or will be.

Another statement with which it would be hard to disagree is the assertion on the third page of your letter that "consultation with Indians, followed by utter disregard of their wishes, is a mockery." Here is what Commissioner Emmons had to say about consultation with Indians as recently as last July 11 in a public address at Estes Park, Colorado:

"To me the term does not mean going out to meet the Indians with preconceived plans or cut-and-dried solutions

for their problems all wrapped up in advance. It does not mean merely advising the Indians of what we intend to do and then going right ahead with it regardless of any objections they may have or any views they may express. It does not mean being in too much of a hurry to really listen or being too self-righteous to really understand.

"In my definition full consultation has several important, and actually essential, characteristics. First, it involves making a sincere and warmly sympathetic effort to learn just what the Indian people have on their minds and in their hearts. Secondly, it means providing them with a complete and unhampered opportunity for an expression of their views. Thirdly, it means giving the fullest possible consideration within the limitations of law and policy, not to every individual Indian's opinion, but to the clear consensus and to those views which are obviously supported by a majority segment of the tribal population. Finally, in those cases where there are good and compelling reasons for not complying with the tribal requests or recommendations, it means explaining carefully and clearly just what those reasons are and why, from the Government standpoint, they seem to be important."

In your letter to the President you mention the "termination acts affecting the Klamath and Menominee Tribes of Indians. In a recent article for North American Newspaper Alliance you had this to say: "The Administration came in with a sheaf of bills to terminate the Indian status of various tribes. Heaven knows how the tribes were chosen." In the first place, the purpose of the bills is not what you state. Secondly, there is no mystery whatever about the selection of these particular tribes. As you must know, all tribes covered by the Administration's "terminal" legislative proposals of January 1954 (except the western Oregon Indians who explicitly requested such legislation) were specifically designated in House Concurrent Resolution No. 108 which was adopted in the summer of 1953 by both branches of Congress without a dissenting vote. That Resolution was a clear-cut Congressional mandate to this Department calling for early submission of such legislative recommendations covering the Indian groups named.

If you ask how the groups were selected by Congress for inclusion in Resolutions No. 108, it may be that we can find a clue in

testimony submitted to the Senate Civil Service Committee on February 8, 1947, by Mr. William Zimmerman, Jr., who was then Acting Commissioner of Indian Affairs and is now your associate in the organization which you head. As part of his testimony Mr. Zimmerman submitted to the Committee a list of tribal groups which, he said, "could be denied Federal services immediately or in the future, whichever the Congress should decide." Included were not only the Klamath and Menominee Tribes but several others such as the Flatheads of Montana, the New York Indians, the Potawatomi group, and (conditionally) the Turtle Mountain Chippewa Band of North Dakota which were later named in House Concurrent Resolution No. 108. In fact, the parallel between the Zimmerman list of 1947 and the Congressional list of 1953, while not complete in all details, is remarkably close. To me, therefore, there is no special mystery about the selection of the groups included in Resolution No. 108. If the Acting Commissioner of Indian Affairs felt that these groups could be denied Federal services immediately back in 1947, certainly the Congress was justified in concluding that such action could be taken in 1953.

With regard to your comments about the credit program of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, there are several points that should be made. First, this is not a grant program and was never intended to be. Secondly, Indian tribes are making increasing use of their own funds for loans to individual members and for financing tribal enterprises; over \$17,300,000 of tribal funds were being used in this way as of June 30, 1955. Thirdly, both tribal groups and individual members have been obtaining a steadily growing share of the credit they need from the normal sources available to all other citizens; admittedly incomplete reports made to the Indian Bureau indicate that the volume of such credit mounted from at least \$20,200,000 in 1951 to a minimum of \$33,900,000 in 1954. When it is recalled that the largest amount loaned from the Bureau's revolving fund in any one fiscal year was less than \$3,300,000, it becomes apparent how woefully inadequate this fund would be if it were the only source of financing available to Indians. The plain fact is that if the Bureau's revolving credit fund is to continue serving the purpose for which it is intended, loans must be made from it only where there is a reasonable prospect of repayment; otherwise the fund would be quickly dissipated and would contribute little to the creation of sound and stable economic enterprises among the Indian people. With this guiding principle in mind, I am confident that the credit needs of Indians (as distinguished from their other needs) are being amply met from the various sources available to them. But I would emphasize that the credit program of the Bureau of Indian Affairs should not be regarded as the total answer to all the Indians' economic problems.

