

SCOMM

#7:7

PLEASE NOTE: THE FOLLOWING PAGES WERE TREATED
AS A UNIT IN THE ORIGINAL DOCUMENT.

PUBLIC HEARING TESTIMONY

BY THE ALASKA STATE LEGISLATURE
INTERIM COMMITTEE ON SUBSISTENCE

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:

Representative Nels A. Anderson, Jr., Chairman
Representative Leo Schaeffer

STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT:

Dorothy M. Larson, Staff Assistant

PUBLIC HEARING LOCATION:

JUNEAU, ALASKA
ANB HALL

DATE: Friday, December 9, 1977
TIME: 7:00 P.M.

THOSE REGISTERED IN ATTENDANCE AT PUBLIC HEARING

<u>Name</u>	<u>Address</u>	<u>Organization</u>
Mr. & Mrs. George See Robert Willard	RR6-6074, Juneau 155 David # 222	Sealaska Corp. Tlingitt Haida Central Council
John P. Norton Vic White Cliff Lobaugh J.E. Leisu	Box 582, Haines P.O. Box 449 Bcx 2633, Juneau 99802 Switzer Village	SEACAP Sierra Club Southeast Alaska Empire
Harold Howard Peter Williams	Box 156, Douglas 99824 382 Village Street	ANB

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PAGE

1. Testimony of....Robert Willard.....	2
2. Testimony of....Amy See.....	9
3. Testimony of....John Norton.....	9
4. Testimony of....Cliff Lobaugh.....	10



JUNEAU ALASKA

Alaska State Legislature

House

INTERIM COMMITTEE ON SUBSISTENCE
NELS A. ANDERSON, JR., CHAIRMAN
P.O. Box 234 • 842-5970
Dillingham, Alaska 99576

DECEMBER 9, 1977 - JUNEAU PUBLIC HEARING

Representative Nels Anderson: We'll call the meeting on subsistence to order. For those of you who do not know me, my name is Nels Anderson I'm Chairman of the Interim Committee on Subsistence and to my left is Representative Leo Scheffer from Kobuk and our Staff Assistant, Dorothy Larson, is from Dillingham. As most of you probably know already the Interim Committee on Subsistence was created just before this last Session ended. The reason for our existence is, to collect as many of these as we possibly can on the subject of subsistence to determine what the State of Alaska should do defining or describing subsistence activities and making a recommendation to the Legislature on what the State of Alaska should do about protecting the subsistence activities with the State of Alaska. We also felt the State of Alaska is going through some major land transfer changes and as the land begins to change hands a goodly portion of it moves into State control and the Federal control, that there are going to be some conflicts in how Alaska's resources are going to be managed. As that process is continuing however, there are some very definite State needs that must be recognized and one of those, at least my belief is the issue of subsistence.

We have been holding hearings throughout the State of Alaska, we're just about to conclude our meetings with this meeting and one final meeting in Barrow which will be held on Monday. That will conclude our hearings at that time and we will prepare a report to the Legislature, which will be submitted to the Legislative Council on January 7, 1978. And not only that there are several pieces of legislation that will hopefully will be acted on in the 1978 Legislature. If there are no further comments from myself and Mr. Schaffer wishes to comment, and if there are witnesses that may like to tell the Committee what they think is

important about the issues of subsistence.

Robert Willard: Mr. Chairman, my name is Robert Willard and I'm from Angoon. I've read the accounts and activities of the Committee regarding subsistence and sports fishing. My immediate reaction which I think is in the best interest of the residents of Angoon, which depend on fishing and hunting, not for sports or trophy, is that until such time as the Federal Government completes the intent of the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act conveyances of land, complete the transfer of lands that the State, that the Legislature should become heavily involved in the interpretation of what constitutes subsistence use and hunting. Its inconceivable to me that there would be any deviation of the aboriginal rights of the Alaska Natives to go hunting and fishing as against taking for sports or other purposes. But taking of fish and game by Alaska Natives in the rural areas was because it was necessary for diet (inaudible). And yet, the Alaska Department of Fish and Game would allow a sports fisherman, as an example, as against commercial fisherman as they did in Cook Inlet. I think you will recall in 1971 or 1972 when the Department regulated commercial fishermen along Cook Inlet who were mostly Alaska Natives.

It appears to me that the problem that we're running into is that Alaska Natives use of our own resources are being over-regulated. Are being regulated out of the use and take of what has been traditional to us. Now see subsistence is something that we have always used not because its traditional but because its nutritional to our people. The problem that I run into now is that the State now conceives to try to regulate or legislate the resources that's available to our people that use it that we're going to run into some serious problems after the lands have been conveyed to the State and also to the Regional Corporation's established through the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act and also the Village Corporations. I don't think that the use of our resources have been abused by the villages. There are various accounts that the abuse of our resources that are available by non-natives, trophy hunters. Well its a known fact that Alaska Native people use everything that get (inaudible). Thank you.

Representative Nels Anderson: Basically, what you've told us dovetails

with comments that were made in other parts of the State. There is a great deal of concern in the State of Alaska. (inaudible) not able at this time to really (inaudible) any further kind of regulatory authority because first of all I really don't think they understand. At least the Department of Fish & Game, in my opinion does not understand the full utilization of our resources and the way the resources are being used. I do appreciate the comments and know you have given them alot of thought.

The other thing is that the Alaskan Native people are going through, and I think that you are well aware of it by your comments is that there is a feeling throughout the non-native community in the State of Alaska but also out in the lower 48, they think that the Alaska people are a rich people, a very rich people now and they don't need to depend on the land as much as they used to in the past, which is a real false impression that has been stirring up and has largely dominated the thinking of non-native people and those people who are in authority that may have some regulatory authority over how lands and waters can be used in the State. I think that this is a false impression and I see many years before we actually see some real dramatic results from the passage of the Lands Claims Settlement Act. The point that you made, again, I think is extremely important that the Federal Government yet has not lived up with the terms with the Claims Act, the land has not been conveyed as you pointed out and the money that was supposedly to be for compensation for lands taken has not yet been realized, there still will be some yet to be conveyed to the Alaska Native people. I think that has to be emphasized over and over.

Robert Willard: Mr. Chairman, if I might just elaborate a little bit more on the commercialization. It was just, I would guess just 10 or 15 years ago that people would snicker at the Alaska Natives in Southeast particularly about the herring roe. Herring eggs. Now it's overly regulated to the point that our people can't even get a ticket, or excuse the language, goddam permit. They can't go down to the beach and pick clams, gumboots or whatever without first a permit from the Government. They did that in my estimation is only to stop us from taking them further, commercially, (inaudible) and that is what is beginning to concern me is that if we get too involved now in regulations

of subsistence before we actually define what lands we're talking about that we're going to run into serious, serious problems, because when the Natives finally get their land, are they going to succumb to the pressures of the State to regulate? Is the Federal Government going to come in and try to regulate like they did in the Fairweather Grounds? The Federal Government in the North Pacific Marine Management Council tried to come in and try to regulate our Cape Fisheries as against the Department of Fish & Game. And if you look at the record the reason that Egan VS. Kake, VS. Angoon, BS. Metlakatla case came up was because the State wanted to regulate its own resources. And I'm not saying that the State is wrong in trying to regulate its own resources. I'm saying that I appreciate the State doing it, I just don't think its time. I would rather see Alaskans sit down and work these things out then to have some Washington D.C. Official come up and tell us what do do. Thats about it.

Representative Nels Anderson: Is there anyone else that would like to testify at this time?

George See: Mr. Chairman, my name is George See, Corporate Secretary of SeaAlaska. I would like to thank you for sending an invitations to SeaAlaska to participate and to attend your meeting this evening. Due to the short period of time we received our invitation that we have had not the time to prepare a statement that we wish. Mr. Borbridge has been travelling extensively and he will not be able to make this meeting tonight.

Representative Nels Anderson: Yes, we would be looking for your written comments on the issues of subsistence. Sealaska's viewpoints is going to be very valuable and we would like to consider it. Is there anyone else that would like to testify on the issues of subsistence. Well, if there is no one else we will take a very short break and see if anyone else is going to be coming and just take a short recess at this time.

Short Recess

Representative Nels Anderson: Okay, we'll call the meeting back to order.

Needless to say, we're a little dissappointed not more people came out. Quite possible we didn't advertize enough, but for those members that have just come in since we started, the Interim Committee on Subsistence is and has been holding hearing throughout the State of Alaska to collect peoples views on the issues of subsistence. And it's a subject that is going to be looked at very carefully at the 1978 Legislature. One of the reasons, as probably most of you know is that the State of Alaska's land holdings are going to be changing or who owns what is going to be changing dramatically and as these changes occur there is going to be conflict, inevitable conflict between who's going to be managing what and just exactly what private land holders are going to tolerate as far as land and fish resources that may reside in large pockets of private landholdings. The State of Alaska in turn will be selecting another 35 million acres of land which they will in turn own. Also under various D-2 land proposals, large tracts of land are going to be selected by the Federal Government and certain activities are going to be permitted within the withdrawals that are being proposed and certain activities are going to be permitted and some are not going to be permitted. What we're trying to determine is just what impact does subsistence have or subsistence activity have on the kinds of land management proposals that may come out of these deliberations as they occur as we move into the future. And our job as we define it, is that we're going to be taking a look at, a very close look at the compatibility of present and projected subsistence needs.

We are in the process of gathering data that has been generated by various Regional Corporations, non-profit Corporations throughout the State and they have been giving us some very vital information telling us just exactly what the total dependence of the people is on fish and game resources. One of the things that we know is that the State of Alaska has not enacted any (inaudible) of subsistence laws. To date, it's been a fragmented approach there has been really no real direction provided by the people to the Legislature or the Administration. The Administration does have a policy that they have incorporated, they have done this voluntary. Simply because they have voluntarily provided an approach to how subsistence activities occur simply means that if they decided at some point in the future not to do it anymore, then they have the administrative power to cease doing what they are

doing today. They do permit to a great extent a pretty liberal view of subsistence activities. However, as we have travelled throughout many parts of the State of Alaska right now, a lot of people in Rural Alaska especially are being prohibited from taking these resources any longer. One of the original or earlier statements that was made by one of our witnesses and something that we note, is that there is backlash that's coming all the way back from Washington D.C.. That people who are in authority back there and people who are in decision-making positions in the State of Alaska have a false impression on what the impact of the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act is having on the income of Alaskan people who are living in Rural Alaska. The impact of the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act has not been that dramatic and the continued dependence on fish and game resources for food is still going to be a primary concern that people in rural Alaska are going to have to count on from both the Federal Government and the State Government. They depend on this Committee to make sure that whatever information is available to show the State Government and the Federal Government that this dependence does exist that we want this information to be on the record so that the traditional use of fish and game resources is not shunted aside as we begin to compete with these resources for commercial purposes and recreation purposes and sports purposes. As Chairman of the Committee when I asked the Legislature to consider me for the subsistence I felt very strongly that the subsistence issue had not been adequately taken care of nor does it have any real place in the State Government and the studies that we have conducted, the research that have been conducted to date bears itself. We have reports that tell us exactly what the State of Alaska, how it uses subsistence and its place is pretty far down the ladder in areas of priority and we're going to try to turn this around and that is the intent of this committee.

If there isn't anybody else at this time that would like to testify it is my intent to adjourn this meeting and as I said earlier, we plan to go up to Barrow, we'll be up there Monday and that will be our final series of meetings that we have conducted throughout the State. We'll be taking whatever information that we collect and incorporate it into a final report which we will be submitting to the Legislative Staff draft several pieces of legislation that is going to be submitted

to the Legislative Council for introduction into the next Legislature. As they deal with the issues of subsistence, however the Committee does not take on the task of defining what subsistence means, because we have been asked by people that we met throughout the State to try to define the terms of subsistence at this time would have far more devastating effects than we probably could live with.

What we have come up with though is that there is strong feeling that the subsistence activities should be described, rather than defining the term itself. By defining subsistence activities it is very strongly felt by people throughout the State of Alaska that this kind of approach would not have the tendency of excluding people from access to resources that they need. On the other hand if we were to define the situation there is a great possibility that subsistence activities as we know them, could be excluded from those people or be excluded from utilizing those resources that they have grown to depend on and have taken without interference in the past.

Although we are moving very rapidly into the modern age and several communities in the State of Alaska this great stride forward in our communities in the State of Alaska are not moving at the same pace and the State of Alaska and the Federal Government as I view the comments made in other communities that the State of Alaska will have to insist that because of so many people use fish and game resources that belong to all the people, that subsistence is going to have to be considered very carefully, very deliberately and we have to make sure that we don't exclude people as they still use those resources. If there is anyone who would like to comment on some of the things that I've said or if they have any views on the issues of subsistence we would like to hear them at this time. If not, as I said during the Legislative session we will be taking up these issues and hope we will see you then and we have developed the position on the issues of subsistence we would certainly look forward to your testimony at that time.

