

of suitable alternatives to a hunting and limited farming economy and the difficulties in developing sources of money income are also well known.

I am never surprised but always dismayed when well-meaning but poorly informed people ask why do not the Indians integrate themselves more effectively into the general society. This question, so frequently asked, is disarming because to answer it appropriately requires a considerably longer explanation than most inquirers have the patience to hear. To reply simply that probably they'd rather not, or, contrariwise, that they do not have the opportunity to integrate would not, either way, properly answer the question. Nor would it be very informative to reply that for the most part they do not have the opportunity and that, in any case, they have strong attachment to their own cultural heritage and are understandably ambivalent in their reactions to the alien society which has engulfed them. This is, it seems to me, a reasonable statement of the case, but it is quite meaningless to anyone who is unfamiliar with the values on the one side of the equation, namely the character and equality of the cultural heritage to which Indians are attached. Therefore, if *we* wish to preserve the National image in which *we* see ourselves, namely of fairness, of beneficent interest in the powerless and the underprivileged and value in defining the specific character of mental health problems in Indian life, and the origins of the problems will be evident to anyone who reads the transcript of that conference."

THE ROLL OF THE STATE OF ALASKA'S EXPENDITURES, BY TYPE AND FUNCTION, 1965

| Type/function                           | Expenditure | Percent of total |
|-----------------------------------------|-------------|------------------|
| Total expenditure.....                  | \$196.3     |                  |
| Education.....                          | 47.8        | 24               |
| Highways.....                           | 78.1        | 39               |
| Public welfare.....                     | 6.6         | 3                |
| Hospitals.....                          | 6.6         | 3                |
| Correction.....                         | 4.5         | 2                |
| Natural resources.....                  | 6.5         | 3                |
| Employment security administration..... | 2.1         | 1                |
| General control.....                    | 6.7         | 3                |
| Housing and urban renewal.....          | 9.7         | 4                |
| Airports.....                           | 8.7         | 4                |
| Water transport and terminals.....      | 6           |                  |
| Interest on general debt.....           | 3.0         | 1                |
| Insurance trust expenditure.....        | 5.9         | 3                |
| Miscellaneous.....                      | 7.8         | 3                |

Source: Compendium of State Government Finance in 1965, U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, table 9.

What is the role of the Federal Government in Alaska in terms of fiscal appropriations of 1967?

AGGREGATE EXPENDITURE OF FEDERAL PROGRAMS FOR ALASKA, BY AGENCY, FISCAL YEAR 1967

| Agency                              | Expenditure   |
|-------------------------------------|---------------|
| Defense Department.....             | \$320,734,500 |
| Air Force.....                      | 185,791,500   |
| Army.....                           | 104,755,000   |
| Navy.....                           | 30,188,000    |
| Commerce Department.....            | 58,940,572    |
| Health, Education, and Welfare..... | 50,628,932    |
| Independent agencies.....           | 49,416,841    |
| Interior Department.....            | 46,921,576    |
| Treasury Department.....            | 15,364,000    |
| All others.....                     | 23,972,185    |
| Grand total.....                    | 565,978,606   |

Source: News letter, Report from Washington, from the office of Senator E. L. Bartlett Feb. 4, 1966.