Ronald Reagan Presidential Library Digital Library Collections

This is a PDF of a folder from our textual collections.

Collection: Blackwell, Morton: Files

Folder Title: American Indian Leaders

Advisory Council (2 of 7)

Box: 31

To see more digitized collections visit: https://reaganlibrary.gov/archives/digital-library

To see all Ronald Reagan Presidential Library inventories visit: https://reaganlibrary.gov/document-collection

Contact a reference archivist at: reagan.library@nara.gov

Citation Guidelines: https://reaganlibrary.gov/citing

National Archives Catalogue: https://catalog.archives.gov/

in Indian country. With one Administration we are up in employment, the next we are on the bottom and back up and down, up and down.

MR. LESTER: Maybe I ought to say something because that roller coaster, when unemployment goes down, it goes down about 40 percent, and when it goes up, it goes up to about 90 percent, so we are dealing with the roller coaster that is very high.

MR. DRIVING HAWK: But to put dollars and cents on that particular case, when you talk of, I believe you mentioned a stable economic entity in tribal governments, in this particular case, this case of CETA being used in tribal governments to strengthen themselves and they have become fairly strong over the last years by utilizing the CETA programs; with this being taken away, there again you weaken what you are striving to obtain, we are all striving to obtain.

In relation to that, when we geto to that bottom end of the cycle, the high unemployment, all our other social problems rise, and then as tribal governments they are unable to deal with the economic development, energy development, natural resource development because they have to deal with the high alcoholism rates and so on, the social services, the minimum budgets and so forth, because law enforcement in those areas comes to light, so you get to this continuity, and I hope all three of you get together and maybe convince somebody

within the Administration that you do have an opportunity
for once to coordinate and put your words to action in dollars
and cents, and endorse this \$50 million because like Chairman

MacDonald says, it does play a vital role within our
governments, so hopefully--I don't know if there is any
response to that or not.

MR. LESTER: I can tell you that I had a very difficult time yesterday, and the Senators were, a couple of them were, got upset with me, but be that as it may, I understand what you are saying, that we have got tremendous economic opportunity but without some assistance, that economic kpportunity won't be realized for the benefit of the tribal members, and that we are dealing with some very fragile economies and some very fragile kinds of existences on the reservation.

In terms of the concept of developing an overall effort to establish a longer term, more consistent economic policy with respect to Indian tribes and the development of Indian tribes as separate political cultural entities, I for one would welcome such an opportunity to use that mechanism so that we could all be working off and singing from the same sheet of music.

As you know, the fragmentation in the federal government is not just the fragmentation within the Executive Branch. The Legistative Branch is also fragmentized and when

they pass legislation, they often don't consider or even understand the interrelationship of one program to another or one effort to another, and so we have a crazy quilt situation, particularly in all of the programs based on how the legislation was written. Some legislation recognizes Indian tribes as recipients. Others do not. Others require the tribes to comply with the same kind of standards and requirements that states have. Others establish separate requirements for tribes, and so it requires I think that we try to bring some consistency at least to economic development and the role of tribal government within not only in terms of their own economic development, but within the federal system the legitimate role of the tribal government which has been confirmed by courts, by numerous Presidential Executive Orders, et cetera, but still there is this confusing mess, so I would welcome the participation if such a group could be organized.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

CHAIRMAN BLACKWELL: Let's take this comment and response and one more if there is another, and we will move on to the next topic.

MR. MACDONALD: In that regard, you know, here we have CETA program cut back quite a bit, particularly looking at the public service employment, and I don't know whether Homer, Homer's operation has the facts on how many thousands of Indian individuals would be left out without a job because

of that setback. In our own reservation we project a 10 percent increase in unemployment, from 40 percent to 50 percent, and that is just a cursory, a first-run look at it. It may be more.

1

2

3

5

6

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Now that throws the whole burden on Ken Smith because now this, whatever that means, maybe eight or ten thousand Navajos would now line up for general assistance. Now do you have enough money to take care of general assistance for that many increased within the next month? you have not, then we better get together and find out what is going to happen, and there were projects I'm sure by many tribes using CETA funds to do certain things, and if all of a sudden these things are cut, some of those projects and materials and assets that were brought to bear using CETA monies will go to waste. It is just a wate of I don't know how many millions of dollars, and my suggestion is here that perhaps recognizing that CETA is going to be cut, maybe BIA through its general assistance program cannot handle the number of unemployed individual Indiana who may be flocking to these offices. Perhaps there is a serious need to supplement the general assistance program with maybe some kind of work experience program that will allow the completion of some of the projects as well as to help with the burden that the general assistance program monies might be subject to, and I just want to ask Ken Smith if he and the Department

of Labor are working together to see how folks are going to be taken care of because it becomes a welfare situation, and these are the safety net that we were trying to protect according to our President.

MR. HOMER: We don't know exactly how many people have been cut from each PSE programby weekly contacts and weekly reports received from the grantees from records.