And I would also like to invite you to write to our staff or submit your comments to the Legislature up at the Capitol there. When I come back down to Juneau I expect to be down here on January 1, I would be very happy to review your comments and meet with anyone at anytime to discuss

your viewpoints. I think its extremely important that the entire State of Alaska get together. To me, the issues of subsistence is not particularly a native issue, I think it's an issue that touches every household in the State of Alaska and I think that every person in the State of Alaska is going to have to grips with the issue, because I do know for a fact that it is not just people who rely to some extent on the land around them.

Amy See: May I make a comment (inaudible who was raised in (inaudible) village. I still have a family there that do make a living off the land and the entire family who do draw from the natural resources to get through the winter, take care of unemployment compensation and some of my family have absolutely no retirement. I think these people should be able to have crab pots, to catch a fish, collect herring eggs, shoot a deer or be able to shoot for his family. When I go back to visit weekends I take my children out on fishing trips in the summer time and we do trade at stores. A box of kleenex in most of those villages there are a \$1.05 to a \$1.15, meat counter is bad, they are black, refrozen, half-thawed refrozen hamburger no one wants, I usually go back to my brothers and say bring home a fish. I don't care to buy meat at the store and the prices are unreasonable. We have family in Tenakee, there are probably only two Alaska Native people there, but then there are alot of older people who are living on a small retirement stay there because of their health, for the baths and (inaudible). They have to be able to draw a fish or a crab or a herring egg, or a deer, or a bird as needed. I think this is an Alaskan problem and should be taken care of to each area's need by Alaskans, thank you.

Representative Nels Anderson: Thank you.

John Norton: My name is John Norton, from Haines, and I'd like to (inaudible) permits to older people of our State who are living on small pensions and who have found a deer, or a moose will help them get by, otherwise would face economic hardship. I would hope this commissions is able to study this, this program or this concept in developing and pay attention particularly for older people, both Native and white. And give them as much consideration as they can. In haines, now we have and ability for people to fish inthe Chilkat River. Chilkoot River has

been closed for some time and this year in particular we had a pretty good run in the Chilkoot and the people who have fished there years before. The Native people, particularly, have not been allowed to fish, subsistence fish in that river and there was an exception (inaudible) this year. I think if we have people (inaudible) \$50, and \$60,000, and it seems somewhat inequitable to those people who are not as well off to not be able to utilize those resources at least to some extent. I think that you should take cases like this and study them and you could compromise a little between all the use (inaudible) Commercial fishermen through their fisheries programs are getting better runs and they can afford to give some of these increases in their catches to the people in the area. (inaudible) that is the extent of my statement, thank you.

Representative Nels Anderson: Thank you very much, Mr. Norton.

Male in Audience: Let me ask a question.

Representative Nels Anderson: Yes, please.

Cliff Lobaugh: I've listened and this is a very confusing issue to me. I've read the park services subsistence policy and then the State, Keith Specking came back from Washington D.C. and just two of the non-profit native corporations, and the only piece of legislation I've seen so far has dealt with subsistence is HR-39 and since you're in the process you know, drafting legislation, you've probably reviewed that. I was wondering what's your feelings on that piece of legislation from a subsistence stand.

Representative Nels Anderson: Well, the Committee really has not taken any kind of position on any of the various D-2 land proposals that have been drafted. We had originally adopted that as one of our goals and objectives, but because we had not been able to address that, and simply because we have had so much work, we adopted six goals and objectives and that was one of them. Because we have not had the time, because gathering information, meeting with people, and trying to get people to grasp the issue of subsistence we haven't taken a look at D-2 legislation at all. I have, on my own reviewed the D-2 proposals as

several of those have been written and I've got some very strong feelings on whether or not they should be adopted, simply because there are a large number of people in the State of Alaska who think that the Federal Government ought not to adopt a policy that would exclude non-native people. Although the Federal Government has the authority to manage the resources on Federal lands in that manner, I think there are going to be an awful lot of people that are going to be excluded, and not just native people, or non-native people, but I think that both communities are going to be affected, inadequately.

Again, going back to an original statement that I made, we're going to have some very definite boundaries of who owns what. And, what the Federal Government will permit or prohibit from being done within their boundaries they are going to be adjacent to land that is going to belong to private land owners and also to the entire State of Alaska. And when are these differences going to be resolved on various land use policies. I would think that it would be a wise thing to do, is to have the State of Alaska try to bring the message back to the Federal Government. I'm only talking about my opinion, I'm not speaking for the Committee at this time. I'd like to say that I think the entire Alaskan community ought to try to control those resources themselves, rather than to ask the Federal Government to come in and impose on us, what they think is right on our behalf. I'll also then speak as a native person, which I am. I don't think that my likes are going to be excluded by Alaskan people. I have a great deal of faith in the wisdom of the people who have come up here from the lower 48 and I think that the very things that we enjoy up here, are those things that those people have been looking for and I don't think they are going to jeopardize or in any way threaten my well-being. So, I see, that within the D-2 land proposals a very definite threat on my personal (inaudible). Are there any other questions, or comments.

Robert Willard: Mr. Chairman, I just want to make one more comment. The utilization of the resources doesn't depend on income. You've lived up here for along time and I think Willie Hensley put it very straight. If he's working in Anchorage and somebody kills a whale in Kotzebue, he's going to have some on his table that evening.

Representative Nels Anderson: Quite frankly, there are a lot of people that make an awful lot of money in urban areas, and they do I know for a fact travel 100's of miles into the Bristol Bay area and they do take the moose and caribou for their tables and I do know that they make enough money just with their job to purchase, beef, from the stores and I tell you the selection in Anchorage is a lot better than what you just told us about. It's pretty good. My feeling is and I have a dual income as well, but to expect people not to have access to resources, especially when we know foreign people are coming in from out of State, from out of our country, coming in and exploiting our resources just for the antlers, for recreation so that they can take home a trophy. That's something, that people who really use the land can't understand, why are we allowing this, why are we allowing people to come in from Germany or Scotland or wherever just to get a moose, when we know that our moose population in many parts of the State are going down. And also, our caribou herds are going down. So there is a tremendous conflict there and also the competitive use for those resources just can't be permitted much longer.

Then, one of the things that we are going to look at very closely at is just to see whether or not we can stop this because we know that the headhunters are coming in and they are taking the moose and only taking the moose for the trophy. That's wrong. A lot of that meat is rotting out in the field and not being used, That's my feeling. Also the lower 48 people that come up. Are we going to allow the people from the lower 48 to come up and take our resources if the people in the State of Alaska are not getting enough at this time. And when, where do we draw the line and what information do we have available that would make it possible for the State of Alaska to make a judgment to say, we can't allow this to continue any longer. And live by it. I think we are getting a lot closer to that time than most of us realize. Any other questions, or comments that the public may have at this time? If not, I know it is cold out there and I know many of you may not have prepared for this evening's meeting, but I do appreciate your being here and again, if Mr. Schaeffer or myself, or Mrs. Larson can help you, if there is any other additional information you need, we will have our report formally submitted to the Legislative Council on January 7. We would like as many of you as can, to get a copy of that final report to

Page 13 - Juneau Public Hearing

to get an idea of what we come up with. Again, thank you very much and we appreciate your attention. This hearing is adjourned.



JUNEAU ALASKA

Alaska State Legislature

House

INTERIM COMMITTEE ON SUBSISTENCE

NELS A. ANDERSON, JR., CHAIRMAN

P.O. Box 234 • 842-5970

Dillingham, Alaska 99576

Testimony of Jan Douglas Burgess from Hydaburg, Alaska

I'm from down southeastern Alaska and I've been fishing for all my life and I've experienced just about all of the economic development of the herring. I've watched how it all started. Last time we picked herring eggs was in 1967. That was Commercial Harvest and they paid us up to \$1.50 a lb. and that was mostly the native profit. That was the small man on the totem pole. He cleared the money and then it got more developed and then the purse seiners started off something like only 3 boats. Now there is something like 30 boats. The herring pickers are cut out and just the purse seiners are in there reaping all the profits. When I came up here to Togiak to pick herring eggs I seen it all, cause I picked home this spring - I picked herring eggs and I watched them fish and I noticed how new the development is up here. I guess it's supposed to be the first year for purse seining and when we first went out there we heard all these stories about fish and game is going to be there to enforce everything to make sure that the herring business is controlled. They talked about closing everything down if things got out of line with the Japs. You hear these people that tell these stories they say that people that say they rot the herring to take the eggs out - they don't know what they're talking about - that's against the law. But that happened this year in 1977 even after it was outlawed. I seen it all happening there and I never seen one fish and game manager down there in the five days I was there. I see those fish getting rotted on the beach by the tons. The Japs are there on the beach personally working - we took pictures of them and everything.

Back to the purse seining how it kills the herring off and cuts out the small picker, the native picker. Through the years he is going to get cut out too, because the purse seiners are going to take all of it and theres not going to be enough for commercial harvest. But they have have a different operation up here, they have spotters smaller purse seiners, but they have charters flying around up there and they let them exactly know when to let her go and they wrap them up and they get their packer and they just re-lay it back and forth, seven days a week to that Korean boat across the boarder, and its all happening there, and you hear all that talk that the Fish and Game says about how the Japs are killing off our fisheries, and thats really just as much American involvement you know.

The Marine Mammel Act - When they make their hauls, they can't miss all the seals and everything because they're all there, they just wrap them up, they just kill them they get so plugged with fish sometime.

I'm Douglas Burgess from Hydaburg, Alaska, I've been fishing for 15 years and this is my first year fishing up in Bristol Bay, but I really feel bitter toward the Fish & Game, because its really a sin because they tell about the fish thats getting killed off all our salmon - but down to the herring business and how its developed its going to happen the same way up here, because it happened there already, and it use to be that the Bay used to turn white from all the spaun for miles and miles now when the herring spaun now you can't even set up branch

Page 2 -

Jan Douglas Burgess's testimony con't.

The Japs were not seinging at all, they were on the beach, they were rotting the herring, they weren't buying at all, they were on the beach they would let them stink for five or six days big tons, just as big as this room, stink boy! And they hire out some people and pull the heads off and pull the eggs out, half of them are milk. I'd gladly testify, I was over there with Burt Reamy from Pilot Point, and Richard Clark from Clarks Point, we were all over there we took pictures for proof of the Japs down on the beach, so if they ever want to really see that its not true theres proof there. But like we picked eight and ten years ago the last time, and now were can't pick anymore, but the last time we picked they paid us up to a \$1.50 a pound we only got to pick for twenty minutes, here its 5 days 7 days a week you could pick twenty-four hours a day and the price difference, they paid \$1.50 to us and up here they only paid \$.35, and they sell herring eggs for \$15.00 a pound.

This would really - if that New Subsistence Committee they just formed, if they could experience these things that are really happening it would just fit right in.

file in
D-2 (Linda)

My name is Mark Jacobs Jr., first Vice-President of the Tlingit and Haida Indians of Alaska Central Council and a shareholder in the Shee Atika Corporation. I am a full blood Tlingit Indian and a patriotic American. I am deeply concerned about the strength and lobbying power of the environmentalists and conservation groups. Though their purposes are necessary and very commendable, there seems to be no stopping point in their efforts to halt economic growth. They are forcing upon us new governmental policies that are dangerous and that are deteriorating the American system of law. They are, I believe, the cause of a lion's share of inflation. I believe the destruction of our economic system, by severely limiting the multiple use concept with the passing of severe bureaucratic regulations without regard for economic needs is a dangerous governmental power. I believe in a well organized management of resources, with local participation of concerned citizens, rather than economic strangulation by some heartless bureaucratic agency located in some distant office.

My main concern as a shareholder of Shee Atika Corporation is the land selection rights provided in the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act, especially land selections on Admiralty Island. There has been enough dragging of the bureaucratic feet in implementing of this land transfer to the Native Corporations, due to some objections of the Angoon group. I only hope that the D-2 legislation will not hamper or further delay the land transfers. Although Shee Atika has met every legal requirement in the Act, the Secretary of the Interior chose to honor the objections of Angoon. As I see it, the Secretary recognizes the aboriginal claims of the Kootznoowoo Corporation in spite of the Act clearly stating that all aboriginal claims are hereby extinguished. If the Secretary's recognition of Angoon's objection is held as valid, then the real aboriginal Indian laws should apply. There are many aboriginal Angoon Indians living in Sitka and Juneau and enrolled to Shee Atika of Sitka and Goldbelt of

There are several other areas of concern such as minerals, access and right of way, private lands and rights which I am sure will be adequately addressed by others concerned. Due to the many (hundreds) that will testify, I shall close.

I wish to thank the committee for this opportunity to present my personal views.

Enclosure for reference Native foods.



tingit and haida indians of alaska



TESTIMONY OF RAYMOND E. PADDOCK, JR.,
PRESIDENT, CENTRAL COUNCIL OF TLINGIT
AND HAIDA INDIANS OF ALASKA, JULY 7,
1977, OVERSIGHT-ALASKA LANDS COMMITTEE
HEARINGS, JOHN F. SEIBERLING, CHAIRMAN

MR. CHAIRMAN, MY NAME IS RAYMOND E. PADDOCK, JR.
I AM PRESIDENT OF THE CENTRAL COUNCIL OF TLINGIT & HAIDA INDIANS
OF ALASKA, A FEDERALLY RECOGNIZED INDIAN TRIBE. AS SUCH, IT
IS THE RESPONSIBILITY OF THE CENTRAL COUNCIL TO ADDRESS ALL OF
THE SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC NEEDS OF OUR PEOPLE.