Your remarks about the Indian Bureau's policy on issuance of fee patents to competent Indian applicants were interesting in the light of testimony submitted by your associate, Mr. Zimmerman, at the hearings before the Senate Civil Service Committee in 1947. Here is what Mr. Zimmerman had to say at the hearing held on January 23:

"The old system required each Indian to get a permit when he wanted to sell a cow, required him to go to the agency when he wanted to draw \$25. It seems to me we are past that stage. Unless he is actually incompetent, he should be allowed to have individual control of his property." (Emphasis supplied.)

The last sentence quoted, while apparently referring to Indian personal property, seems to me an excellent statement of the basic principle underlying the Bureau's present fee patent policy. In short, we do not believe that a man who has demonstrated his competence and seeks control of his property should be denied that privilege merely because he happens to be an Indian. However, this does not mean that the Bureau is unaware of its continuing trust responsibility in connection with unpatented Indian lands that may be affected by issuance of a fee patent in any particular area. The Bureau has clearly recognized that problems of the kind mentioned in your letter may occasionally arise and has indicated that, when they do, it will take the initiative in consulting and cooperating with the affected Indians in working out a fair and equitable solution. Our principal point is that the solution need not be sought and must not be sought, as it was in the past, by denying or frustrating the property rights of an Indian who has demonstrated his competence and applies for unrestricted control of his land.

It is difficult for me to understand why you would look upon the recent revision of the "General Grazing Regulations" cited in your letter as an "example of administrative paring away of Indian rights and property." The lands in question were submarginal tracts purchased by the Federal Government during the 1930's and later administratively transferred to the Secretary of the Interior for Indian use. Although they have been available for Indian use for 15 years or more, they are not and never have been Indian property in the same sense as tribal land. In some cases they are being used effectively by the Indians; in other cases they are not. The change in the grazing regulations which you mention merely puts a stop to the practice of placing in special deposit accounts the income received from leases or grazing permits on these Federal properties. The action was prompted in part by the fact that the General Accounting Office has taken

exception to the continuation of such special deposit accounts and in part by a recognition that the final disposition of these lands cannot be administratively predicted since it will depend ultimately on Congressional decision. Meanwhile we are continuing to recommend that the lands be retained for Indian use. If any Indian Bureau "spokesmen" have said, as you report, that these lands "should be returned to white ownership," this statement was made without the knowledge or approval of either Commissioner Emmons or myself.

Now let me say a few words about the principle of Indian "consent" which you emphasized toward the end of your letter. We must start, I believe, with the fact (stressed in your letter) that Indians are citizens and now have the privilege of the ballot in all 48 states. This means that they are represented in Congress just as other citizens are and that they have the same rights (which they frequently exercise) of petitioning the Congress and of stating their views before Congressional committees considering legislation. What you are proposing -- and let us be quite clear about this -- is that, over and above these normal rights of citizenship, the Indians should also have a special veto power over legislation which might affect them. No other element in our population (aside from the President himself) now has such a power and none ever has had in the history of our country. In short, it seems to me that the principle of Indian "consent" which you are urging so strenuously has most serious Constitutional implications. With full respect for the rights and needs of the Indian people, I believe it would be extremely dangerous to pick out any segment of the population and arm its members with authority to frustrate the will of the Congress which the whole people have elected.