First of all, what the Administration did is when they cut the PSE program, they took all the money that they saved on the cut and put it in the unemployment insurance compensation pool. The individuals that are cut from PSE have the right to go to the state employment office to receive compensation—15 weeks.

your staff should then try to transition or develop jobs for those people. After the 15 weeks they will become maybe the welfare type situation for the Bureau of Indian Affairs. Now that sort of sounds crazy for the Administration to take the PSE people off the program and put them on unemployment compensation instead of jobs and take care of welfare. That's the way the Administration wants it. The PSE program they felt had welfare mentality behind it anyway and possibly they felt that you could do a lot better things with private sector initiative programs that dealt with developing a tribal enterprise and on-the-job training.

I don't think it is very important that since the

Administration has cut the programs—it is very important that the tribes consolidate a lot of programs, consolidate staffs to possibly relieve that impact that is coming down the line.

I think it is going to come down a little more later on, so I guess it is the right time to just streamline.

CHAIRMAN BLACKWELL: Ken, did you want to respond on this matter?

MR. SMITH: No. I didn't mean to. I think what he said is right, what Peter said is right, that we are going to keep impacting, as I understand, \$4 million this coming fiscal year, and of course that is just an educated guess. We won't know until everything comes in. I understand next year we are talking about 16 million. This fiscal year I think we can overcome 4 million, but next year when it becomes 16 million, that's a little more money than I think we might be able to bear, so I am not sure what we will have to do next year. It may cost us more. I really don't know, and we won't know until it is over.

I do understand that the resident general welfare, that tribes can have the option of having a work program.

MR. MACDONALD: Work experience.

MR. SMITH: Work experience program, rather than going on general welfare. That still costs X number of dollars, but that might be something to look at. It might be

a better program rather than getting something for nothing, just paying someone to do something, but it would cost 45 to 55 dollars more, and I don't know enough about that program, but I am aware that there is a program such as that in BIA.

CHAIRMAN BLACKWELL: Okay. Fine.

MR. MACDONALD: This becomes very important because mind you there is no private sector on reservations. Whereas in Chicago if everyone on the PSE program is cut off, even though there is half a million of them, they could find many other jobs because they are right in the middle of the private sector, and that is the Administration's philosophy. There is nothing wrong with it, but when you get into Indian reservations, when there is absolutely no private sector, when you cut these folks off from the employment, that's it. They have no place to go, so all of them then become a welfare situation, and until we get down to the point where the private sector is developed and this is what most tribal government is working to do, I just want to bring that out because it is a serious situation and I think it needs to be looked at.

CHAIRMAN BLACKWELL: We will take one more question or comment from Ned Andersen who had his hand up earlier, and we will move on to the next topic.

MR. ANDERSEN: I would like to touch on one subject, trusteeship. I think two or three of our speakers have touched on that, but they didn't go into detail.

If you talk about trusteeship, essentially what it means is that our interests and welfare have to be looked out for by the federal government.

I would like to state, actually there are two concerns of mine under this particular topic. Number one is that it seems like our trustee really does not have a sufficient amount of money so that it can do the job for us. There are many of these tribes throughout the United States who are now in court fighting for their water rights, for example, and this could also touch on other resources, but yet there is not enough money to collect data with which we can do the battle, we can fight the battle, and I believe that there should be enough money in this particular area so that our trustee can help us with these cases as well as developing natural resources and so forth.

CHAIRMAN BLACKWELL: What are we talking about in terms of money? Could you estimate?

MR. ANDERSEN: I think whatever it takes to really do the job right; there is hardly any money, and I know for a fact there are, almost all the tribes in Arizona are in court in various sectors of that area, and yet we are not really equippped to fight this kind of battle because we don't have the proper information that we need. I think I am speaking for just about all the tribes in Arizona as well as throughout the country.

Number two has to do with our Bureau of Indian

Affairs. As you know, there have been proposed cuts in the

Bureau of Indian Affairs. Well, the impact that we have now

at the local level, and I am talking about the tribal level

as well as the agency level, is that the cuts are going to be

made at these areas, at the tribal and agency levels.

There are actually no cuts either at the area offices or at the Washington offices where there are many unproductive staff people. I think before any cuts are made in the Bureau of Indian Affairs some of the personnel should be cut at these higher levels, at the Washington and area office levels, because we like to have the service or expertise at the local level, at the agency and tribal level.

We are going to be hurt in these areas if these are fulfilled.

CHAIRMAN BLACKWELL: Ken, do you want to respond on that?

MR. SMITH: All of it?

CHAIRMAN BLACKWELL: It seems to me the trusteeship and BIA.

MR. SMITH: On the water policy, Ithink we have got about five and a half million programmed, at least tentatively, if I am reading my notes right because I have only been here three months and I haven't really got down to some of the details, but according to my notes here, there is five and a

half million or so requested in Fiscal Year '82. We won't know that until some time down in the near future what we actually have, and that is sixteen studies, and we have got about 274 required studies, so sixteen, we will only be able to do about 166 of those, as I understand, and I have been asking our people.