IN THE RELATIVELY SHORT LIFE OF THE COUNCIL WE HAVE
BEEN ABLE TO ACCOMPLISH A NUMBER OF GAINS. THIS INCLUDES A
HOUSING AUTHORITY THAT HAS BUILT SOME 400 UNITS OF HOUSING IN
SOUTHEAST ALASKA, A DIVISION OF MANPOWER THAT IS ASSISTING THE
UNEMPLOYED THROUGH VARIOUS CETA PROGRAMS, A CONTRACT WITH THE
BUREAU OF INDIAN AFFAIRS THAT DELIVERS EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMS,
SOCIAL SERVICE AND WELFARE PROGRAMS, A CREDIT UNION THAT ASSISTS
IN ESTABLISHING CREDIT AND SAVINGS AND LOAN PROGRAMS, AND A
HEALTH CORPORATION THAT IS JUST GETTING STARTED, BUT WILL BE
ADDRESSING THE HEALTH NEEDS OF OUR PEOPLE. ALL OF THIS HAS
BEEN DONE IN SPITE OF BEING PRE-OCCUPIED IN TRYING TO IMPLEMENT
THE ALASKA NATIVE CLAIMS SETTLEMENT ACT (ANCSA).

THROUGHOUT ALL OF THE DEVELOPMENT OF THESE VARIOUS
PROGRAMS, AND THE DELIVERY SYSTEMS THAT THE CENTRAL COUNCIL
IS INVOLVED IN, THERE HAS BEEN A MISSING INGREDIENT. THAT IS
A VIABLE AND STABLE ECONOMIC BASE. IT IS ONE THING FOR THE
FEDERAL GOVERNMENT TO POUR DOLLARS INTO VARIOUS PROGRAMS TO
ASSIST PEOPLE, BUT THE BASIC GOAL OF ALL OF THESE FEDERAL
DOLLARS SHOULD BE TO ESTABLISH AN ECONOMIC BASE THAT MAKES
THESE OTHER PROGRAMS UNNECESSARY.

tingit and haida indians of alaska



tingit and haida indians of alaska



WHEN THE ANCSA WAS PASSED, MANY OF US BELIEVED THAT WAS THE TOOL WE NEEDED TO ESTABLISH OUR OWN ECONOMY. NOW, WITH THE INTRODUCTION OF VARIOUS BILLS IN CONGRESS THAT IN EFFECT WOULD UNDERMINE THE IMPLEMENTATION OF ANCSA, WE ARE INCREASINGLY FRUSTRATED THAT WE MAY NOT ESTABLISH THAT DESIRED ECONOMIC BASE.

I WOULD LIKE TO SUPPLY THE COMMITTEE WITH A FEW FIGURES WHICH SHOULD CLEARLY DEMONSTRATE THE SCOPE OF THE PROBLEMS WE ARE TRYING TO ADDRESS. THERE ARE APPROXIMATELY 16,000 TLINGITS AND HAIDAS, 12,000 RESIDING IN SOUTHEAST ALASKA, WHICH IS THE AREA SERVICED BY OUR CONTRACTS. IN 1976 OUR GENERAL ASSISTANCE WELFARE PAYMENTS TO THE NEEDY AMOUNTED TO APPROXIMATELY \$424,000.00. IN 1977 THE BUDGET AMOUNT IS APPROXIMATELY \$520,000.00. THE INCREASE WAS ANTICIPATED BECAUSE OF THE REDUCTION OF ACTIVITY ON THE ALASKA PIPELINE. SOME 900 PIPELINE RELATED JOBS WERE PROVIDED TO NATIVE PEOPLE FROM SOUTHEAST ALASKA DURING THE PIPELINE ACTIVITY. HOWEVER, THAT IS NOW COMPLETED. A GAS PIPELINE, IF AND WHEN IT IS BUILT, WILL NOT PROVIDE MORE THAN ONE-HALF THE JOB OPPORTUNITIES AS DID THE OIL PIPELINE. IN ADDITION, THE LEGISLATION AUTHORIZING THE CONSTRUCTION OF THE OIL PIPELINE CONTAINED DEFINITE PROVISIONS FOR EMPLOYMENT OF ALASKA NATIVES. THERE ARE NO SUCH GUARANTEES OF WHICH WE ARE AWARE WHICH WILL APPLY TO THE GAS PIPELINE.

FURTHERMORE, IT IS NOT THE POLICY OF THE CENTRAL COUNCIL TO ENCOURAGE EMPLOYMENT SITUATIONS WHICH DIVIDE FAMILIES. THE SOCIAL CONDITIONS CAUSED BY FAMILY DIVISION SUCH AS THE OIL PIPELINE EMPLOYMENT RAISED OTHER PROBLEMS. MOST OF THE NATIVE PEOPLE EMPLOYED ON THE PIPELINE WERE YOUNG, SINGLE



tingit and haida indians of alaska



PERSONS WHO COULD AFFORD TO BE AWAY FROM HOME. BUT IN THOSE SITUATIONS WHERE HEADS OF HOUSEHOLD HAD TO GO TO THE PIPELINE TO SEEK EMPLOYMENT SIMPLY TO HOLD THEIR FAMILY TOGETHER, THE SOCIAL CONDITIONS THAT AROSE WERE NOT WORTH THE EFFORT IN OUR OPINION.

IT SHOULD BE REMEMBERED THAT THE BUDGET WE ARE TALKING ABOUT IS A BIA BUDGET, AND DOES NOT REFLECT THE TOTAL NEEDS OF THE STATE, BUT IS MERELY A SUPPLEMENT TO THE RESPONSIBILITY THE STATE ALREADY HAS. BETWEEN US, THE STATE AND BIA, THROUGH OUR CONTRACT, WE ARE STILL NOT ABLE TO TOTALLY ADDRESS THE GENERAL ASSISTANCE AND WELFARE NEEDS OF OUR PEOPLE. IN 1976 WE ASSISTED SOME 730 CASES. OUR BUDGET FOR 1977 IS FOR AN ESTIMATED 750 CASES. THIS DOES NOT INCLUDE OLD AGE ASSISTANCE AND SOCIAL SECURITY, WHICH ARE STATE AND FEDERAL RESPONSIBILITIES.

I WOULD LIKE TO SUBMIT FOR THE RECORD SEVERAL DOCUMENTS WHICH REFLECT THE UNEMPLOYMENT CONDITIONS OF THE NATIVE PEOPLE IN SOUTHEAST ALASKA. THIS DOCUMENT WAS PREPARED BY THE BIA, AND I WILL READ FROM THE REPORT FOR THE MONTH OF MARCH, 1977. THE TOTAL NATIVE LABOR FORCE IDENTIFIED IN SOUTHEAST ALASKA, 16 YEARS AND OVER, IS 7,725 PEOPLE. THE TOTAL UNEMPLOYMENT IS 60.3%, OR 3,317. OF THOSE THAT WERE WORKING AT THE TIME OF THE SURVEY, 479 WERE EARNING AT A RATE OF \$5,000.00 OR MORE PER YEAR, WITH THE REMAINING 2,513 EARNING AT A RATE OF LESS THAN \$5,000.00 PER YEAR.

MR. CHAIRMAN, THESE STATISTICS ARE APPALLING. IF ANY ONE OF THE COMMITTEE MEMBERS OR ANY OTHER CONGRESSMAN FOR THAT MATTER, HAD TO GO BACK AND FACE HIS CONSTITUENCY WITH UNEMPLOYMENT RATES EVEN HALF OF WHAT I HAVE BROUGHT OUT HERE,

tingit and haida indians of alaska



tingit and haida indians of alaska



HE SIMPLY WOULD NOT BE RETURNED TO OFFICE. IT SHOULD BE NOTED THAT AT THE TIME THIS REPORT WAS MADE, UNEMPLOYMENT WAS HIGHEST BECAUSE OF THE PRIMARILY SEASONAL WORK IN THE STATE OF ALASKA. BUT WE HAVE OTHER STATISTICS THAT SHOW THAT EVEN UNDER THE BEST CONDITIONS, DURING THE SUMMER MONTHS, THE NATIVE PEOPLE OF SOUTHEAST ALASKA SUFFER AN UNEMPLOYMENT RATE OF OVER 40%.

IN SUMMATION, MR. CHAIRMAN, THE VARIOUS BILLS THAT YOUR COMMITTEE WILL CONSIDER THIS YEAR ARE LAND RELATED BILLS ACCORDING TO SECTION 17 (D) 2 OF ANCSA. BUT WE ARE HERE TO TESTIFY ON BEHALF OF PEOPLE. WE HAVE ALREADY POINTED OUT THAT WE HAVE SEVERE SOCIAL PROBLEMS AND IT IS ONLY THROUGH IMPLEMENTATION OF ANCSA AS IT WAS INTENDED TO BE THAT WE FEEL WE CAN RESOLVE OUR SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC CONDITION. THE BILLS BEING PRESENTED NOW BEFORE CONGRESS SHOULD TAKE THESE FACTS INTO CONSIDERATION AS A PRIORITY BEFORE JUDGMENT IS MADE ON WHAT IS TO BECOME OF THE STATE OF ALASKA.

THANK YOU.

REPORT OF LABOR FORCE

Data are for March (month) 1977 (year) 1/

Year 1977	State Alaska	
	MALE <u>2/</u>	FEMALE <u>3/</u>
Total	12,262	6,0
<u>A</u> Total Resident Indian Population (b/c excluding d)		
<u>a</u> Within the reservation		
<u>c</u> Adjacent to the reservation (in Okla., Indians in former reservation areas)		
<u>d</u> Other Indians, not included in labor force data (In California rural parts of counties with reservations or rancherias)		
<u>3/</u> Total under 16 years of age included on line "A"	4,537	2,160 2,37
RESIDENT INDIAN POPULATION OF WORKING AGE		
(16 years old and over) <u>4/</u>		
<u>F</u> Total 16 years and Over (A minus e)	7,725	4,094 3,6
<u>g</u> 16 - 24 years	2,330	1,328 1,0
<u>h</u> 25 - 34 "	1,962	981 9
<u>i</u> 35 - 44 "	1,594	828 7
<u>j</u> 45 - 64 "	1,594	828 7
<u>k</u> 65 years and over	245	129 1
<u>7/</u> Not in Labor Force (16 Years and Over), <u>5/</u>		
Total (u + o + p + q)	2,226	802 1,4
<u>n</u> Students (16 years and over, including those away at school)	822	427 3
<u>o</u> Men, physically or mentally disabled, retired, institutionalized, etc.	410	410
<u>p</u> Women for whom no child-care substitutes are available	497	497
<u>q</u> Women, housewives, physically or mentally disabled, institutionalized, etc. <u>6/</u>	497	497
<u>R</u> Potential Labor Force (16 yrs. and Over) (F minus M)	5,499	3,299 2,20
<u>S</u> Employed, Total (t + u)	2,182	1,319 86
<u>t</u> Employed, earning \$5,000 or more a year (all jobs)	479	407 7
<u>u</u> Employed, earning less than \$5,000 a year (all jobs)	1,703	912 79
<u>V</u> Not employed (R minus S) <u>7/</u> Rate: 60.3	3,317	1,957 1,36
<u>W</u> Of these, persons actively seeking work	497	362 13

Prepared by

ATTACHMENT: Superintendent's Evaluation o

Area Director

Superintendent

Area

Approval Date

Agency

Approval Date



TLINGIT AND HAIDA INDIANS OF ALASKA



Memorandum

To: Ray Paddock, Jr.
President

Date: July 6, 1977

From: Terry Pegues, Director
Manpower Division

Subject: Unemployment Data

Here are B.I.A. "Reports of Labor Force" for March 1975 and 1976. Please note that the periods covered reflect employment generated by the pipeline and that the increase in the pipeline workforce, which peaked in 1976, is also reflected in this data.

Also attached is a letter from the Area Programs and Environmental Coordinator, Juneau Area Office, Bureau of Indian Affairs, which attests to the accuracy of our data.

