

ing. In order to do that and maintain our villages, we need land from those withdrawn areas. At the time that these areas were withdrawn, obviously the people that did it did not realize that the native people actually lived there and certainly should be entitled to a land base. I think, if they had thought of it, they would have reserved excluding a reasonable amount of land for the native people.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Are access and use being permitted on those withdrawn areas?

Mr. WRIGHT. They have surface rights. The problem is that without a land base and without investment money they cannot develop. As a result many of them are on welfare rolls and many are attempting to make a living; but there is no real way for them to do that. They need a reasonable amount of money. In Alaska the housing in some of these areas, especially in this particular area here, is tarpaper shacks, scrap lumber, with no water, no sewer. Do any of you gentlemen have any questions in regard to this map display?

Mr. HALEY. Let us continue with the testimony of the other members and then we will come back to that.

Mr. WRIGHT. Yes, sir.

Mr. HALEY. Does that complete your statement, sir?

Mr. WRIGHT. Yes. I think we can continue and, if there are questions, we will attempt to answer them.

(The statement follows:)

STATEMENT OF DONALD R. WRIGHT

My name is Donald R. Wright. I am First Vice President of the Alaska Federation of Natives. I am also President of the Cook Inlet Native Association. My purpose here today is to present testimony concerning the status of the lands in Alaska from the Native viewpoint. Another purpose is to bring to you gentlemen an overview and comparison of the lands, villages, and population in Alaska. I have here for the Committee's information various maps and overlays that will aid in furthering your understanding of the land question.

My first map illustrates the distribution of Native villages and population as they exist today. This map was prepared from information developed by the Federal Field Committee for development planning in Alaska in cooperation with the Bureau of Indian Affairs. It shows the estimated land area in and around each village based on a grant of 500 acres for each person residing in those villages today. It does not include an allocation of lands for the urban Native who at one time or another resided in these villages or those that have been extinguished for one reason or another. However, these Native people must be included.

Although the Field Committee study now shows only 178 Native villages, there were at one time more than 500 villages. Movement of Native population to centers of trade and commerce and employment and limited educational opportunities account for the decimation of the village structure.

The first overlay shows all Federal withdrawals up to July 1964. You note that the reasons for the withdrawals appear to be economic in character and they did not bring any direct benefit to the Native people. As a matter of fact, in all instances, they were made without consulting the aboriginal inhabitants. The total wealth extracted from and as a result of these withdrawals is well documented. For example, it is estimated that more than six billion dollars in fish, furs, and minerals have been extracted from Alaska since 1867. The estimated timber potential in withdrawn forest reserves in Southeastern Alaska alone will exceed 100 billion board feet. The timber potential on the river drainages will exceed 800 million board feet. The coal and oil reserves have not been fully explored but all indications are that these two minerals alone will return hundreds of billions of dollars when fully developed. Potential hydroelectric sites explored to date exceed 68 in number with a prime power potential of 13 million kilowatts.