We have got to make sure that our money stretches, that the money in the federal budget and so forth—I understand we have been planning 100 percent of these studies. I think we have got to allow for the tribes that feel the authority, the tribes that do have some resources available, that I think they are going to have to participate in this program, that the tribe that does not have any resources, our funds I think justify running at 100 percent. The tribe that has some resources, let's participate as partners and get the study done, whether it is 40/60, 50/50 or whatever. At least you would be able to make our five and a half million go further than just funding 100 percent of that, but that is the only way right now I know how to get around that, to do more of that work.

The other argument that Ned handed out about too many people in area offices, the central office and so forth, I haven't had a chance to really get a handle on that. I did get an approximate handle on our overhead when we were going over the '83 budget. I don't know how accurate it is, but we

1 are very sophisticated. Other tribes are not. Some tribes 2 are ready to move and other tribes are not, and so we have 3 got to work with some of the tribes that are not quite ready, are ready to move on these contracts and I think we have got 5 to help them beef up their fiscal management, and it is 6 surprising that a lot of tribal tribes don't even have audits. 7 I am concerned about that. I think tribal leaders and tribal government, that you would almost require an audit of your 9 administration, at least your operation, because you should 10 be held liable, but it is surprising how many tribal govern-11 ments don't require an audit of their total operations.

That is only to protect the tribal council. I know our reservation could, have been doing it for the last 20 years, but some tribes really don't do it, and I think I would love to encourage that, and I would love to get that started because I think that will tell you a lot.

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

CHAIRMAN BLACKWELL: All right. Thank you very much, and we will move to the second topic, and let me caution the speakers now that we are running slightly behind, but we have more speakers in the first section than we have here.

The next session is on the topic of education and we will start again with a presentation from Ken Smith.

MR. SMITH: I guess I take the lead on education again. I think to speed this thing up, of course, we spend

most of our money in the Bureau of Indian Affairs for education. I think we spend a little over 26 percent which amounts to about \$261 million in our budget, and we have a multiple of programs, as you know. We fund about 209 elementary and secondary schools, 15 dormatories, and we have about 44,000 children going to those schools.

We also have a Johnson/O'Malley program which is a supplemental program for districts. We have about 29 million in that program.

Then we have continuing education, the higher education grants. We fund about 21,000 scholarships a year which cost us about \$28 million. We have some special higher education programs. Of course, we have adult education programs, and we have three post-secondary schools that are operating in Haskell and IAIA. Then we are funding about 18 community colleges in Indian country for another \$10 million, so it is quite a program, and we do have some concerns in our education area.

We are taking a very hard look at our policy. I am a firm believer in quality education, but we are asking the question are we getting quality education in some of the schools we are contracting for and some of the schools we are operating, and they can't tell me whether we are or not, so I am going to continue to dig our education people to see whether we are, and I also am a firm believer that the

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

government as a trustee has the responsibility to make sure that Indian children get a quality education, but I don't think it says that we have to fund for the expense of Indian children to get an education.

Now there are some unique situations in Indian For instance, the Navajo, they are way out there, that we have to fund those types of schools, or if there isn't a state school in a certain area I think we have to fund those, but it came to my attention that we were funding private schools where state districts were moving out, and we just automatically came in and started funding those types of schools, as long as the tribal council came to us and said we request this particular school, and of course, on a declining budget I thought I better take a good look at that and come up with a broad policy to see what direction we are going because I just couldn't imagine we taking over the responsibility of state government, county government and tribal government, and even the responsibility of parents out there, so this is a biggy.

I would love to have your input on this and what you really feel. Just the other day we got a scare when they deleted the 874 impact money which was for basic education.

That was a biggy. There is \$139 million as I understand that goes to districts where Indian children go to. Can you imagine what that would do to Indian country? I know in our

area we send our kids to a district school or state funded, state funded and county funded, and our kids, I think our enrollment is 700 or so, and the total enrollment is 2100, so we have a third of those kids in that school, and can you imagine if they didn't get the 874 impact money what the non-Indians would say? Why should I pay for those Indian kids going to school when the reservation doesn't pay anything, when the Indiana don't pay appropriate tax, the the Indians don't pay a state tax if the government pulled out?

I mean if you were a taxpayer on the other side of the fence, you would think twice and say why am I funding this? That really had us scared there for a while, but as I understand, I think that was just some politics being played up on the Hill on the budget because as I understand it some of that money came back and now we are going to be funded somewhat belatedly for in fact money, but there is some real problems I think in this whole area, and I am not sure what the answers are.

It is costing us more and more dollars. I think there are some tribes that have contracted schools. They are screaming for more money, and naturally we are not going to get that much more money. I am not sure what we are going to do. I do like to point a finger at the state and say I think they have a responsibility of funding our, of making sure our Indian children get an education out in their area.

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

I would like to point a finger at counties and I guess I would like to point a finger at local government which is tribal government and say what are we going to do about it, but I think we have got some problems out there if the funds keep on dwindling, and I think we are going to run up against some of those problems, so I will just throw that out for you to digest.