Encl: AS:st

TLINGIT & HAIDA INDIANS OF ALASKA

REPORT OF LABOR FORCE

Data are for March (month) 1976 (year)

Year	State	
	Alaska	
1976	MALE	FEMALE
Total	5818	5485
Total		
Within the reservation		
Adjacent to the reservation (in Okla., Indians in former reservation areas)		
Other Indians, not included in labor force data (In California rural parts of counties with reservations or rancherias)		
Total under 16 years of age included on line "A"	1905	2000
RESIDENT INDIAN POPULATION OF WORKING AGE (16 years old and over)		
Total 16 years and Over (A minus e)	7398	3485
16 - 24 years	2492	1126
25 - 34 "	1799	885
35 - 44 "	1346	639
45 - 64 "	1435	687
65 years and over	326	148
Not in Labor Force (16 Years and Over), Total (n + o + p + q)	2133	1392
Students (16 years and over, including those away at school)	803	398
Men, physically or mentally disabled, retired, institutionalized, etc.	336	
Women for whom no child-care substitutes are available	495	495
Women, housewives, physically or mentally disabled, institutionalized, etc.	499	499
Potential Labor Force (16 yrs. and Over) (F minus M)	5265	2093
Employed, Total (t + u)	3053	1185
Employed, earning \$5,000 or more a year (all jobs)	704	112
Employed, earning less than \$5,000 a year (all jobs)	2349	1073
Not employed (R minus S) (.42%)	2212	908
Of these, persons actively seeking work	450	105

Prepared by _____

Area Director _____

Area _____

Approval Date _____

ATTACHMENT: Superintendent's Evaluation of Data

Superintendent _____

Agency _____

Approval Date _____

REPORT OF LABOR FORCE

Data are for _____ (month) 1975 (year)

Year **1975** State **Alaska**

Total MALE FEMALE

Total Resident Indian Population (b+c excluding d)		10985	5646	5339
Within the reservation				
Adjacent to the reservation (in Okla., Indians in former reservation areas				
Other Indians, not included in labor force data (In California rural parts of counties with reservations or rancherias)				
Total under 16 years of age included on line "A"		4018	1955	2063
RESIDENT INDIAN POPULATION OF WORKING AGE (16 years old and over)				
Total 16 years and Over (A minus e)		6967	3691	3276
16 - 24 years		2081	1164	917
25 - 34 "		1799	914	885
35 - 44 "		1346	707	639
45 - 64 "		1415	728	687
65 years and over		326	178	148
Not in Labor Force (16 Years and Over), Total (n + o + p + q)		2064	716	1348
Students (16 years and over, including those away at school)		773	395	378
Men, physically or mentally disabled, retired, institutionalized, etc.		321	321	
Women for whom no child-care substitutes are available		471		471
Women, housewives, physically or mentally disabled, institutionalized, etc.		499		499
Potential Labor Force (16 yrs. and Over) (F minus M)		4903	2975	1928
Employed, Total (t + u)		2709	1628	1081
Employed, earning \$5,000 or more a year (all jobs)		531	445	86
Employed, earning less than \$5,000 a year (all jobs)		2178	1183	995
Not employed (R minus S)		4194	1347	847
Of these, persons actively seeking work		449	342	107

Prepared by _____

ATTACHMENT: Superintendent's Evaluation of Data

Area Director _____

Superintendent _____

Area _____

Approval Date _____

Agency _____

Approval Date _____
71



UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

BUREAU OF INDIAN AFFAIRS
Juneau Area Office
P. O. Box 3-8000
Juneau, Alaska 99802

February 8, 1977

TO WHOM IT MAY CONCERN:

It is my opinion that the BIA Report of Labor Force for the SE Agency is the most current and accurate report available on Indian Unemployment for March/April 1976. The Native population is the same as that served by the Tlingit & Haida Central Council.

Furthermore, I believe the unemployment rate for Native people served by THCC is currently higher than reported last year primarily due to (1) the declining impact of the Trans Alyeska pipeline and (2) the net natural rate of increase in population.

As an economist and Program Planner for BIA's Native services, I have closely observed the reports on employment and unemployment in Rural and Native or Village Alaska since 1953.

For the past 15 years it has been my responsibility to collect, analyze and coordinate Native population, income and employment statistics and reports for the Juneau Area Office (State) Alaska. State-wide and nation-wide it is BIA's major report on this subject since 1966.

I shall be pleased to answer any further questions concerning this report or subject, generally,

H. P. Gazaway
Area Programs & Environmental Coordinator

December 5, 1977

Nel A. Anderson Jr., Chairman
Interim Committee on Subsistence
Box 234
Dillingham, Alaska 99576

Dear Mr. Anderson:

My name is Karen Moore I am a Tlingit from Klawock. I have worked in the lower 48 as a dietician, but I have returned to Klawock to stay.

My title now is City Coordinator but I am writting this letter as statement of my own personal opinion.

I belive our policy makers from the large population centers don't seem to realize the absolute necessity of subs'tance type food in many geographic areas of Alaska, including many sections of southeastern.

Among the native population of Alaska even though times are beginning to change, there is still a very real economic as well as traditional and cultral need for subsistence food.

I believe at all times especially when land use and water policy is being developed or sports use or commerical regulation of subsistence items is being considered that subsistence use should have top priority and be allowed in the amount necessary for the size of the family and their traditional use.

With this type of regulation there should be substantial penalties for any type of dervision of subsistence food to any commerical outlet.

There will be many people for years to come, who will still be forced to live at least a semi-subsistence type of living.

It would seem very unjust to put these people outside the law.

I feel strongly about this and intend to show other people this letter and if they agree with me they can also sign this letter.

Sincerely,

Karen Moore

Box 81
Klawock, Alaska 99925

Copies to:
Governor Hammond
Ray Paddock, T.&H. President
Frank-O Williams, ANB President
Ketchikan Daily News
Robert Ziegler, Senator

Linda Low, Director Seacap

12-5-17

Mary M. Jackson	Klawock, Ak
Victoria Peratrovich	J. H. president (Local)
Joanne Rickson	Klawock
Ilina M. Peratrovich	"
Frances Dundas	"
Ronald Macasait	"
Faye L. Keene	"
Henrietta J. Smith	"
Marvin J. George	Fire dept. secretary
Joe Wilson	
Arlene Buey	
Al P. Macasait Sr.	Mayor City of Klawock
Clwood Thomas	"
Esther Rasmus	"
Victor Hanson	"
Lonnie McNeill	"
Henry McNeill	"
Sine McNeill	"
Raymond G. Merrill	"
Henrietta J. Kato	Asst. School Sec.
Sonja Arman	"
Robert Arman	"
Ronald C. Arman	"
Rudolph Smith Sr.	"
Joan Smith	"
Harriet McNeill	"
Joe McNeill	"
Robert W. George	"

12-5-77

	Klawock, AK
Diane George	"
Nelen Keene	"
Ann Kennedy	"
Peter Keene	"
Mrs Ruby Smith	"
John Perkins Smith	"
Harvey Smith	"
David Amiskitts Esq	"
Rose Charles	"
John Charles Jr	"
Dowey Skan Jr.	Box 34 Klawock, Alaska
Sally A. Skan	Box 34 Klawock, Alaska
Lulu Bergeron	"
Richard Buzyn	"
James L. Thomas	public safety officer
Nana R. Thomas	"
Danny Kennedy	"
Leola Jackson Sr.	"
Robert Kennedy	"
Evelyn Williams	Klawock, Alaska

· PLEASE NOTE: THE PRECEDING PAGES WERE TREATED
· AS A UNIT IN THE ORIGINAL DOCUMENT.

PLEASE NOTE: THE FOLLOWING PAGES WERE TREATED
AS A UNIT IN THE ORIGINAL DOCUMENT.

PUBLIC HEARING TESTIMONY

BY THE ALASKA STATE LEGISLATURE
INTERIM COMMITTEE ON SUBSISTENCE

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:

Representative Nels A. Anderson Jr., Chairman
Representative Joe Hayes
Representative Steve Cowper
Senator Kay Poland

STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT:

Dorothy M. Larson, Staff Assistant

PUBLIC HEARING LOCATION:

KODIAK, ALASKA
KODIAK BOROUGH ASSEMBLY

DATE: Monday, October 17, 1977
TIME: 7:00 P.M.

THOSE REGISTERED IN ATTENDANCE AT PUBLIC HEARING

<u>Name</u>	<u>Address</u>	<u>Organization</u>
Charles Naughton	733 W. 4th Ave., Suite 400, Anchorage	F/S LUPC
David "Stick" Morrison	Box 571, Kodiak	
George Binder	Box 172, Kodiak	
William Donaldson	Box 591, Kodiak	
Jack Wick	Box 746, Kodiak	President, Kodiak
Fred F. Zharoff	Box 405, Kodiak	
Yvonne Zharoff	Box 405, Kodiak	
Dick Wamser	Box 351, Kodiak	
Bob Worl	3407 Seppala Dr., Anchorage	
Jack Christiansen	Box 108, Old Harbor	
Iver Malutin	Box 525, Kodiak	
Larr Matfay	Box 2, Old Harbor	
Gust Rastopsoff	Larsen Bay, Ak.	
Thomas D. Peterson	Box 172, Kodiak	
Janet Wente	Box 2791, Kodiak	
Karl Armstrong	Box 631, Kodiak	Kodiak Is. Conser. Society
Wayne Marshall	Box 571, Kodiak	
Bill Hartman	Box 733, Kodiak	
Ron Brockman	Box 95, Kodiak	
Sylvia Barnes	General Delivery, Kodiak	
Pete Olsen	Box 485, Kodiak	
Bill Berestoff	Box 2196, Kodiak	
Gene Sundberg	Box 746, Kodiak	
Frank Peterson	Box 172, Kodiak	KANA

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PAGE

1. Testimony of....Charles Naughton.....	3
2. Testimony of....David "Stick" Morrison.....	4
3. Testimony of....Bill Donaldson.....	6
4. Testimony of....Ivar Malutin.....	7
5. Testimony of....Jack Wick.....	10
6. Testimony of....George Binder.....	12
7. Testimony of....Gene Sundberg.....	14
8. Testimony of....Karl Armstrong.....	17
9. Testimony of....Frank Peterson, KANA Ex., Director..	21
10. Testimony of....Dick Wamser.....	25
11. Testimony of....Pete Olson.....	26
12. Testimony of....Fred Zharoff.....	28
13. Testimony of....Male in Audience.....	29
14. Testimony of....Jack Christenson.....	31
15. Testimony of....Larry Matfay.....	31

** Written Position Paper from the Alaska Conservation
Society, LIFE STYLES, SUBSISTENCE AND HUNTING
December 1976



JUNEAU ALASKA

Alaska State Legislature

House

INTERIM COMMITTEE ON SUBSISTENCE
NELS A. ANDERSON, JR., CHAIRMAN
P.O. Box 234 • 842-5970
Dillingham, Alaska 99576

OCTOBER 17, 1977 - KODIAK PUBLIC HEARING

Representative Nels Anderson stated that he would like to introduce members of the panel that are up here with me; On my immediate right is Representative Joe Hayes from Anchorage, on my left is Steve Cowper from Fairbanks. We have been conducting hearings from throughout the State of Alaska trying to get an estimation of what the peoples feelings are about the subject of subsistence. Its an issue, its a word that has not yet been legally defined, there have been no primitives of any kind put around it. Every person that I have spoken to in previous meetings throughout the State, that every individual has their particular feelings about what the subject of subsistence means to them.

What we are trying to determine is what action we need to take, and the reason why there is this kind of interest in the Legislatures, because the land ownership pattern of the State of Alaska is changing dramatically. There is going to be 40 million plus acres of land in private land ownership through the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act, the State of Alaska will receive, hopefully in our lifetimes 103 million acres of land and then the Federal Government will have its land that it will be managing.

In order to avoid the future conflicts we're trying to make a determination of what peoples feelings are about hunting, fishing and gathering rights that they feel they have at this time, and what should the State and Federal Government do to protect these activities. We do know through testimonies in other parts of the State that there is a definite interest in the subject of subsistence and that there is a strong feeling that subsistence has got to be protected.

I hope that the purpose of the Committee has already been brought to your attention and that some of you may be prepared to give us your thoughts on the subject. At this time I would like to ask if any members of the panel have specific comments that they would like to make at this time, as we go on as people testify, members of the panel will be questioning you on occasion to clarify points that you have made, but we are asking for as many comments as you can possibly can, either verbally or in writing. If you feel tonight that you are not prepared to make a statement we ask you to please contact us, Dorothy Larson will give you our address and we ask that you write your comments on the subject at a later time and mail it to us prior to January of 1978.

Representative Hayes do you have any comments at this time?

Representative Hayes: No thank you Nels, I don't have any specific comments, other than to say that I am happy to be back in Kodiak again this evening and am looking forward to the testimonies that we receive here.

Representative Cowper: Thank you Mr. Chairman, I'm wearing a couple of hats tonight, not only as a member of the subsistence committee but as the Chairman D-2 Steering Council for the State and as most of you know that legislation will cover all the federal lands now in the State of Alaska. Congress wants to make a subsistence preference on those lands and how they are going to do it they sure don't know and that's one of the reasons why we're here. One of the main reasons for holding these hearings is to determine what you think we ought to do, if there's a shortage of fish or game in a given area - who should have the preference? Should subsistence users have the preference - should commercial users have the preference? What about sports hunters and fishermen? The question doesn't arise until there is a shortage of fish or game. We want to be sure that what we do is in line with what people in Alaska think. That's sort - they're the questions that we're looking for answers here tonight.

Representative Nels Anderson: Thank you Mr. Cowper. Senator Poland do you have any comments?

Senator Kay Poland: Just that, as you know from being a former Chairman of resources we've never been able to get a real definition of subsistence and I'm hoping that this committee will be able to give us something on that because there is going to be so much coming up on land disposal before the committees that a definition will be a tremendous help.

