

Mr. ASPINALL. The usual slice is about 10 percent, is that correct?

Mr. GROH. Mr. Chairman, I honestly don't have any experience with either side. I have had no cases with them. I have heard all kinds of stories as to whether he is generous or not generous; I don't know.

Mr. ASPINALL. Are you being paid at the present time for your services?

Mr. GROH. No, sir.

Mr. ASPINALL. Are you being paid for your expenses to make this trip?

Mr. GROH. Yes, sir.

Mr. ASPINALL. By the Indian Association?

Mr. GROH. By the Alaskan Federation of Natives; yes, sir.

Mr. ASPINALL. By a nonprofit group; is that correct?

Mr. GROH. Yes, sir.

Mr. ASPINALL. Subsisting solely by private donations?

Mr. GROH. Yes, sir.

Mr. POLLOCK. Mr. Chairman, I wonder if it might, for the record, be useful to have one of the counsel, Mr. Jackson or Mr. Groh, very briefly explain what they understand to be Indian title. Mr. Notti said the natives believe they have Indian title to all of Alaska.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Chairman, Mr. Groh may wish to supplement this, but Indian title, as I see it, is the right of occupancy and the right in theory to prevent others from using the land that you use and occupy and have from time immemorial. Unfortunately, the Indians cannot sue and remedy is generally denied them and it is up to the Secretary to protect their right of occupancy, their Indian title.

Mr. ASPINALL. If my colleague would yield there, I think we have to go a little bit further than that. The Secretary doesn't have jurisdiction over this land. This land is under the jurisdiction of the Congress of the United States. The Secretary has some administrative authority. The Secretary can't make these determinations and when you found your title claim upon occupancy and possession then, you see, you are in a little difficult position because you can't defend that position unless you come to Congress and ask for an equitable determination. Isn't that true?

Mr. JACKSON. As far as getting some relief is concerned, I would say "Yes."

Mr. ASPINALL. As far as holding the land is concerned, you can't do it. You can't move from one place to another. It is true the associations can establish themselves in particular areas—and they have already done that—and perhaps they can move in at the present time and pick up a new site to live on for a while, as nomads would do. But as far as establishing any claim to keep the Government out or anybody else out, your occupancy doesn't go that far.

Mr. JACKSON. This may be. It was my understanding, for example, an Indian who has a trapline—and I know of a case—finds a white trapper comes in without making formal entry under the public land laws and says to the Indian, "Do not cross this place." He is a trespasser and the Indian can do nothing about it but the United States can do something about it.

Mr. ASPINALL. That is it. The land is in the ownership of the U.S. Government at the present time. I am sorry to say, but it is my understanding that the people who occupy this land do so simply as squatters