

One of the reasons this bill is being proposed is a recognition by the Secretary of the Interior and the native people and the State of Alaska that the claims process is of an arduous, expensive, frequently unjust route; that it often results in a judgment for dollars which, by the time they are given, have been inflated and therefore it is an unjust award, and because these awards do not carry interest in the interim.

I think for these reasons everybody would like to solve this problem and get on with the development of the State of Alaska.

If you are going to go to the claims route on these cases, it seems to me, in justice, you would have to leave the door open for all of the groups in Alaska to bring suit from time to time as their land is taken in the future. This could go on for another century. This could involve a program probably as tortuous, as difficult and as extensive in scope as all of the cases before the Indian Claims Commission from the other 48 States.

We are talking about potentially many hundreds of cases which would have to be litigated in Alaska. I think it is the recognition of this difficulty which is the source of this bill. In fact, Secretary Udall came to Alaska last November and suggested that a political settlement would be the best thing for all concerned. It was for this reason that the native leaders got together and drafted a bill which they thought would adequately compensate for the values involved in the taking of the land.

As to values, I might point out that the Secretary's bill specifies \$180 million and in the covering letter transmitting the bill, it is said this is based on the Tlingit-Haida award which averaged 43 cents an acre. But that award was based on values largely obtaining about the turn of the century.

If you took the Tlingit-Haida award of \$7 million at the time of taking, and it was the values of those days that were determined in those days, and if you merely compute straight interest of 6 percent on that amount, you boost it up to \$28 million, which in rough figures comes out at \$1.75 per acre. Yet we know that most of the lands in Alaska are even more valuable today than they were 70 years ago by reason of the compounding of the entire national economy, and of the less amount of land available generally. So I would suggest that values have risen considerably over that.

We do not feel a settlement of roughly \$1.50 or slightly more per acre is an unjust amount.

That, gentlemen, concludes the remarks we wanted to make about the earlier issues.

Mr. Lekanof would like to speak.

Mr. LEKANOF. Mr. Chairman, I submit to the committee two reports, one having to do with the educational aspects of land claims, and one on the housing. I would just like to ask that these be made a part of the record.

I would also like to submit on behalf of these two written statements materials which I think will be quite important. One is "Housing the Alaska Native" by Charles Abrams and the other one is the statement of the Alaska Housing Committee and the implementation plan.¹ Also, one on a study that I personally made on the education of the native people of Alaska.

¹ These two statements will be found in the files of the committee.