Representative Nels Anderson: Thank you very much Senator Poland. At this time then we'll ask people who would like to testify to come forward and sit here and we are recording your comments - if your comments are not in writing, we will transcribe these comments and each comment that is made will be taken into consideration and if there are any suggestions that you may have for the committee that you feel is important for us to consider the floor is open.

Charles Naughton: I don't want to do into any lengthy - with respect to subsistence I don't have anything prepared, however I would like to respond to Senator Poland's request to have a definition of subsistence and would like to say that I think that in terms of the people that it would be very detrimental to define in law any definition of subsistence.

Representative Steve Cowper: Suppose there were only a certain number of salmon (inaudible), that could be taken from given drainage systems around here - who do you think should have the preference? Suppose you could only take a thousand fish from a certain stream. Who do you think should get preference to those thousand fish?

Charles Naughton: I could answer that question in a number of ways. Not being sarcastic - I could remember when I could hike over the hills and I could spear a salmon from Pillar Creek and I could remember when I could go down to Menashka - those streams are without salmon now - not because of subsistence users, but because of the ignorance and the lack of municipal management and so I'm answering your question that way and I would like you to redirect your question.

Representative Steve Cowper: Well, O.K. regardless of who is at fault for this - assuming you have to set a quota for harvest - who gets first crack at it? - This is the question that we are addressing. If you have to limit the take of salmon, moose, caribou.

Charles Naughton: I can answer that question and understanding what your are saying. But I would like for the record that it be emphasized that a lot of these problems are not a result of subsistence users but the result of lack if municipal and state management of our resources and I cannot say that I feel a monetary system should be used. The people here and the people in Kotzebue and the people in Barrow and the people in Hoonah are fishery oriented people and I do not think that because of the increase of people from the states that they should lose the right to live the way that they have lived and sports fishing is fine, but why should someone because of law - because there are more sports fisherman lose the right to live the way that they have lived just because someone else comes up from the States.

Representative Steve Cowper: Just to make it clear where I stand on the thing I think that if you have to prioritize, you should go with local subsistence users.

David "Stick" Morrison: I have been a resident of Alaska for about 11 years now and I just have a comment or more or less an answer to the question that you gave to Charlie and I agree with Charlie an awful lot there but I just sort of like to answer the question in my own way - when you asked the question if you had a thousand fish, who would get priority? I don't think it should be just the people who have been living that way all they're life - I think it should be for the people that are mainly in need - not only natives but non-natives - there are many people around the state that do to financial situations cannot afford to provide for their families maybe the way they should go, therefore they use subsistence to go out and obtain what they need without going to a store or something like that - who wants to pay 4 or 5 dollars for a little filet of salmon you find in the store, when you could go out and get it right down in the stream and I think it should be for the people that are in need not only for the people that have done this all their lives. I've known many that have been in this

situation, but could just as well go down to the store but they choose well, we'll go get our subsistence license and get salmon and we can eat that way. But I think a lot of people that can afford to go out and get these things not only in a store but can't get a commercial fishing license or don't qualify for limited entry, things like this - I think the people in need is the ones to get priority - if there is a shortage. I mean I respect game laws and like if there is a species in the process of being wiped out - yes it should be banned - it should be built back up - I agree with that - I don't believe in wiping something out. If the person - this is how he lives by - and I'm taking this personally also because this is how I live - again - the person in need of it should be the one to get it.

Representative Joe Hayes: Mr. Naughton mentioned that he didn't think that there should be a definition of subsistence - that we should try to shy away from that - do you have any feeling on that? Do you think that there should be a definition for subsistence? You probably have your own idea on what definition should be but do you think that this committee or that possibly some of the federal legislation - federal or state should try to come up with a definition for subsistence that would meet some criteria you have mentioned - you sort of put a definition on it that you say that people in need ought to get first shot at any limited resource - what's your thinking about definition?

David Morrison: Well, I think it's kind of hard really to sit down and I don't envy you in the coming Legislature to define subsistence even with all the input of everyone else because it's just - it seems to me that it is awful difficult and I don't think I can answer you directly because it would just take to long and I probably would just be going around and around in circles but it is very hard to define the word subsistence.

Representative Joe Hayes: But if we could define it do you think we should?

David Morrison: Yes, I do.

Bill Donaldson: The Board of Directors of the Alaska Conservation society prepared a position paper on subsistence - I'm not sure if you have been presented with this or not. ** See Table of Contents.

Representative Steve Cowper: Bill you mentioned something about subsistence use being traditionally associated with areas with relatively low population density which brings something to mind which we've considered from time to time that would be approach by which the preferences in a given area, let's say in a fish and game management area, would be the local people - do you think that is a valid concept?

Bill Donaldson: I think so, in general. I think once you get away from an isolated area you probably reduce your dependency on strictly subsistence type living - I think that's what the point was addressing but I think subsistence is basically a traditional type thing and if there is a cutoff point it probably should go to the traditional user of the resource.

Representative Steve Cowper: Do you think geographical distinction is valid one?

Bill Donaldson: I think in a case where you have a limited resource I do. I think geographical distinction is very valuable.

Representative Steve Cowper: How about if you have to set up priorities and I realize that much of this might not apply in this area. If you have to set up priorities within that given group - what about economic distinctions if you have to do that? Do you think that's valid - In other words do you think that the law ought to say for instance if there is you could take two hundred caribou from a given herd do you think the top priority should be to people that don't have an income and work down from there?

Bill Donaldson: It is hard to measure how important subsistence may be to an individual who has traditionally hunted for this species all his life and even though he may be rather well off economically - you know how do you measure closing him off from a caribou hunter or traditional fishing stream - what that might do to him psychologically

and I think this is something you gentlemen have to grope with although ranking subsistence uses on, on economical basis is one tool you do have. If you have a very limited resource you may be forced to approach it in this manner, but I do think that if you can get any kind of a measure on how important a traditional use of game or fisheries is to a person that would be also legitimate basis for you now letting you continue in the resource or letting somebody else get it. But I don't think this is a black & white issue and I think alot of consideration needs to be given to the traditional use of the resource now what it may mean to a person's former and future lifestyle not only his pocketbook.

Ivar Malutin: I have been a resident of Kodiak for 40 years and Alaska. In hearing these comments on subsistence - it upsets me - I have been subsistence hunting and fishing all my life. Just to give you a little example of what's happening in Kodiak, we fished out at Knome Bay and out at the Mission and out at Buskin and this area close by the town and as time went on as Kodiak has increased in population with the sports fisherman coming in they moved us out of areas - they moved us out of Knome Bay and they moved us out of the Mission. We had been getting dolly vardens in the spring of the year when they would first come in - okay they closed off our prime area to dolly varden which was the Mission Beach, no longer can we get the dolly varden in the spring because the sports fisherman want to get them so we just sit back and watch. Now that was also our prime silver salmon area and we were moved out of there so now we were out at the Buskin Rivers and listening to the Alaska Department of Fish and Game, Sports fishing department with their statistics - they have a real good record - they tell me that there are no 800 subsistence permits this year as opposed to maybe 200 last year and 100 the year before or just roughly those figures I may not be correct exactly, but, to give you an example of what's happening - I have went and applied for a subsistence permit again this year on April the 11th, mind you, a month before any fish come to Kodiak and already I was number 28 for a subsistence permit - before the fish were even here. I don't know who these users are. I was getting permits from day 1 when there wasn't any permits, and now it kind of bothers me. I have had some fantastic years fishing and I have had some fantistic years working and to me that salmon means exactly

the same - every single year - I heard the conservationists here and I agree with some of the things they say and I disagree with some of the other things they say. To me, if they take away subsistence from me - penalize me because I make or have a good season. I think it's wrong and if they give me something because I have a poor season I think that's wrong too. A lot of things are going to my mind - it upsets me every time I get into these things.

Representative Nels Anderson: Mr. Malutin - I think there is an awful lot of people in the state that feel the way you do and the reason why we feel that the state has to take a leadership role in this is that we're faced with a possibility that when Mr. Udall get done with his bill on D-2 lands that there is a significant chance that either the Carter Administration or the Congress in some way will jeopardize our access to fish, game, birds, and whatever else subsistence activities we engage ourselves in up in Alaska but I really hope that you will give us more thought and if you have more ideas now we ask you to share them with us and the door isn't closed if something else were to come to you. We ask you again to write us a letter and give us your views on this because you did say something that was significant no matter how good the work was no matter how much money you had, the salmon still meant the same to you and I think that's a significant statement to because a lot of other people have said that too no matter how much money you had you felt you still had to have that salmon.

Ivar Malutin: In closing, a salmon to me is not just to go out get a fish on the end of a line because I have never had a sports fishing license - I don't go out and buy an expensive rod and reel because if I take my gill netter seine and I go out and get one or two or whatever needs - and we eat the heads - we can make a good meal out of the heads. We can make a good meal out of the eggs, we can make a meal out of the milt, we dray the, we salt them, we can them, we smoke them, we freeze them. To put a regulations to really cut us down from using these things is going to be really detrimental - I could see it coming - I hate to see it coming but I think it will be detrimental.

Representative Joe Hayes: I wanted to clarify something you said

initially - you said the number of subsistence permits is declining?
No, increasing.

Ivar Malutin: The numbers are registered there at Fish & Game. What I did say was that - when the first permits came out there might have been 10 permits, 15 permits - it was gradually going up hill and this year there were 800 permits issued.

Representative Joe Hayes: I take it that there may be some people who are now getting subsistence permits who traditionally did not subsistence on fish - that were traditionally not subsistence fisherman - I mean there must be people who are now coming to the State maybe that have just been here a few years.

Ivar Malutin: For a fact I can say that.

Representative Joe Hayes: So this increase from 200 to 800 - some people are going it for some other reason than you are doing it for - maybe just for the experience of being a subsistence fisherman or living off the land which in fact they don't really need it or at least it doesn't have the same meaning.

Representative Steve Cowper: When you said Fish and Game moved the subsistence users out of Mill Bay - How did they do that - did they tell you can't use your nets there anymore or what did they do?

Ivar Malutin: To correct the record - I don't think I said the Fish and Game moved us out of an area - I think it's moved by the influx of sports fishermen. An interested party that outweighs the subsistence people like myself. I think it's more of a political move.

Representative Steve Cowper: In other words, were the sports fishermen taking so many fish that there weren't enough left over for the subsistence user.

Ivar Malutin: That's not it at all - they have an area and we have been fishing in this area I think before the sports fisherman even came around all of a sudden it's a real close accessible area and they want

it so they just flat put it into regulation and absolutely no subsistence fishing in the area, sports fishing only.

Representative Steve Cowper: Well, who is doing this? Is Fish and Game doing this?

Ivar Malutin: It's on the subsistence permits. Right. They indicate the closed areas to subsistence on the permits. The regulations are enforced by the troopers. (inaudible talking)

Representative Nels Anderson: I don't know what the background is either but I do know that the Board of Fish & Game is going to be meeting in December and they have been soliciting comments and one good one could have been for you to make a proposal to the Board of Fish & Game that you would like to see that area reopened to subsistence users again because, it seems to make an awful lot of sense I can't understand why that kind of a regulation would be made totally disregarding the local people for the sake of sports fishermen that doesn't make any sense to me at all.

Male in Audience: I would think to Ivar, that the local people could bring this to the Kodiak Advisory Board and get them to back up a request like that because when you have as many putting in for subsistence licenses as we do here it certainly is a voice that should be listened too.

Ivar Malutin: Okay, to go a little further than what we were talking about one of the recommendations at the Advisory Board meeting by the Department of Fish & Game Sports Fisheries Department was to close this entire area (inaudible) to subsistence fishing. This is one of the recommendations that was not brought on the table because they would not accept it at the meeting.

Representative Nels Anderson: Before I take any questions from people that have already gave their presentation I would like to ask other members who have not spoken to come forward please.

Jack Wick: My name is Jack Wick, I apologize to the committee that I

do not have a prepared statement at this time, but I will submit one. Just like to make a few comments to the committee that I think might be some that you find useful and that if you have heard a person testify that they would not like subsistence defined and you have heard a person testify that they would like to see subsistence defined. I think that we've indicated in other hearings that we've had that subsistence is a major concern to people in Alaska both for the lifestyle, heritage, low income people and some people who just want to live that way. My concern is not who gets it or when there are several alternatives to - I should say it's the worst possible situation where you have to say we only have this many and you're going to get your share. I think basically I'd like to see a program developed whereby there will be enough. My concern stands for the fact that when you define something or legislate something there are many gray areas. To give you a good example of a piece of legislation that was passed by Congress - I can't remember what year, I always use this one as an example, it's legislation regarding oil spill. The tankers were going (inaudible) creating large oil spills. So they created legislation to stop that and now you have a case where the ordinary fisherman who has a 32 foot boat who has to go out at night to pump his fuel case he gets the same fine as a tanker. That's the problem with subsistence - if it isn't legislated correctly, instead of solving the problem you make people unlawful. Instead of law abiding people who live in rural areas - you'll find people who don't follow the letter of the law simply because it isn't right. That's my major concern. As far as the issues that have been presented today of course I think subsistence should be a major consideration not only because of the fact that people do subsistence. Subsistence has been treated very - people take it for granted - If you went to Larson Bay for example, and you ask somebody - Do you subsist during the winter time? My answer would be, I guess so. They live that way all their life and they just never put a handle on it. They hunt ducks - it's just a natural way to live but when you start defining it and you take different areas of the State, different lifestyles, me for example, I would subsist as much as I could if I had the time. I grew up on salmon, smoked salmon and it's really difficult to get in Kodiak. I think the biggest problem that we have to face is to solve the gray areas and combine lifestyles and culture and me.