CHAIRMAN BLACKWELL: Thank you, Ken. Our next speaker is Acting Director, Indian Education Programs, Office of Elementary and Secondary Education at the Department of Education, Louis McGuinness.

MR. McGUINNESS: I am going to be very brief because we are running behind schedule, and leave more time for questions, especially since this group I think knows at least as much about the Indian education program as I do because you have helped write it, lobby for it, get it reauthorized and so forth.

The Indian Education Programs Office in the Department of Education is responsible, as you know, for administering the Indian Education Act which is Title 4 of Public Law 92-318 as amended.

The purpose of the Act very briefly is to meet the special educational and culturally-related academic needs of Indian students. This purpose is addressed by providing financial assistance through grants to public school districts, Indian tribes, Indian organizations and institutions, and state educational agencies and institutions of higher education, and grants are authorized under three sections of the Act-Part A, Part B and Part C. Part A is the largest one and

deals with schools.

The purpose of Part A is to address the special educational and culturally-related academic needs of Indian students in public elementary and secondary schools, tribal schools, and Indian controlled schools.

Part A has four objectives—to increase the cultural relevance of local educational agencies; two, to involve parents in the education of their children. We think we have been extremely successful here, by the way, because all of our public school programs, which is the vast majority of the Act, the most expensive part of it, we require Indian parent committees to literally have veto authority over the Indian program, and this is a bit of a sticky point for many different superintendants and Boards of Education throughout the nation.

and fourth is to reduce dropouts and to improve attendance.

The amount of money involved here, the programs authorized are entitlement program grants to public school district and to tribal schools, and they are also competitive. That means discretionary grants to Indian controlled schools.

Total funding for the Part A programs in 1981 is 58,250,000. I'm sorry--58,520,000. Of that amount, approximately 53,520,000 are entitlement grants and were awarded two months ago, for a total of 1,052 grants, including a thousand sixteen public school districts and 36 tribal schools in 41 states. I have all this in a press release which was issued last week by Secretary Bell which you can get from me if you are interested later.

These schools will serve approximately 290,000

Indian students. In addition, 4,730,000 will be awarded or have been awarded, is in the process I should say of being awarded in discretionary grants to 33 different Indian controlled schools, and to cut down the number of facts and figures I give, I am delighted to say that for 1982 we are in the President's budget for practically the exact same amount of money. It is about 1.2 million less in Part A, and the difference, the 1.2 million, comes out of the public school area.

The Indian controlled schools discretionary funds of 4.730,000 is the exact same as the current year.

Under Part B, the purpose of Part B is to improve educational opportunities for Indian students through competitive grants and contracts. At the pre-school, elementary and secondary school levels, grants are awarded to Indian tribes and to Indian organizations for planning,

1

2

4 5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

pilot demonstration programs, and for educational service programs.

At the higher education level, however, grants are awarded to colleges and universities and to Indian tribes and organizations for Indian educational personnel development programs.

In addition, fellowships are awarded to Indian students pursuing degrees in six different fields, in medicine, law, engineering, education, business administration, and natural resources. The last one, natural resources, was recently added as a result of a request from Indian tribes and especially Indian reservations in order to provide trained personnel for resource development on Indian reservations and Indian lands.

Part B funds also support resource and evaluation centers. We did have five. Now we have four and we will soon have five again. The centers provide technical assistance, evaluation and dissemination services for all Title 4 grantees, and all Title 4 potential grantees.

At the present time, centers are in Seattle to take care of the upper northwest; in Tempe, Arizona for the American southwest; in Norman, Oklahoma for the southwest; and in Washington, D. C. for the entire part of the United States east of the Mississippi. A fifth one is missing and that is in the upper midwest area. It was in Montana and had

year under Part B.

The President's budget for 1982 is literally the

While a small program, we think it is extremely

be provided for five resource and evaluation centers this

We put a great deal of stress on it. Funding will

to be cancelled and it will be soon re-established somewhere in that huge group of states in the upper midwest and upper Rocky Mountain area.

We put great strength and great push behind these technical resource and evaluation assistance centers because they have very competent staffs. They are done by contract. Almost all of the staff members are Indian professionals. They go right out on site. They do a marvelous job and their services are free to the Indian community.

The total amount of funds available for Part B programs in Fiscal Year 1981 is 14.5 million, and from this amount we estimate that 76 grants will be awarded and that 190 fellowships will be awarded. We feel the fellowship program is small compared to Ken Smith's in the Bureau of Indian Affairs. Ours is only 1.5 million new dollars per year, but it is a fellowship program. It is not a scholarship program, and we are very proud to say that a great many of the present Indian leaders have been trained at both the Ph.D. level and doctorate level and at the masters level as well as the baccalaureate level.

same for the 1981 one. It is up a little more than \$1 million to allow for certain kinds of funding within the centers. It comes out to something very complicated. It is difficult to explain, but in order to fund the centers next year at the same rate of funding, spending they enjoyed in 1981, it took an additional million dollars which the Administration is providing.

Under Part C, the purpose of Part C is to improve educational opportunities for basic and high school equivalency education for Indian adults.