If I read correctly your letter of November 10 and other recent writings of yours that have come to my attention, the basic difference between your position and that of the present Administration on Indian policy boils down essentially to this. You apparently believe that the interests of the tribal group should be given priority over the rights and interests of the individual Indian and that first emphasis should be placed on maintaining tribes intact on their present land base no matter how thin this base may be or how remote the prospects that it will provide an adequate livelihood for the tribal population. We believe, on the other hand, in the primacy of the individual Indian and in his right to choose his own way of life without pressure or coercion. If he prefers to live in a strictly Indian environment and participate actively in tribal affairs, his preference will be respected and assistance made available to him within the framework of tribal life. However, if he decided to make

his way in non-Indian society, we believe that he should be given every aid and encouragement in making the transition and adjustment. In other words, our purpose is not, as you seemingly believe, to "detrribalize" the Indian or deprive him of his identity; it is, rather, to give him a wider range of choice and a greater opportunity for fulfilling his own potentialities than he has previously enjoyed.

I personally believe that the Bureau of Indian Affairs under the excellent leadership of Commissioner Emmons has already made important strides in this direction. If private citizens sincerely interested in Indian welfare will lend their encouragement and support, then I have no doubt that even greater strides can and will be made.

Sincerely yours,

(Sgd) Douglas McKay

Secretary of the Interior

Mr. Oliver La Farge, President
Association on American Indian Affairs, Inc.
48 East 86th Street
New York 28, New York

*Yakima
Republic*

DEPARTMENT OF INTERIOR
DIVISION OF INFORMATION NORTHWEST REGIONAL OFFICE
P. O. BOX 3537
PORTLAND 8, OREGON

BUREAU OF INDIAN AFFAIRS

RELEASE ON RECEIPT

FEBRUARY 6, 1956

EXTRA COPY

Indian educational and relocation programs established new records for the Pacific Northwest during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955, Don C. Foster, area director, bureau of Indian affairs, reported today. Irrigation, road building and forestry activities on Indian reservations were maintained at a high level, the bureau's report to the secretary of interior indicated.

Indian children enrolled in public, federal, mission, vocational and private schools in the region totaled 6,229. A special Navajo program of 500 pupils at the Chemawa Indian school, Salem, Ore., added an enrollment of 50 Navajo students, an increase of 50 for the fiscal year and 236 over 1954. This increase was made possible by making arrangements for public schools to take many of the Pacific Northwest children enrolled at Chemawa.

Arrangements made by the bureau with state educational authorities in Oregon provided special adult educational courses directed to help members of the Klamath and western Oregon tribes to earn a livelihood, conduct their own affairs and assume responsibilities as citizens without special services from the bureau.

A 60 per cent contribution of \$206,880 was made by the bureau during the fiscal year for construction and equipping of new public school facilities at Chiloquin, Klamath county, Ore., to provide for Indian and other children alike.

MORE MORE MORE

Special voluntary relocation programs designed to aid Indians in moving from their reservations to better employment areas and aid in finding jobs and housing showed excellent acceptance during its first year's experience. This special terminal readjustment, vocational training and relocation program assisted 65 Indian trainees from Klamath and western Oregon tribes to relocate off the reservation, while 169 persons in 55 family groups and 63 unattached men and women were assisted in establishing themselves off the reservation in two special programs.

Approximately 1500 acres of Pacific Northwest Indian lands were provided with irrigation and drainage facilities during the fiscal year and construction surveys were started toward irrigation of an additional 21,000 acres. Preliminary surveys and investigations are under way to provide flood control for approximately 10,000 acres and irrigation facilities for 28,600.

Reservation road maintenance programs for the year included surface maintenance, snow removal, flood damage repairs and bridge repairs on 948 miles of regular maintenance and 2,246 miles of occasional maintenance for bureau roads. The Indian bureau graded and drained 22 miles of reservation roads, surfaced 43 miles and constructed 122 running feet of bridges.

The bureau's Pacific Northwest forestry branch supervised cutting of 471,000,000 board feet of Indian timber with a value of \$8,500,000 for calendar year 1955.

Contracts were entered into with Washington, Oregon and Idaho for state agricultural extension and home demonstration offices to take over projects formerly handled by the Indian bureau. Extension workers under the program assist the Indian in adopting better farm practices, improving crop

MORE MORE MORE

varieties, controlling insect and plant diseases, bettering soil conditions by fertilizing programs, and producing better livestock.