Also you have to face the fact, (inaudible) basically, we discussed fisheries but there are other issues, I don't know why it seems weird but we have on the island here, a herd of reindeer that have no seasons, no limits and you can go hunting them anytime of the year and they have managed to survive. As far as I know, they're not in a critical stage or extinction or they are not overpopulated, but I bet if you put a limit on them two years ago and a season you would have a heck of a time finding them now. So I don't know what the answers are. I'm just going to give you some general comments. As far as subsistence locally, I think it's the same problem you find in all areas of the state, you have the Alaska Department of Fish and Game, Commercial Division, you have the Sports Fish Division, and subsistence just falls within the trap. I think you should develop a subsistence division - somebody to look at the figures from a subsistence point of view, instead of looking at it from the Fish & Game point of view and saying well, we've got guys out here sports fishing and subsistence users and commercial users that are infringing on their rights. You should have somebody saying well, we've got subsistence fishermen out here and we've got some guys with poles slopped in the water and we've got commercial users among (inaudible) subsistence - somewhere there's (inaudible) I remember when I was kid, why native people thought non-native people were dumb. Because there was a nice brand new beach seine, right there on the beach and here's a guy out there catching them one at a time. Nobody sport fished when I was a kid. You have different lifestyles and they have to somehow come together but I think the key to it that we have to look at it from a subsistence point of view.

Representative Nels Anderson: I agree with you by the way that we do need a division on subsistence and I have asked Legislative Affairs to draft legislation for the Committee. The Committee doesn't know that yet but it will be brought up on November 11th for their consideration and I'm hoping that, that legislation will be ready for the review then (inaudible).

George Binder: My name is George Binder - I have more questions than I have answers. I think if you asked me to define a giraffe and I told you I would rather describe it. I think maybe you've got the same predicament as subsistence lifestyle. I think it needs to be described

and described in terms of the particular areas and if you try run a general definition through which will cover all areas then you'll wind up with something that backfires but the thing that bothers me is why this panel exists in other words that if you pass a law which gives preferential treatment to certain citizens isn't that unconstitutional according to the State of Alaska?

Representative Steve Cowper: I think that in my opinion that in fact you can have preferences. I do not think that you can do it on a racial basis - we would be opposed to that in any event but I think you can create classes of users, both on federal and state lands. There are people who disagree with me, I guess we'll have to see.

George Binder: It would have to be decided then by the Supreme Court of Alaska. It seems to be that there really is a question existing and I thought perhaps you were trying to get around that by creating subsistence zoning. I thought you were perhaps trying to expand the zoning laws to include this concept - and maybe I'm wrong.

Representative Nels Anderson: Well, we have on the books - we do have in the Department of Fish and Game the authority to create these subsistence zones after a petition has been signed by 100 residents of the area where they feel that a subsistence zone ought to be created. There have been five requests at this time and one of those requests have been honored.

George Binder: What subsistence will mean in that sense is quite different than the subsistence that is talked about in the Udall Bill. He talks about subsistence, and subsistence management zoning. It seems to me that he's talking more about a lifestyle and not so much about income supplement. It seems to me that, that's your point is income supplement rather than preserving an ancient type of lifestyle. Is that true?

Representative Nels Anderson: No, that isn't correct. I don't think that we really settled on any one aspect of which way to approach the question on how we are going to deal with the subject at least I haven't yet. I'm not certain that I want to look at subsistence legally, I

don't know if that's going to be correct. I think your suggestion of describing subsistence and putting general parameters around the activity has some merit. I'm not going to look at subsistence from a total economic point of view. I think some of the suggestions that have been made throughout the State regarding lifestyle, culture, (inaudible) all the way into what we attempt to do, but I do believe that this committee has to do something that has a specific charge from the Legislative Council and we've got to address the situation.

Representative Steve Cowper: I think what we're talking about relates more to a lifestyle with the people who voluntarily adopted it than anything else but if there's not enough to go around within that group what we're talking about is economics. You break it down.

George Binder: I think the Udall Bill certainly arranges them in the order of preference of subsistence user, then the commercial user, then the sportsman, then the non-consumptive user - something like that. He certainly gives all kinds of preferential treatment to the subsistence user and doesn't avoid the word Native. In an interview he said very strongly that he is trying desparately to preserve these ancient lifestyles, that is what he wants to do.

Representative Steve Cowper: I believe that Udall is determined to keep a subsistence preference (inaudible) and I don't know of very many people who are arguing with me. I'll put it that way. Of course this committee has gone further than that, we need to adopt some sort of policy on the State lands, too. Or lands on which the State has jurisdiction. So, we go a little further as far as the information we're seeking than the Udall Bill.

George Binder: Harvesting the salmon which is a big part of subsistence is done completely in State waters - it's under State control. So the question is where does the Federal government fit in there? In other words what - they can't guarantee the people who have a subsistence lifestyle a quantity of salmon because it's under the control of the State.

Gene Sundberg: I have a brief statement for the committee. I'm Vice-

president in charge of land for the Koniag Regional Corporation. My statement will be brief but basic, and I use the word basic because you know and I know that for the Eskimo, Indians as we of the Aleut race subsistence is basic. We all subsist in this life one way or another but in Alaska due to the harshness of the land and the sea it is more noticable. We live in areas that are inaccessible, some areas that don't have no stores others whose residents are scattered and villages, that travel with the herd or follow the sea mammals and there are many more reasons that you will hear on this tour of hearings. But the reason you are hearing this in others testimonies is because they want to tell you that in order for any of them to live through any of the above mentioned reasons, they must live off the land and sea, they must. Nobody but themselves is going to drop by and feed them. They have few jobs to provide them with case and food. Village life is a poor life, but I'm sure they tell you it's a good self-rewarding life. You and I like the way we're living too. It's our choice - people live the way they want to in most cases. And in those cases they must have the right to live their lives in the traditional manner that they used too. They shouldn't be told that they cannot hunt and fish for the food that keeps them alive now and that has kept them alive for centuries. And should keep them alive for centuries more. And why are they being told because the resource is being depleted. The resource is near distinction, that they must call a 10 year moratorium in order to increase the stock, that you may only kill a few in order to preserve the species.

Why all the absurd reasoning - simply because somebody in the regulatory agencies made some bad mistakes in years past. Now the natives and subsistence users must suffer - why should their food and livelihood's now challenged and possibly taken away because certain agencies gave away their resources without thinking of the native concern. This point has been proven time and time again.

We all remember water fowl problem at Barrow. The recent caribou count difference. The walrus, the seal and the other day, the bowhead whale. The same agencies are trying to take away all the subsistence resources. The fisheries of the State are in trouble - who is to blame? Who's responsible? Mr. Chairman, I say that it isn't the Indian, the Eskimo,

or the Aleut. You'll remember them as the original environmentalists who certainly wouldn't bite the hand that feeds them. The answer lies with the people who manage these resources and the mistakes they made in years past and continue to make in our time. It's about time these problem areas are recognized and we put people on our local State and National Boards who are cognizant of the problems of the subsistence users and recognize that the people who rely on the land and sea for their food, clothing and shelter are also guaranteed their happiness in life and liberty by allowing their traditional heritage of the hunting and fishing process.

Representative Steve Cowper: Gene, do you think that the local Fish and Game Boards have really had the authority to bend the rules some?

Gene Sundberg: More things at the local level, it gets a lot more input from the users of the area and it sure makes a lot more people happier.

Representative Steve Cowper: Do you see any, and I don't know the answer to this, potential or conflict between subsistence users and commercial fishermen: Is there any conflict here in general - is it a problem?

Gene Sundberg: I'm not sure - I'm not a commercial fisherman - I am a sport fisherman and as far as I'm concerned there hasn't been a conflict between myself and a commercial fisherman. I've known of cases that I've heard about that there is definite areas of conflict and I'm sure that a lot of the commercial fisherman can relate those to you - I'm sure there's some here.

Representative Steve Cowper: I'm interested primarily in conflict that might exist between subsistence users and commercial fishermen. I think everybody who has testified in hearings throughout the state, just about everybody has noticed the conflict between subsistence users and sport. I just wondered since there was such a large commercial enterprise of fishing in Kodiak I just wondered if there were any conflicts there.

Gene Sundberg: Nothing that has been brought to the public that I'm

aware of. I know there - Mr. Malutin - I know he related some differences at one of the other hearings that of course I didn't attend and possibly he could come back and relay those to you or oany of the other fishermen.

Karl Armstrong: I would like to testify first for the Kodiak Island Conservation Society and in doing so endorse what has been testified to by Mr. Sundberg and then I would like to speak for myself as an individual. I'm old enough to recall catching salmon and what is now used as a sewer in downtown Kodiak - that was the silver salmon stream and that was the silver salmon stream for the residents of the village of Kodiak. I recall being able to fish for Salmon trout (inaudible) at Mission Beach and that was closed off. I recall being able to catch Salmon at Mill Bay and that was closed off. I can recall even the days when we were able to catch Silver Salmon in what we call now Mission Lake, and the creek that feeds it and Potato Patch Lake and the creek that feeds it. Those are virtually sewers today. In just the last month I watched two more creeks die, one of them is known as Menashka River and the other is known as Pillar Creek through mismanagment, through a disregard for the resources, through a total lack of concern on the part of the Department of Fish & Game and other agencies of the State and Federal Government. I lay the blame on the State and Federal agencies. I feel that there should be rehabilitation of these creeks and that there should be damages paid to the people that depended upon those creeks. I think that the time has got to end in this area when official agencies are closing their eyes and doing absolutely nothing to carry out the duties that they were created for. What good is Fish and Game if there is no Fish and Game. What good is any of these agencies they don't seek and they don't hear and they don't do anything about it - the destruction - the absolute total destruction of a salmon run or the trout run into creeks where they have taken or permitted to be taken all of the water. They spend all summer chasing people away from taking the salmon properly so that are going up stream. I don't know how many dollars were spent to protect those streams for the salmon to run through them. At the end of the spawning season they close their eyes and they don't see that all the water has dissappeared because of the lack of planning, the lack of concern for this resource. It just doesn't make good sense. It's an ecological disaster that needs to be corrected. The

silver salmon streams played an important role in the lives of all the people in this area when it was a smaller village, when it was a smaller town than it is and even today there is no reason why that creek that runs through the middle of town, it still runs through the middle of town, but it's used as a sewer, literally, they confined it inside of this big, round concrete, conduits and it racesthrough town - it's an "improvement" not. It could have been handled properly, it could have been channeled during the urban renewal. It could have been on top of the town, it could be producing salmon today but nobody cared and none of the agencies whose job it is to take care of those things did anything to take care of it. We've had 16 years go by and they still haven't done anything about it. We wouldn't have subsistence problems in the Kodiak area if these of all these streams which seemed to be producing salmon for us. At least in regards to salmon.

I wanted to protest before the Committee and urge that the committee consider those aspects of salmon that I had described here and in this concern for subsistence and subsistence users that they try to do something to insure that there is going to be rehabilitation of these creeks and that there will be adequate protection in the future to see that these disasters do not reoccur. If I were to list - I have been a subsistence fisherman, I have been a commercial fisherman, and I have been a sports fisherman and I believe from time to time am one or the other or all three. If I were to list them in order of importance, I have no doubt in my mind that I would list them 1) Subsistence, and by that I mean people who traditional make salmon, if that's what they're talking about, a main staple in their diet, 2) the commercial fisherman, because that is a way people make their living, and also obtain food for their families and 3) sports fisherman - I don't feel like it's a crime to Sports Fish - I enjoy it. I don't think that sports fishermen should be given some sort of exalted position. I think it is the least important of the three uses if there are only three uses.

Representative Joe Hayes: I've got a comment. I certainly (inaudible) and your sentiments that something should be done about rehabilitation and going a little further on that on the streams your speaking of - you mentioned some of them being used probably for sewage discharge and carrying the fluid out to the tidewater or whatever, but why are the

streams you mentioned earlier are drying up - The problem you mentioned isn't all the Alaska Department of Fish and Game - goes into overall broad management of our State and our Resources, I'm talking in terms of water being a resource. What is the problem as far as you let the fish go upstream and spawn but there's not enough water or there's not the right kind of water.