The major objectives of Part C are one, to reduce the rate of illiteracy; two, increase basic skills; three, increase the number of Indian adults earning high school equivalency diplomas, and this is our big push; and four is to develop culturally-relevant adult education programs and curricula.

Under Part C competitive grants are awarded to

Indian tribes and organizations for educational service

projects and for planning, pilot and demonstration projects.

Now the biggest part are the service programs. For Fiscal Year 1981 the total amount of funds available under Part C is 5,430,000. From this amount we have estimated that about 50 grants will be given. Again, the President's budget for next year, for 1982, is the exact same amount of money for Part C. We estimate that almost \$4 million of this amount

will be used to support educational service projects. About one and a half million dollars will support planning, pilot and demonstration projects.

administration, and under program administration, in addition to planning all the support personnel, to back this up and administer it, we also pay for the National or provide funds for the National Advisory Council on Indian Education. This is a very unique program. It is a Presidentially appointed national advisory council. It is unique I understand in the entire Indian area, in the Indian community, and as I said, it is Presidentially appointed. It is Presidentially appointed, incidentally, from tribally nominated names.

At the present time, nominations are open and the Department of Education is accepting nominations from the tribes and Indian organizations throughout the United States for I think it is, I'm sure it is five vacancies on the National Advisory Council, and these names are then, they are not put into a hat. They are very carefully evaluated and submitted by Secretary Bell or will be probably late this summer to the President for five vacancies on the National Advisory Council on Indian Education.

To very quickly recapitulate, we have an \$81 million program. We are in the President's budget for \$81 million next year. I am told that we are unique in the

1 Department of Education and that we are the only program that 2 has not suffered a budget cut for 1982, and under Part A we 3 provide funds for approximately 290,000 Indian children in 4 local public schools and in addition to this, there are 5 12,000 approximately Indian children in tribal schools and 6 Indian controlled schools as well. That is a figure that 7 also counts in Part B, tribal and Indian organizations service 8 projects, and then under Part C, there are about 11,000 Indian adults undergoing various forms of adult basic 10 education.

Thank you very much. It is certainly a pleasure to be here and my colleague Mr. Ed Simermeyer and I will be more than happy to answer questions.

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

CHAIRMAN BLACKWELL: Our third speaker on this topic is Bob Carleson who is Special Assistant to the President for Policy Development.

Bob is also in charge of the Federalism Project for the President which is the block grant program, and I know because of my conversations with many of you previously, you have a lot of interest in the block grant program, and I'm sure that his presentation will be followed by some questions and answers for Bob on this.

I am very pleased to present Bob Carleson.

MR. CARLESON: Thank you very much. I know that the block grant program is probably, has probably been the

subject of not only a lot of discussion here, but in many meetings and many different groups.

What this is, of course, is part of the President's concept of wanting to return authority to the state and local level from Washington; in other words, to try to get the federal government out of directing how people conduct their state governments and their local governments, and when we talk about permitting state and local governments to operate without federal interference, we really are also talking about tribal groups which are in effect local governments; in other words, the point being that for too long, whether we are talking about a small city somewhere or whether we are talking about a state or whether we are talking about the groups that many of you come from, we feel that the best decisions are those made by the people at the local level, the people where the problem is.

At the same time, the President has indicated that he wants to turn revenue sources and revenues over to states and local governments and to your group so that there will be adequate funds to carry out what would be the federal responsibility or the federal role.

Eventually he would like to be able to turn over more authority. There is a natural resistance in Washington to giving up control, giving up authority. There is a resistance not only in the Congress, of course, but in the

departments and the agencies, but he feels very strongly that the best decisions are made by local people. He is, of course, as you know, and I won't try to get into John McClaughry's presentation which comes later on the President's commitment—I would say one personal note. I have been with the President from the time he was governor where I served in two positions in his administration in California, and there is one thing that he impressed upon those of us who were in his administration, and that was his interest in Indian interests in California, and I think that his record to the extent that he was able to have an impact and have an influence showed his particular interest in that area, and I know that that interest is continuing, but I will let John get into the details.

When we designed the block grants, and we take programs—of course, the purpose of the block grant, and I am going beyond education. They had to put me somewhere in here because we have block grants in education and health, and health services and preventive health and social services and energy emergency assistance and so forth.

Remember, the goal, of course, is to try to keep the federal government, people here in Washington, from deciding how you people run your affairs or how the people who live in cities run their affairs and at the state level. It is a very difficult thing because we have to move this authority

out of Washington to the state and local level.

We are also aware very frankly of the record that some of the states at least have had in previous years relating to some groups that are within their states, particularly in some states where many of the people were not enfranchised for many years. Of course, the Voting Rights Act, the Civil Rights Act, the reapportionment of state legislatures has changed most of that, but we are also aware, and I will be frank with you, want to become even more aware to the extent that the tribes and other Indian groups are assured of receiving the kind of attention that is necessary.

One of the things that we would do, of course, is do everything we can to urge the states and localities that get block grants to recognize the necessity of providing some of these funds, even funds that are not now going to Indian tribes, to meet the health and education and social services as well as energy and emergency assistance needs there.

