I have attached to the statement, which may not be pertinent, our commentary to the Federal Alaska Native Claims Act before you as H.R. 15049 as prepared by the drafter. The commentary on the State act as prepared by the drafters. The proposed State bill, the bill as actually adopted by the Alaska Legislature. A copy of the Alaska review of business and economic condition on the problem of native land claims which apparently is not to be included in the file, and certain extracts of testimony intended to illustrate certain points of my testimony as to the position of the Alaska natives.

Finally, an indication from both parties in Alaska that they support a settlement of these claims.

As a principal draftsman of the AFN proposal—that is to say, our amendment to Secretary Udall's latest proposal; also of the State bill and of the commentary which has been prepared, I am prepared to answer questions on these documents or review with you the proposals in detail, or with your staff. I have discussed the test case but I think the key point on the test case is simply regardless of the outcome of the test case Congress will still be faced with the necessity of passing some kind of legislation. Traditionally, this has been a jurisdictional act. We believe a jurisdictional act, whether it is for a single case on behalf of all Alaskans as the Californian Indians did, or whether it is by each of the separate villages, in either case extended litigation is not in the interest of the natives or of the State of Alaska and we prefer a legislative-type settlement which is what Governor Hickel's task force has proposed. Others have discussed money and the amount of land and I wish to discuss the fourth part of the task force proposal where the discussion begins on page 8. The fourth part is the scheme for administering the lands and the moneys. This is as important as the land and money itself. Is the land and money to be squandered in per capita payments or eaten up in bureaucratic administrative costs? We propose to avoid both extremes. The natives in Alaska are very vehemently antireservation. They would like to participate as fully as possible in the life of the State and in Alaskan society.

We have separated the native village as a municipal corporation from the native village as an incorporated tribal enterprise. And the lands and the money will be going to the incorporated tribal entity which will be gradually transformed into an ordinary business corporation with shares that are fairly alienable. This is a gradual process. It is controlled by the Alaska native commission. We have eliminated per capita grants as such. We have said, however, that the native corporation may grant to the individual members townsite lots, fishcamp sites, and so on, but not more than 10 percent of the land may be distributed in this manner and not more than 160 acres to any one person or family.

We have also said that they may make what we call family-plan distribution, but not more than 20 percent of the capital of the corporation may be so distributed in family-plan-type distributions.

Now this, of course, is a type of per capita distribution. We recognize that, but the experience with Tyonek has been that this can be a very helpful method of improving the status of the members of the tribe. Generally, however, the State law requires that the capital of the corporation be kept intact to be invested in business enterprises, and that in the long run, over the long term, the members of the cor-