Karl Armstrong: There's not enough water, Sir, because they build dams. They make value judgements, apparently, and they decide that the water is more important used in some other place, than it is to keep salmon eggs alive or the salmon or the trout that are in the streams. I'm not suggesting that the water isn't needed somewhere else. I'm suggesting that very strongly I believe, in heart and soul, that there's a way that there has to be a way to use the water resource that you show that you are an intelligent specie of life yourself. It doesn't make good sense to kill off two salmon streams, utterly and completely, and lets say that using it to provide water for the salmon canneries. Now how much sense does that make to the salmon canner? And it will make less sense to the salmon fisherman. It's just a senseless destruction of a resource. The tradedy of it is, and I've mentioned this, I think, before, I have watched as we have had the "protection" effort, if you wish to call it that, grow from a couple of men, to god knows how many they have in those buildings downtown now. I don't believe that the protection effort is better, I think it's probably worse than it has ever been. At least back in the days when there was only two portecting the resource they managed to keep from killing off whole runs of salmon, and because of this, this is my personal opinion, and I would endorse and I realize that you are a State group and you probably don't agree with this. But my personal opinion is that until the State of Alaska demonstrates that it has the sense and the capability to handle these resources properly, that we must return to Federal control of Fish and Game in the State of Alaska. Because right here in the community of Kodiak there's a shameful disregard for the resource. There's an inexcuseable disregard and concern for the people who depend on that resource. I don't like Federal control anymore than I like State control. I like local control. But I don't know that we have the ability to protect these resources either. But I do know, I have been here when the federals controlled these resources, and believe me they did a much

better job than the State of Alaska is doing today. And they did it with far fewer people, they did it with two people while like the State of Alaska is spending, I don't know how much money. I don't know how many people are employed down there but they are not getting the job done and it needs to be looked at and it needs to be looked at by this committee from a subsistence standpoint. Why, how long are you going to tolerate this - I don't mean to be abusive or accusatory perhaps I'm trying to be accusatory, only for the purpose of trying to induce you to do something.

Representative Nels Anderson: Well, Karl your points are well taken. And your not the only one that has taken a stance and throwing some mighty huge stones at the Department of Fish and Game and I'm not going to apologize for their past mistakes nor am I going to be their defender as a member of this committee. I realize that they have made some serious mistakes in the past, this has been pointed out in other areas of the State - in Fairbanks, Glennallen, Nenana, Nome, Kotzebue. There is just absolutely no way this committee could ignore the fact that the Department has been accused of incompetence and what recommendations that will result from this criticism is unknown at this time. I don't know what recommendation we are going to make. I think it would be rather drastic to make the recommendation to return control to the Feds because I fear that prospect mightily. But we have to consider the fact that you have stated what you've said. There is merit in what you have said and we are going to have to discuss that in committee and make a recommendation to the legislature on what we must do to try to correct the situation.

Representative Steve Cowper: Karl, I've got to know what happened to those two rivers we've knocked all around besides I still don't know what happened to them Menashka and the other one.

Karl Armstrong: They just diverted all the water out of them.

Steve Cowper: They just built dams, or what?

Karl Armstrong: Well, the way I put it was that there were a bunch of Japanese owned seafood processing plants that needed water. So they

took all the water from our creeks and put it into the Japanese seafood processing plants and killed all our salmon.

Frank Peterson, KANA Executive Director: Mr. Chairman I would like to invite several people who insisted on developing this testimony, I would like to ask them to come up and sit behind me for physical or moral support - Ivar Malutin, Larry Matfay, Old Harbor, Gust Rastopsoff, Larson Bay and Arthur Panamaroff from Karluk, if he's here. Mr. Chairman, members of the Interim Committee on Subsistence and guest my name is Frank R. Peterson, president of the Kodiak Area Native Association. I would like to read parts of the testimony, the highlights parts of the testimony. On behalf of the officers, directors and Staff of the Kodiak Area Native Association I wish to express my appreciation for this opportunity to present testimony regarding subsistence in the Kodiak area. Sitting with me today to continue discussing and learning about subsistence are Mr. Ivar Malutin, Kodiak, Larry Maffay of Old Harbor, Lester Stopsoff from Larson Bay, and Arthur Panamaroff of Karluk. Other participants who were involved in discussing subsistence prior to this day are Nick Peterson, Wayne Marshall, Bob Worl, Emil Christensen, Walter Stanley, Lois Stover, Martha Matfay, Senafont Zeedar, Matt Jamin, Janet Wente, and Fred Zharoff.

I wish to commend the committee on its efforts and undertaking to address the issue of subsistence. In reviewing the committee's letter announcing these public hearings today, we found ourselves unable to respond or to react to the stated goals of this committee. In regard to the specific questions the committee is seeking public comment on, it was our consensus that we are presently unable to respond completely enough to adequately express and represent the views of the people in our village communities, without adequate time and cash resource with which to gather and collect such information from the village people. Since the issue of subsistence has not been collectively nor publicly discussed or addressed here in the Kodiak area before, we have determined not to respond to the questions posed by the committee without adequate research and discussion with those who would be directly affected by any control on subsistence.

However, in our discussions concerning subsistence, we have come up with

some comments and statements of concern on subsistence which we think should be reviewed and included in the committee's report of findings and recommendations to the 1978 session of the Legislature:

Laws are generally predicated on the assumption that the cash economy exists everywhere in the State, urban, and rural alike! Just as it does in places like Anchorage, Kodiak or Fairbanks. This is not so in our villages.

A national concern every year is the percentage rate of unemployment, whereby anything above seven percent unemployment rate is an issue of grave national concern! In the village the unemployment rate, for the majority of eligible workers, is 70% to 90%! What is referred to as subsistence here is and has been a natural activity for all or most Native people in the Kodiak areas. In the villages, the law of the empty stomach prevails over any other law.

There is a saying that applies here as well as in other coastal villages, "when the tide is out, the table is set..."

We present the following discussion regarding the issue of subsistence for your information and review:

AREAS OF CONCERN FOR "SUBSISTENCE"

Definitions set too tight on limitations - it should be descriptive and qualitative in scope.

Economics of Subsistence

Subsistence, as we understand it, is oriented towards pursuing/acquiring Natural Resources for food, clothing, shelter, fuel, utilitarian items, and arts and crafts.

Aboriginally Native people were dependant solely on an exchange, or barter economy; trading foods, tools, clothing or raw materials with others, so that natural resources were well distributed. Modern times have seen some addition of cash to this system for purchase of equipment

and transportation but it is still a traditional system and the person who accepts cash for a share of a subsistence resources makes no profit since no amount is charged for time, labor, and often equipment use such as snow machine, boat and even charter flight costs. The money received seldom if ever, covers these costs. Therefore, the Native economic exchange of goods and food, is not solely dollar oriented.

There is no direct relation between cash income and need for subsistence foods. Some places, cash serves only to supplement what we can obtain from the seand and land. To replace the foods we get would be more expensive than the cash we have left over from fishing.

Social-Aspects of Subsistence

The social structure of a Native group or tribe is tied up in the organization for subsistence. It is not something that one person does alone, but he depends on help from family or frieds, sometimes, even from other communitites. Subsistence, as we know it, is a cooperative, community and group oriented affair.

The distribution of subsistence resources is the same; it goes to family, friends and those in need. Much of this aspect of subsistence is tied to traditions as old as a group's history.

The organization for subsistence has three types of people involved:

1. Harvesters - who actually go after the resource.
2. Users - who receive the bounty?
3. Cash providers - who may support activities of harvesters with cash services, equipment, in exchange for a share of the resources.

Cultural Values of Subsistence

This aspect is often founded in antiquity and has a continued, modified over time, to the present day. Kinship based activity, sharing between families and communities are examples of this.

Food preferences, choices of occupation, and choice of a place to live one's life are other examples of cultural influences which also relate to subsistence. It is the total relationship of group to their chosen environment and its resources - the way people feel. It is often difficult to put into words. These things are often called a "cultural heritage." Certain subsistence activities provide status in the community and family and self-esteem. It effects the way people feel about themselves. The expectations they have learned from parents and grandparents.

Certain methods of exploiting resources for subsistence are cultural. Feelings about spiritual life of animals, winds and the land and their expression and enhancement in songs, stories and artwork are expressions of the importance of subsistence. These areas are seldom clearly understood or easily articulated but are vital to a cultural way of life. The National Environmental Protection Act of 1969 recognizes the social, cultural, psychological and economic importance of subsistence to Native life.

You have a number of specific questions that I will not ask. We've responded to a certain comments and certain press coverage related to subsistence and we had additional questions that I will ask of the committee that is part of our testimony.

In concluding, we appreciate your efforts in addressing this very important issue of subsistence. We hope you understand our reluctance to respond to your specific questions at this time, and that this committee would consider our request for financial resources adequate to generate the answers to the questions you raise, from Native people here in the city, as well as in the village. We estimate that a period up to one year would be adequate to develop a more specific statement regarding subsistence in the Kodiak area. We would request that recommendations and legislation you propose will have built in to them ways to consider our future recommendations and to amend any laws which apply. Thank you.

Representative Steve Cowper: You said a lot of very important things, I think perhaps the most important is simply that there is not a cash

economy in most small villages. I think it's something that the people of the Congress, never did understand until they actually came to Alaska and went into some of the villages of the State and I think perhaps some of them at least do understand that. We got such comments, by Congressmen from back east someplace, one of them said well, I thought all natives were rich now. The Claims Act is been an Act that, of course nobody bothered to tell him that not much has come down yet. Had another one in Maryland - You don't need subsistence hunting and fishing anymore because you're eligible for food stamps. So you know that people like that trip through Alaska is a real education.

Dick Wamser: I don't have a statement either, I've been out of town for awhile and I think just about everything has been said here that can be said. It goes around subsistence considerably and there is a lot of questions and statements and I can't help but agree with every single one of them that has been made concerning subsistence. I'm a commercial fisherman at times. The last couple of years I've been working in town so I don't really depend on subsistence in any way shape or form anymore I used to like hunting, I used to go sports fishing, I've done a little bit but it's been quite awhile since I've done all of them. I think that my opinion should be stated here because really there's really three, perhaps four different types of uses of the resources, the fish and game resources. The first obviously to me anyway is the subsistence should be defined if it can be defined. I never thought of it before but it's something that a person's life may depend on. Very close to that is their personal use, which is a habit. Which primarily here is the traditional use of the fish rather than the game. The fish is the most important here and it always has been. The third use would be commercial - a person whose livelihood in general depends on it since more and more people are being required to change to the cash economy. The last and definitely the least important, would be sports which is the killing and fishing for the fun of it. I was born here over in Afognak Island, which is one of the nicer areas around. Hunting is a nice thing. The last few years the only thing I've done is for sport. I think it's much less important and that's the main point I wanted to state of my opinion. There's a real big difference there, it's been talked about as subsistence is personal use. Personal use is nice, I like to smoke a few fish even though at times I could go down

and buy some, but most of the times it's not very good (the commercial variety). There's many other interpretations of subsistence, not interpretations of subsistence, rather but precedence of sports over subsistence which really, I think, is the question that is coming more and more to the forefront all the time is that it would be extremely unjust and it's something that you can't legislate a person's way of life or his livelihood or his right to even live. It's only that kind of thing that causes disrespect for the law cause when a person gets down to a point where he can't live he's going to say heck with the Law. He's going to try to live as much as he can. I don't think we need anymore of that - there's a great deal of that in this country today and the control issue is something that can only be done locally. It's proved for years that bureaucrats in distant locations are never going to effectively answer the problems. They have the so called Advisory Boards and various things of that sort but the majority of the times that's exactly what they are - advisory - this function should be brought right down, not only in fishing but in almost in every other issue to local control not just advice - local control by the people who are most directly affected.

Pete Olson: I was born and raised in Alaska. I guess I spent over a month in the so-called United States. I have this distinction that many people don't have that after I was three years, Congress was nice enough to have me become a citizen of the United States that's pretty nice of them. You, I don't know your name but you mentioned something that Congressmen think that we are rich people now. I'll tell you a little secret - we're spending all of our money on lawyers trying to get back what they say is ours so the rich Natives are only by-products of the lawyers. They're the ones who's getting the money. What is subsistence? This is what I've been hearing for so long. Whenever I try to do something or anyone tries to do something everybody is saying well, listen I've got my rights. I've always tried to live with that policy well, I've got rights - you have some too. But nobody said anything about or aboriginal rights that we had that the people that were born here and raised here - that they could have something to say about their lifestyles. Our lifestyle has been forced through socitey to change, with your lifestyle your culture changes. It can't help but do it.

Along the coast, the people lived on fish, that was their primary food. Slowly now we see it taken from us. One time I would go out here, I never had to go to anybody and tell them how many fish I want get - I went got X number of fish. My wife and I would can them, smoke them, salt them and if we had any that we could not use we did not throw it away. We gave it to somebody that could use it. We believed in that.