The education block grant we have provided, for instance, that the Secretary may reserve up to 1 percent of the total funds for payments to insular areas and to the Secretary of the Interior for programs for eligible Indian children in Department of Interior funded schools.

In another example, in the energy and emergency assistance block grant, we have provided that the Secretary

may direct payments to Indian tribal organizations if the state has not provided or is not likely to provide funds in the requisite amount, applying to tribal organizations which have been receiving lower-income energy assistance funds, and I can tell you now that to the extent that block grant legislation moves through the Hill, it gets changed many times, and a lot of things that we may want to have in it we find we lose. Other things we may find that we would like to add to it as it moves along and we do want to protect you folks, but at the same time we want to, we not only want to give you more authority just as we do all cities and counties and states, we also have to be sure that the very special obligation that the federal government has to the tribes is protected.

We have to say this. We have mayors come to us, big city mayors and small city mayors that worry whether or not the states are going to pay attention to them, and they are afraid of some of these block grants, particularly the ones where the funds pass through the states.

I know some of you must be concerned to the extent that the states are given discretion or even some of the counties are given discretion whther or not adequate provision is going to be made for you in these programs, and we tell the mayors and we tell the people in the counties and we tell you folks that we want to build in adequate safeguards, but

4 5

0.5

we don't want to build in so much control into the system that you lose the ability to run your own programs, so those are examples of some of the block grants.

I would say one other thing. To the extent we can make the block grant legislation better or to the extent that in the administration of the block grants we can make them better from the standpoint of protecting your valid interests, we certainly want to do it, but at the same time we want to do as much as we can to remove the control over the programs out of Washington and in effect to your level of government.

CHAIRMAN BLACKWELL: Thank you very much, Bob. Now let's take some questions and answers or comments with respect to education or block grants in general. Who wants to start off?

MR. LAWRENCE: The question I have on the block grants, are we going to have to stick to the regulations as the programs are now? What I understand is that block grants coming locally can be utilized in whatever area you want to utilize them, but are the regulations going to have to be adhered to?

MR. CARLESON: First of all, what our block grant is, and I probably should have taken more time, they can only be used for the kinds of programs that they are being used for now.

For instance, the preventive health block grant,

that is a group of narrow categorical preventive type health types, each one with all of the rules and regulations and federal red tape, and it uses up a lot of money before it gets to the people who need it. We say take the grants and put them in one grant and list the names of the programs and we tell the state or local government that you can't use the money for anything but preventive health. You can't use it for anything that isn't in that list, but if you find that you need to have one kind of preventive health service more than you need another, you will have the ability to move the money around within the block grant.

You get over into the social services and it is the same thing. They put a group of social services programs together. We list them and tell you that you have to use the money for social services, but you have discretion as to what kind of social services you are going to provide, and the same is true with the other kinds of programs, so some people have said if you give block grants for health or education, the people are going to use it for highways. Well, they can't do that, or they are going use it for something else. They can only use it for the kind of services that have been displaced.

Now as far as regulations are concerned, we are trying to get rid of the federal regulations. In other words, we want to make it as simple as possible, to tell you,

you get this money, you can spend it for any of these kinds of services. You have to have an open planning process. You have to permit citizen input and I might add in all of our block grants we have strong civil rights provisions, and you have to adhere to those kind of things, and you have to make a report as to how the funds were spent, but as far as telling you exatly how to spend the money, that is what we are trying to get the federal government out of doing.

MR. LAWRENCE: Okay. I understand that. We have got another situation where I contract for a program and that program does not allow me to pick up the total indirect costs. That indirect cost has to come out of my budget, and Indian Health and all the others, you run into this, all the other contractors than the Bureau.

We have fortunately been able to put a contract support citation, but we are running into this problem with all other agencies, and we are having to put money in to operate federal programs, and I think that should be addressed in your block grants.

MR. CARLESON: I hope so. Now it is very difficult sometimes to try to comment on all of them because there are so darn many programs involved, and it may be that the program you are talking about may not be in one of the block grants. I think there are five, at least five hundred federal programs that go to state and local governments, and there are probably

many more if you take subprograms, and there are about 83 programs that are combined in this first set of block grants, so I am not sure, but the programs that are in the block grants we want to get rid of that kind of red tape as long as the funds are spent for those kind of services; in other words, so that the funds aren't spent, as I said, on highways, or roads instead of health services.

MR. LAWRENCE: I think ironically, we are trying to protect our programs from not going to block grants for the states because they are a set-aside and as they are being set aside, they are becoming categorical kinds of programs and we will have to deal with indirect costs.

MR. CARLESON: See, I would personally favor a setaside or a guarantee that X amount of the funds in a block grant based on some kind of proportional basis would be set aside for Indian tribal governments.

Having said that, I would also strongly say that it should be pretty much up to the Indian tribal government to decide how it used those funds, just like a city, in other words, or just like a state, as long as they, like a city or state, could only use the money on the kind of programs that were included in the block grant, so what that does is, if you are in one of those block grants, and if it is subject to either a set-aside or a passthrough, it could be used.