Excellent progress was reported in carrying out provisions of the 1954 laws providing for termination of federal trusteeship for the Klamath tribe of Oregon and numerous bands and groups in western Oregon.

###

ULRICH: BE 4-3361

Send to Republic

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
DIVISION OF INFORMATION NORTHWEST REGIONAL OFFICE
P. O. BOX 3537
PORTLAND 8, OREGON

BUREAU OF INDIAN AFFAIRS

July 3, 1956

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE

Herbert L. Moore, Administrative Officer of the Portland Area Office of the Bureau of Indian Affairs since January, 1955, has been promoted to Assistant Area Director in charge of administration, Don C. Foster, Portland Area Director, announced today.

Moore has been in federal service since September of 1934. He was employed on the Fort Peck Project of the Corps of Engineers. He started his work at the Flathead Agency in Montana in June, 1939. He was on the Bureau audit staff and later Assistant to the Fiscal Division Branch Chief at the Central Office in Chicago during the war years, and came to the Portland Area Office as Finance Officer in July, 1946.

Foster said that Moore's promotion was "much deserved." Moore resides at 925 N. E. 109th Avenue, Portland, Ore.

#

RECEIVED

JUL 9 1956

**YAKIMA INDIAN AGENCY
TOPPENISH, WASH.**

ULRICH - BE 4-3361

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
DIVISION OF INFORMATION NORTHWEST REGIONAL OFFICE
P. O. BOX 3537
PORTLAND 8, OREGON

*Send To
Republic*

BUREAU OF INDIAN AFFAIRS

FOR RELEASE TO AM's SUNDAY, JULY 8

Two Indian relocation service offices will be opened in the near future at Warm Springs Agency and at Klamath Falls in Oregon, Don C. Foster, Portland Area Director of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, announced today.

Foster said Indian families and individuals who want to relocate away from reservations in metropolitan centers will be able to get detailed information on the relocation program and to file applications for relocation at the new offices.

The Warm Springs Agency office will serve the Warm Springs, Umatilla, Celilo and Burns-Paiute colony Indians in Oregon and any Yakima Indians who are interested in relocating. The office will be staffed by an Agency Relocation Officer, an Assistant Relocation Officer, and a Relocation aide. Recruiting for these positions is being carried on through the U. S. Civil Service Commission.

Leonard C. Allen, who has been handling relocation work in connection with the termination of the Grand Ronde-Siletz reservation in western Oregon, will be in charge of the new office at Klamath Falls, which will be opened after August 13. Allen's work with the western Oregon tribes was handled from the Portland Area Office, but he will transfer to Klamath Falls to handle relocation work under the Klamath Termination Act (Public Law 587).

RECEIVED

JUL 9 1956
YAKIMA INDIAN AGENCY
TOPPENISH, WASH.

MORE

A Relocation Specialist will be added to the Portland Area Office staff to supervise the Klamath Falls and Warm Springs offices and one at Spokane, Wash.

Foster explained that the two new offices will serve as intermediate points between the reservations and the full city relocation offices. Funds for the Bureau wide relocation program have been more than tripled from a level of \$1,016,400 available nationally during fiscal 1956 to \$3,472,000.

In addition to opening two new city offices, the Bureau of Indian Affairs will increase its staff at each of the four city offices at Los Angeles, San Francisco, Chicago and Denver, and will convert the San Jose, Cal. office from a sub-office to a full city office. City office staffs will be increased to provide more personalized and extensive guidance service to relocating families and individuals, Commissioner of Indian Affairs Glenn L. Emmons said recently.

The reservation-level offices at Spokane, Klamath Falls and Warm Springs Agency are being added along with similar offices in other parts of the country to place additional emphasis on better preparation of the families and individuals before leaving the reservation.

In the past six types of assistance have been provided by the four city relocation offices: (1) transportation from reservation to city; (2) shipment of household goods up to a maximum of \$50; (3) subsistence expenses en route; (4) subsistence expenses at destination up to a maximum of four weeks, as needed; (5) supplemental subsistence where a relocated worker loses a job through no fault of his own and is not yet eligible for unemployment compensation, and (6) grants up to a maximum of \$50 per person to cover the purchase of tools and equipment needed by apprentice workers.

