

2705 S. W. English Court,  
Portland 1, Oregon,  
November 29, 1954.

Hon. Wm. C. Strand, Director,  
Office of Territories,  
U. S. Interior Department,  
Washington 25, D. C.

Dear Mr. Strand:

Tonight I took a look at the Contract.

On the first page, "with a responsible institution west of the main range of the Rocky Mountains", hits one in the eye.

Referring to paragraph (b), section 6, page 2, I might call attention to the fact that I have not been and am not being provided with private files. In fact, it has been and is being seen to that I have very little privacy and nothing private. A little story is in order here. When I came there one of the first things I found out was that I was unable to lock my desk. I inquired about a key and was told that it had been lost. I then asked if they would find a key to fit the lock or failing of that to change the lock. Mr. Lazelle, the "Supervisor", removed the lock and said that he would take it up town to see if he could find a key to fit it and that if not he would get a new lock for it. That was nearly eight years ago. I have casually mentioned it several times since then, but it was ignored and nothing has happened. And so my desk has been unlocked all this time. I have a pretty good idea that they never wanted me to be able to lock it. They certainly would have retained a duplicate key and so it would not have made much difference as far as any privacy would have been concerned. I certainly would never have left anything in it which I did not want them to see even if I could have locked it. Of course, it should have been done on general principles. It might at least have prevented everybody from digging around in it during my absence, borrowing pencils, etc. The Company has never provided me with satisfactory stenographic and clerical help. They would claim that they have, but I have never been satisfied. It was bad for a long time at the start, then from time to time it has been a little better, lately it has been very unsatisfactory again. I should be the sole judge of that matter. I remember that the original draft of the present contract stipulated that I should be provided with a stenographer of my own choosing, but Mr. <sup>oe</sup> apparently saw to it that it was changed to the way in which it is now stated in the final edition of the present contract.

Referring to section 7, page 3, I might state that there has been much and that there is much work and labor done by patients at times and under circumstances, which I never approved of and which I never could approve, but which I was and am unable to do much about without having made or making a bad situation much worse. There has been much done along those lines during my absence or otherwise unbeknown to me, which I did not find out about until later or probably will never know about, and will no doubt continue. I previously have reported many of the things that happened or went on that I objected to or did not approve of and was apparently helpless to do anything about. I think that the contract is much too liberal in that respect. As far as I know I have put a stop to work being performed for the benefit of someone other than the Company. I personally have many inhibitions as far as patient work and labor benefitting even the Company is concerned. Working patients off the grounds is not as flagrant as it used to be, but it still goes on. Some of it I may not even know about and all of it would be denied.

It is impossible to watch everything all the time. And ultimately, I am only a doctor and not a policeman. I have to try to maintain a certain amount of dignity. Perhaps a letter calling attention to that part of the contract from time to time might be a good idea.

Section 8, page 3, is so impractical that it is useless and should not even have been written into the contract. Certainly, the Company would not be inclined to try to do much along such lines. It has never been acted on and probably could not be even if one wanted to. Anyone who has not read the contract would know about it and if they did would probably not be interested. Even if someone were interested it would still be so impractical, difficult to arrange and supervise, and next to impossible, that it might as well be forgotten.

Section 9, page 4, is ambiguous. It creates a situation where the Company and the Medical Officer are supposed to check up on each other, with the odds being in favor of the Company. In this situation the Company would try to make it work in their favor, try to set themselves up as critic and censor over the Medical Officer's judgement, create confusion, work at cross purposes, shift responsibility, and the like. Until rather recently the Company was never known to have taken any initiative along such lines and even frowned on the Medical Officer doing so and even tried to create impediments. Every move the Medical Officer made along such lines was questioned and viewed with pessimism. In other words, they did not like to see anyone paroled or discharged. That meant someone going off the board bill. Recently they have from time to time proposed the release of someone where they knew that it was practically impossible for the Medical Officer to place the individual or his condition was or remained such that it was out of the question in the opinion of the Medical Officer and would have reflected on his judgement or subsequently embarrassed him, if he had gone along with the suggestion. On the other hand, they would question the feasibility for the release of any which in the opinion and judgement of the Medical Officer were ready for such action. The burden of proof and responsibility is put on the Medical Officer when it should have been put on the Company subject to the opinion and judgement of the Medical Officer instead of vice versa. You might be sure that the Medical Officer's considered judgement in the light of his experience is good in such matters and even then at best you can only take a chance when dealing with such intangibles. However, you are exposing yourself for someone to snipe at if things do not work out perfectly for you at all times. That too they have been prone to do when someone was returned after a shorter or longer period of time or it was heard that someone was not doing so well on the outside. Then according to them he or she should have been left here in the first place, I guessed wrong, or don't know my business, or used poor judgement. I would usually be inclined to question their motives or judgement as being either innocently or deliberately distorted. I have been compelled to use my own best judgement at all times and act accordingly independently regardless of what might develop subsequently. The Company would be only too happy to terminate any absence on leave on the least excuse. It places the Medical Officer into a position where he is the front, etc., for the Company when actually it should be the other way around.

Do the last seven ~~full~~ lines of section 19 on page 8 refer to the sale of pork, cattle, farm produce, OT department products, and the like?

Referring to the base rate in section 20. (a), on pages 8 and 9, and its semi-annual adjustment provisions, most people who know a lot about such matters would consider it to be way too high.

In section 21, item (2), suitable clothing, on page 10, is frequently a shoddy

or shabby makeshift affair. They hustle around and find something left by a deceased patient or something that is otherwise appropriated or that some employee might donate and dress them up somehow regardless of how it may look. Hardly ever is anything new purchased for anyone.

A close look should be taken at section 22, page 10. I believe that the Company could well afford to pay additional needed employees out of their own funds without any hardship or loss.

Section 23, page 11, should not be overlooked and particularly the last two full lines.

Section 26, page 12, might well have been omitted from the contract in the best interest of the committed Alaskan patients.

The letter dated May 26, 1953, attached to the contract warrents a close critical look. The proposed new building for aged women is there only on paper in this letter as you know. I do not know what they mean by the one new medical secretary. I have not seen her yet. Goodness knows I need one. They have done nothing along <sup>had</sup> that line for me. If anything what I have now is worse and less than I have <sup>had</sup> at some times in the past.

So much for the contract. I hope I have not been too critical or harsh.

Sincerely yours,



George F. Keller, M. D.