Now all the block grants don't have, only a couple,

1 few of them right now at the present time have a set-aside 2 such as the one in education and the one in energy and 3 emergency assistance, and one of the problems is that because 4 a lot of these programs only have a very small part of the 5 block grant, that involves services that have gone directly 6 to tribes, but to the extent that we can, and this is where 7 I am asking really more than telling, this is where I am 8 asking for any advice we can get from you people as well as 9 others as to what block grants contain, which programs that 10 give you the most concern about not receiving adequate 11 protections based on the present system, and we can't, we are 12 not trying through the block grant process, we are not trying 13 to change the allocation, but if we are talking about pro-14 tecting your allocation, this is what we want to know about, 15 and if we haven't been able to do that adequately in these 16 initial designs which had to be designed very quickly for the 17 budget process, I know that we are interested enough in it 18 that we want to give the -- see, we want to give the states a 19 chance to do the right thing, too, because one of the speakers 20 said that everybody lives in a state and they are a citizen of 21 a state as well as of the country, and the states should be 22 just as concerned about Indians as the federal government is, so we want to give them a chance to do the right thing. 24

At the same time, we want to protect you and we want to protect the cities that are worried about the states

25

not giving adequate funds to the city. We want to protect
them so we are caught between a tough decision as to how to
tell them look, you have the authority and the responsibility
now, let's see you do it right, and at the same time make
sure that they do it right, but if you folks can come up with
some ideas where we can improve some of these block grants
either by amending the ones that are in the process or amending them later if they are not such, or in the regulations
that are issued, we will be happy to hear it.

CHAIRMAN BLACKWELL: How do they go about communicating that? Do they write to you directly or how should they best communicate their views on this matter?

MR. CARLESON: Well, I think, yes, I would say that probably the best way, and it is a lot better if there can be some agreement or something because we are getting a lot of material, so look at it as constructively as you can and remember that we are talking about protecting the resources that you have been getting, and write to me and my name is on this program, but it is Robert Carleson, Special Assistant to the President for Policy Development, and just address it to the White House and it will get to me.

As I said before, we want the states to do the right thing, and I know I have the same concerns that some of you have. Governor Reagan was doing the right thing, but we don't know how it would be in all the states.

2

3

4

5 6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. MACDONALD: Is it possible to block grant, say take the education monies in the Indian tribal government and let them control and administer the education program as they perceive it as in their best interests?

MR. CARLESON: Well, I am just talking for myself now, just so you understand, because I don't make all the policy decisions. We just advise, but I would say that to the extent we can identify, first of all, to the extent we can identify the tribal government as equivalent to a local government which I think is what most of us believe, we believe that for cities, we should believe that, we do believe that for tribal government; in other words, that if funds are going to go to a city and we want the city to have maximum freedom in how they use their money, then I would think that funds that go to a tribal government should be in the same position, but of course, we do have the strings that, for instance, if they are for health, they have to be used for health and if they are for education, they have to be used for education, and we have got a long way to go.

We are only five months in. This first economic package was put in to meet an economic emergency that was hurting every one of us, but we are going to be continuing on with this whole concept and moving this authority and responsibility out of Washington to your level and to the cities and counties and the states, so when you give me your

ideas, don't just comment on the block grants that may be up there now, although that is important because they are up there now, but give us some ideas for other programs and other things where this kind of a concept in principle can be applied.

MR. TENORIO: I am Frank Tenorio from Pueblo County. We are all for the idea of moving authority out of Washington, but I have to renege on giving authority to the states.

In our experience in the State of New Mexico where it revolves around the education or what have you, we haven't gotten a fair shake. Our involvement in the public schools and Johnson/O'Malley programs to begin with, it just isn't fair and equitable.

The states feel that they should control it completely, and being that we are citizens from that state, that
we don't have that special tie that we have to the federal
government.

MR. CARLESON: You know, somebody mentioned earlier impact aid, and impact aid, you have a similar situation as the people that are on military bases and who live on military bases around the country, and of course, the military base doesn't pay any local taxes and the kids that live on the base go to the local schools, and so the impact aid program is federal money, but in effect pays these bills because before impact aid, the schools, local schools, weren't taking care

of the people who lived on the military reservations, and so it is a similar concept, and I know what you mean, but again if we can try to design our programs to protect your interests but also to give you maximum discretion in how you use the funds, I mean you are just like a city.

I used to be a city manager myself of two small cities in southern California, and you get all of these funds coming in with careful earmarks and constrictions and requirements set on every one. Sometimes you get too much money over here, more than you need for such and such, and you get not enough money over here and you can't meet the best needs.

That is what we want to do with city government, county government and state government, and also with the tribal governments.

MR. ANGAPAK: One of our concerns we face, I think he mentioned it, he said if a certain amount of block grant is given to the State of Alaska or any other state for that matter, what guarantee do we have that we will get a fair piece of the action?

MR. CARLESON: That's right. That's the question.

MR. ANGAPAK: How do we do it?