Six new types of assistance will be initiated during fiscal 1957. These are: (1) grants for the purchase of medical and hospital insurance up to one year for relocating workers and their dependents who do not have such coverage from other sources; (2) grants up to a maximum of \$50 per person for the purchase of clothing and other items that may be needed to bring the personal appearance of relocating people up to a standard acceptable in metropolitan communities; (3) grants up to \$50 per family for purchase of household wares such as linen and kitchen equipment; (4) grants up to \$250 per family for the purchase of furniture; (5) full coverage of tuition costs for one year to provide night school training, of the vocational or "3-R" type, for relocated Indians wishing to pursue such studies, and (6) a pilot program to assist about 100 of the "more settled" city-dwelling Indian families in the purchase of homes.

"With this substantial increase in financial assistance and enlargement of our relocation staff to provide more services," Commissioner Emmons said, "I am confident that our relocation program will reach a new peak of effectiveness in terms of warmly sympathetic guidance and tangible help for relocating Indian people. We have always recognized that the transition from a reservation environment to big city life is a most difficult and exacting kind of adjustment for many Indian families and individuals. But the amazing thing to me is that so many of them have made it so successfully."

ULRICH: BE 4-3361

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
DIVISION OF INFORMATION NORTHWEST REGIONAL OFFICE
P. O. BOX 3537
PORTLAND 8, OREGON

BUREAU OF INDIAN AFFAIRS

FOR RELEASE TO PM'S JULY 26, 1956
(Simultaneous release in Wash., D. C.)

CHOCTAW INDIAN NAMED ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER OF INDIAN AFFAIRS

Promotion of Fred H. Massey, a Choctaw Indian from Oklahoma, to the position of Assistant Commissioner for Administration in the Bureau of Indian Affairs was announced today by the Secretary of the Interior Fred A. Seaton.

"This," Secretary Seaton commented, "is an exceptionally significant appointment. According to the personnel records which we have available, Mr. Massey is the first person of Indian descent to reach the level of Assistant Commissioner in the 132-year history of the Indian Bureau. It is true, however, that a New York Indian and former Civil War general, Eli Parker, served for two years as Commissioner of Indian Affairs during the Grant Administration.

Mr. Massey is a veteran of 20 years' service with the Bureau and has risen from the ranks over the years to positions of steadily increasing responsibility. His promotion to Assistant Commissioner is well merited and is in line with the Bureau's policy of giving preference to Indian employees wherever they are qualified for available positions."

At the present time more than 50 percent of the Indian Bureau's staff of nearly 10,000 employees in the United States and Alaska are people of Indian descent. One of them, Ben Reifel, is serving as area director in charge of all the Bureau's work in North Dakota, South Dakota, and Nebraska. Others are functioning as superintendents at local Indian agencies, as branch chiefs in the

MORE

Washington office, and in many other positions of comparable responsibility.

Mr. Massey first joined the Bureau in 1936 as a temporary clerical employee in the warehouse at St. Louis, Mo. One year later he was appointed a junior clerk in the construction division of the Bureau's Washington office and in 1940 was promoted to budget clerk in the administrative division. Subsequently he was advanced to the positions of senior clerk, assistant administrative analyst, assistant to the budget officer, and budget officer. For the past four years he has served as chief of the branch of budget and finance. In his new position he will supervise the work of that branch and also the operations of the Bureau in the fields of personnel, property and supply, credit, and buildings and utilities. He succeeds W. Barton Greenwood, who was recently named Deputy Commissioner.

Mr. Massey was born in Oklahoma in 1912, and graduated from the high school at Quinton, Okla. He also attended Bacone Junior College, Muskogee, Okla.; Haskell Institute, Lawrence, Kans.; and National University, Washington, D. C.