MR. CARLESON: I understand that, and I am saying that an example of two ways were the ones that I mentioned in the education block grants and the energy block grants where in fact the way that I sort of liked best is the one in

education or in the energy and emergency assistance where
the Secretary, that means the Secretary of Health and Human
Services, may actually—first of all, the money goes to
the states, but if the states do not provide or are not likely
to provide funds to the tribes, then the Secretary can direct
that money there himself, so like in the energy and emergency
assistance block grant, the state gets a chance, but if it
doesn't do it, the Secretary has the authority to do it himself.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Now one of the things that we must remember, we want the state not only to put some of the federal block grant money in there, we want them to put their own money in there, too, and we want the states to start feeling that their cities and their counties and the tribal, local governments, which is the same thing, receive adequate state support as well as adequate federal. It is not in place of federal, I mean in addition, so if we simply cut the states out of the picture all together and just say well, we will fund directly to those, and the state says well, they are not our responsibility and we are not going to provide for it--we want the states also to recognize that they have a responsibility for all the citizens who live within their state, whether they live in cities, counties or rural areas, or whether they live on reservations.

MR. TENORIO: When you have that particular interplay between the federal, I mean federal government and the

state, they want concessions from the tribes to that extent that they fall under the jurisdiction of the state, and we can't accept it.

The prime example is the Indian water rights. The federal government says give action to the state, but that is exactly what they state wants. They want to control our waters and they want to run roughshod over us, and we are not going to have it.

MR. CARLESON: I understand that. Just so you understand, I am over in the program area which is like health and resources.

MR. TENORIO: Everything that we do there, there is a danger of conceding or giving those things that are ours. We contend that we were here first and we have the use of our land and waters, but it is getting to the point where all that has been minimized, and the more we work with the state and what have you, they keep chop, chop, chopping along. I am not going to have that.

MR. CARLESON: What we want to do is we want to ensure that your rights are protected. At the same time, we want to get the federal control out. By control I mean telling you how to run things, and the question is how do we do it?

As I said before, any thoughts or ideas that you have not only for the ones that are up on the Hill now but

other ones--we have already used some ideas. I have gotten a letter or two which we used in, some of the material in designing some of these block grants, so we have already used some, and any more than you can come up with that will help us do that--but on the other hand we want the states, we want the states to get interested in all the people who are in their states.

In other words, it works both ways. We don't want them to control you people. What we want them to do is to treat everyone in the state the same. They haven't been doing that in some states.

MR. MACDONALD: There is a big difference, Bob, that first yes, we are like the cities. We are like a state where we have a constituency and also a land base where we make our laws and have our own courts and what have you, but one difference—the state and the cities are together, or separately have a special relationship to the federal government unlike ours. Our relationship with the federal government comes by treaty. They are trying to force the state to do their job in terms of tending to the needs of the tribes where they have specific private land and private property that belongs to them, and the way they got there is by their special treaty relationship with the government. That comes into play every time.

That is what Frank Tenorio is talking about where

they say okay, the state says we are going to give you some money, you have got to give, you have to relinguish some rights that you have.

MR. CARLESON: I see.

MR. MACDONALD: And then the tribe says no, we don't want to relinguish any rights and they say okay, we are not going to give you anything, and this has been going on for a hundred years now, and so the biggest problem is that the tribes, all of us feel that our very existence, the way we are, is brought about by our treaty relationship with the government and we didn't come about by the state. The state did not, we didn't sign a treaty with the state.

As a matter of fact, in many cases the state came after us, so that is really the crux of the Indian/state relationship for these many years, and in some cases there have been some tradeoffs made between states and Indians, and as a result there is some cooperation.

MR. CARLESON: I guess I understand. I completely agree, but you are also voters in those states, too.

MR. MACDONALD: Even that has become in question lately. They say okay, if you are not going to let us steal some more of your water and your resources, we don't want you to vote anymore, and we say okay, maybe we don't want to vote anymore.

MR. CARLESON: They can't do that. They can't take

your vote away, and the thing is that -- I understand the difference, and it is what really complicates this, but you are also voters. You have the same rights in that state as anyone else does, and so I guess it is double-barreled. You don't have to give up something I don't think to get state assistance because you are a voter, and on the other hand, we want the federal funds that go to you to be used with as much discretion as we can write into it; in other words, that we have to limit it. Congress wouldn't ever let us send money. Well, generally I think you are in the revenue sharing and that was good in that sense that that has very few earmarks on it. As we go with these, all the block grans are is a form of revenue sharing. It is like special revenue sharing. It is money that you get, but you can only use it for health services or only for education, so we are trying to keep the block grants as pure as possible, but the block grants are like special revenue sharing. We can only use it for a certain kind of function.

1

3

4

5

6

7

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. ANDERSEN: From what you are saying it seems like you haven't established here whether we are considered a state or a local government.

My question is what justification do they need here?

He was talking about the treaty relationship. Not all tribes

are that way, but nevertheless these tribes, if you recall

the one case, the Supreme Court case, Warner versus Georgia,