#

ULRICH
BE 4-3361

Save for
Relander -

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
DIVISION OF INFORMATION NORTHWEST REGIONAL OFFICE
P. O. BOX 3537
PORTLAND 8, OREGON

BUREAU OF INDIAN AFFAIRS

FOR RELEASE TO PM's NOVEMBER 9, 1956

EDUCATION CONTRACT APPROVED BETWEEN INDIAN BUREAU, STATE OF WASHINGTON

Secretary of the Interior Fred A. Seaton today announced approval of a \$181,000 contract between the Bureau of Indian Affairs and the Washington State Department of Public Instruction for financial aid to school districts where about 2900 Indian children are enrolled during the current school year.

Indian education in the public schools of Washington is partially supported by federal funds under the provisions of the Johnson-O'Malley Act of 1936. To qualify for these funds school districts must show that Indian students and non-taxable Indian lands within the boundaries of their district constitute a financial burden. The amount received by each district is based on need. Washington was one of the first states to receive Johnson-O'Malley aid. Last year (1955-1956) the total aid was \$174,000.

There are 41 districts in 17 counties with Indian children enrolled in the public schools. No Indian schools are operated in the state of Washington by the Bureau of Indian Affairs. Such schools have long been discontinued although in a few cases the old Indian day school buildings are used by the local public schools under revocable permits. These are fast disappearing.

The education of Indian children in the State of Washington was first a responsibility of the federal government and missions. From the founding of the first Indian boarding school in 1857 at Puyallup there were seven boarding schools and 20 day schools established and operated at various times. Since

MORE

1932 most Indian children have attended public schools.

For a time after the passage of the Johnson-O'Malley Act contracts were made with separate school districts.

Many districts in addition to those receiving Johnson-O'Malley aid have Indian students attending their schools, according to Indian Commissioner Glenn L. Emmons. A number of Indian families have left the reservation areas and are employed in communities where there are no tax-exempt lands. No funds are provided for the student education of these families and the families are part of the community and pay all the taxes which are paid by their non-Indian neighbors. In one Washington district the president of the school board is an Indian (Barney Rickard, Keller).

The Tacoma Indian Tuberculosis Hospital, operated by the Department of Health, Education and Welfare, presents a special case of an educational program for hospitalized TB and orthopedic patients. Since these children are not residents of the Tacoma school district and 75 per cent are from outside the State of Washington, the State and the Bureau of Indian Affairs share equally in the cost of the program which is operated by the Tacoma public school district. During the 1956-57 school year a new program of adult education at the hospital will be conducted on a trial basis by the Tacoma district.

The exact amount each district will receive under the 1956-57 Johnson-O'Malley contract will be decided by the Department of Public Instruction and will be based partially on average enrollment statistics at the end of the school year. A portion, \$8500, of the total contract will be used for administrative purposes. Mr. G. W. Van Horn is Supervisor of Indian Education for the State.

A similar Johnson-O'Malley contract with the State of Idaho for \$146,725, was announced recently and negotiations are in progress for a contract with the State of Oregon.

#

Note to Editors:

For your information and use if you desire, here is a list of counties and school districts affected by the Johnson-O'Malley contract with the State of Washington:

Clallam	Dry Creek Cape Flattery Quillayute Valley	Pacific Pend Oreille	Tokeland Cysick
Ferry	Keller Inchelium Hazelmere	Skagit Snohomish	Concrete LaConner Marysville
Grays Harbor	Taholah Quinault Moclips-Aloha Oakville	Stevens	Wellpinit Ford Columbia (formerly #1, Columbia UHS, #201, Fruit- land, and #204, Hunters, now Consolidated)
Jefferson	Queets-Clearwater		
King	Auburn		
Kitsap	North Kitsap		
Klickitat	Klickitat Goldendale (formerly Goodnoe Hills School #24, now consol- idated) Lyle	Thurston Whatcom	Yelm Nisqually Ferndale Bellingham Mount Baker
Mason	Lower Skokomish	Yakima	White Swan Harrah Toppenish Granger Wapato
Okanogan	Malott Nespelem Omak Okanogan Brewster Oroville		