You look at the history, not only of Alaska but you look at the history of all of the United States - you could never say that the Indian killed off any game, any fish, it has always been the people that come in behind them. Not only took the resource but took the land as well, fenced them in. You say well, where does this lead us then. What should we do about it? I believe the Natives should be entitled to his rights that he had that from the time of his forefathers. We see right now today, look at the walrus now they want to cut the subsistence for the Natives there to put that into a sports fishing, a game animal. Now why should they be allowed to do that? Why should anyone be allowed to change a man's culture, a man's way of life, forcefully. If there's enough for game, fine, if there's not then cut the game out and let the Native people have enough to live on. We see the whale, the Native, the Eskimo never killed off the whale, he never made it an endangered species, but when it comes down to it he's the one that goes hungry. He sits down at the table with no food for him or his children. Why? Because somebody in Washington says look at these other foreign countries have the right to some of that fish and now who is left out. The people, right here, right in Alaska. This has been the way of the land ever since the pilgrims come - taking from somebody and not utilizing it. I don't have to tell any of you what happened to the buffalo. I don't have to tell you what happened to the whale. I don't have to tell you what happened to the sea otter. You know all of that. Not once has it ever been a Native, the Indian, or the Eskimo. Yet, when it comes time to put food on the table who is the one that goes hungry, because of somebody else's mistake? I don't believe the Native, Indian, Aleut, Eskimo should be penalized for this. I believe the people should be penalized that create this problem. I've got no objection when they start infringing on my lifestyle, my way of life, my culture that was here before they come. If they want to come up here and make a living, let them come up to make a living I got no objection to it. You can

look around Homer, Kenai area, look at the moose now. At one time there was moose anywhere there - it was not the Native that done that. Yet where did the penalty go? Right back to the Native. This is all I have to say and I hope it will merit something because this is the way it has been ever since time began. I just hope one thing that there has been a saying with your bureaucrats, with your governments that they have the habit of shooting the bull, passing the buck, and making million copies of it - I hope you don't do that.

Fred Zharoff: Mr. Chairman, members of the Interim Committee on Subsistence, Senator Poland, I have been a resident of the area for 30 years and I haven't really put that much thought into the concept of subsistence. I always thought of it as something that was available if there was a need to use it and I guess the more that you really think about it, particularly those areas on the mainland that they have reached areas that have reached critical stages. I suppose in Pt. Hope they have their problems, Anaktuvak Pass they have their problems and I think Kodiak will eventually have their problems.

The main source of subsistence here, I would imagine centers pretty much around fishing industry and there was a question raised earlier about does this really effect the commercial fisherman as opposed to the subsistence fisherman? We have certain regulations there that do not allow subsistence fishing during commercial season. Yet if you look at the intake there at subsistence as opposed to many of the projected runs we may be talking at the outset of maybe 5,000 fish maybe more as opposed to a run from anywhere from 3 million to 12 million fish so presently I don't foresee this as a problem but I would like to charge the committee there to in their evaluation of writing a definition for subsistence which I feel there really isn't one. One that you can come up with an adequate definition that would satisfy everyone. You take into consideration people in different localities. You talk about advisory boards making decisions that is going to ultimately effect people in that locality. We have an advisory board here locally that has tried to make decisions that effect the people of Larson Bay and Karluk limiting their subsistence of Steelhead. I don't understand why we have to allow something like this to continue. People over there depend on this. Now this is their livelihood through the winter

time. Sure they're eligible for food stamps. Yes, there's a store but what do you do in February when you haven't had a mail plane or a boat for the last three months and you've had the opportunity to obtain your fish in August and September and yet you were not allowed to do this. Who is going to come along and bring you the staples that you need? I think this is something that should be taken into consideration. Mr. Cowper mentioned there that (Inaudible). I don't want to address it totally to villagers as totally subsistence people. There are other people also that depend on subsistence and I think their need should be taken into consideration as well. To sit here and arbitrarily make a decision that affects somebody that you have never seen, that you are not familiar with their lifestyle I think is totally wrong. I think that if they wish to make a decision such as this that they should go out there and live on what is available and then come back and make a decision. And see if they can actually live with it.

Another interesting, and you brought up I suppose as a possible solution and I'll just react to it. Suggest that perhaps an immediate answer to solve this problem of subsistence would be parallel to the immediate to our commercial fishing problem which is the limited entry. That subsistence be based on a "limited entry." That limited entry permits be issued for subsistence be it fisheries, be it hunting or whatever. With basic criteria based upon years of residence. Lifetime residents getting enough points automatically. Not any discrimination whatsoever, lifetime residence. Suppose we start with a limited number of permits as was suggested. I suppose to be determined by a limited entry commission of some sort based on subsistence. I don't envy you of making a decision, I don't envy you of going back (inaudible) your task is probably just beginning.

Male in Audience: I think there's a great deal of merit to this. That it may come to this because certainly there are difference not only in a lifestyle but where you live that make subsistence absolutely vital and essential and if the permits keep increasing such as Ivar mentioned jumping up to 800 in this community and when you see people in the cities get permits and fly to some of these areas and infringe on their game and fish that people there need to live off there is a problem.

Representative Joe Hayes: I would like to follow up and make a comment on what they said regarding comment that Representative Cowper said. Yes, we did have a lot of people up here from U.S. Congress and they've got a look at Alaska that maybe was a real eyeopener for them and maybe it's helped a lot in some of the changes you were hearing about in the Udall Bill and so forth. And just to follow up on what he said and I certainly agree is that this is a big state and we have 60 people in the legislature and I'm one of the 60 people and I've been around a little bit more than most and not as much as some and I think that we really have a responsibility on the State level to try to see more of this State, this big country. There's a real difference from Southeastern to the North Slope and I understood you correctly, I think that was what you were toughing on, is that we're making decisions on the state level that is effecting the lives of people about which we know very little and then whatever limitations we can, make a go for ourselves we should try to become more familiar, and I certainly will support that and I'm trying to do that myself. I hope that others do also because we really need the insight into the problems outside of Anchorage, Fairbanks, Kodiak to solve some of these problems to everybody's satisfaction.

Fred Zharoff: Mr. Chairman, my reflection there was not the intent to make the legislators aware of the problems throughout the state, but rather the people there that are ultimately responsible for the final decision making that they not let pressure groups or people with influence or certain interests steer their judgement from what they actually know or assume to be right for the people that have to survive on this and then submit proposals for regulation change there that benefit their pressure groups. This is my concern. Mr. Malutin, I think when he mentioned there that he had been forced out of several areas. Karluk is a fantastic river for fishing and my goodness just the other week here we had a celebrity come here just to fish the Karluk. Does this mean we close down all of the Karluk River just for people that can afford to fish there? Do we close it all the way down for subsistence just to reserve that little bit of fish there for people that can afford to come in? This is my concern. I think it's probably the concern of many people particularly those that have to survive on what is there. They cannot leave their villages to travel

for 3 or 4 weeks at a time to obtain all the other fish there that they need 10 miles away from their villages when the fish is coming right next door - it doesn't seem right.

Jack Christenson: I'm from Old Harbor. I'm from a big family - 19. My Dad never did have a job working anyplace, but fishing and that's all he did. I think if we didn't have no fish to go fishing for, but to (inaudible) during the fall season and to have somebody to come and say you stay out of there because we want to sports fish. I don't see any reason for them to come in and say that we cannot get our limit of fish. We limit our fish, we don't go in there and wipe out the whole thing. I imagine, if everybody from down south or wherever they come from got up here and (inaudible) streams, I'm not saying they are, but that's our livelihood right now - I don't do nothing but fish cause I was taught that and my Dad taught me that with the rest of our family.

My whole family fishes and my father did. If I had my permit and I have to take it to the stream everytime I went up there and there is somebody saying you lost your permit you can't go in there and I'm going to say there is no way you can chase me out of the stream I've been going up there for 24 years. I love fishing, I love going up there to see them fish. When I was a kid, and I still do it now, I dry my own fish, I split it, I do everything I want with my fish but I don't waste it. That's one thing I want to say is that my Mom and Dad raised 19 kids in that time there was no jobs in Old Harbor and all we had was fish, clams anything from the ocean. My Mom doesn't like canned food or anything right now and she's still alive, my Dad passed away, the rest of my family is still living in Old Harbor and that's a lot of what we depend on is fish. That's all I have to say.

Larry Matfay: I was born in Ahkiok, but I live in Old Harbor. I'm only 70. My school days are really poor I didn't put too much school in. I've been out with my dad in a Kayak. (Inaudible) he like Kayak better. He used to go sea otter hunting. He used to go up in Olga Bay - early fish come there. We split those fish too. Everybody pick them up and dry them. And they won't take anymore. Then in the middle of the summer they move down a ways and split more fish - dog salmon. Then they move again (inaudible) whole bunch of them and they die you know.

I eat even raw fish - some places we don't have no stoves to cook our salmon. Up in the lakes we eat raw fish. Of course we cook the meat. I like whale (inaudible) I don't get it down here anymore. I used to there used to be whaler here before - one guy used to go out in a Kayak down in Alitak and in Old Harbor. You don't see anymore around here now one or two. (inaudible sentences) eggs, we dry eggs, salmon eggs. (More inaudible sentences). I ate them myself and dry them. (More inaudible sentences) They are good - dried eggs. We're limited on 25 fish. My wife's 25 fish - we split fish - even my grand kids 6 years old now split fish. (More inaudible sentences) I hang them up and dry them. I got 14 grandchildren, all blue-eyed and red headed. (Inaudible sentences) I taught them how to do this even out of the sea - I showed them how to get stuff out of the sea like the tide goes out and you get clams. I eat raw clams, I eat sea eggs, I eat raw octopus, and all the kelp. (More inaudible sentences) even if I have 25 fish home I'm going to take all those with me cause I know there's some up there. I hope they don't drop it - because all our kids in Old Harbor from the beginning eat fish and animals. (More inaudible sentences) bear, seal, sea lion, (more inaudible sentences) One time I had to (inaudible.)

Representative Nels Anderson: There's some people that wanted to make some comments and if there's no one else wanting to testify we will let people make comments and questions that you may have.

David Morrison: I would just like to make an addition to Mr. Malutin's testimony on the number of subsistence permits that have been issued. I think one of the main reasons why there have been so many permits every year is that there just about freely given. The only question that I have ever been asked when I've gone to apply is - Did you turn in the record from last year? If you said yes and then they give it to you. I think there should be more strength in regulation to obtain such permits. Because I've known many people that have just gone out well, I'm going to go subsistence fishing. I'm going to go get my permit and I'm going to go out and get so many fish and get my picture taken and I'm going to give them away - they don't even use them - they don't even like fish, but yet they'll go out and get a subsistence fishing license. I don't think this is right. Every year more and

and more of the areas are just closed down. Every year there's new additions - you have to go further and further away to get anything and me personally I don't have any means of going further and further away - I don't own a boat, don't own a skiff, I couldn't go - I'd have to be right now off shore and they've just closed down so many of the areas that you just can't do that anymore. That's about all I have to say.

Representative Joe Hayes: Mr. Matfay mentioned that in Old Harbor - the way I understood him was that there are 25 fish per person. Is that the way it is all over the area?

David Morrison: Yes, it is in Kodiak. That's the only place I've ever subsistence fished before. It's 25 fish per person in town.

Representative Joe Hayes: Is that enough for a family?

David Morrison: No. I only have maybe 40 fish this year and of those 40 I think I have nine left in the freezer right now and that's not even getting me into the winter. One reason I didn't get my quota is the means the access to get out. The reason being that more and more areas are being closed down.

Representative Nels Anderson: If there is no one else. I know it's getting late and again I would like to remind people that if you did not make your statement tonight and those of you that may come in contact with people tell them to please get in touch with us. Write to us in Juneau or to the Subsistence Committee in Dillingham, and we will take your testimony and comments and letters into consideration as we take a close look at the subject that we're trying to wrestle with now again if you would like, Dorothy Larson, our Staff Assistant, could give you our address and you could write to us if you have some other ideas that we did not express this evening. I would like to thank all of you that did appear tonight and thank those of you who did share your thoughts with us. We deeply appreciate your taking the time to attend this meeting. Adjourned.

Kodrak hearing
10-17-77

^{difficult}
~~IMPOSSIBLE~~ TO DEVELOP A SIMPLE, RIGOROUS DEFINITION OF SUBSISTENCE. However, there are still many people who depend greatly upon natural resources in order to make a living; there are also many for whom subsistence living is culturally the way of life. Of necessity or by choice, they live off the land. To a great degree - they subsist. Activities in support of these life styles include hunting, fishing, trapping, and gathering traditional wild foods and other organic materials. Of necessity, practitioners of subsistence life styles live in areas of low human population density. Historically and throughout Alaska, hunting and gathering societies were distributed at low densities as mandated by the productivity and characteristics of the ecosystems of which they were a part. Furthermore, to be successful at subsistence living, they must have the dedication, knowledge and skills, which in essence make them "professionals" at hunting, fishing and trapping.

The Alaska Conservation Society supports the concept of subsistence use of natural resources by Alaskans for the following reasons.

1. There are strong cultural affinities for subsistence living among natives and non-natives, even though the basis for these affinities differs.
2. The existence of viable subsistence life styles provides our society at large with an added and positive element of diversity, which enriches both subsistence users and others.
3. Subsistence life styles, properly pursued, are environmentally less disruptive and less destructive than life styles associated with modern agrarian or industrial societies. Regulated and controlled, subsistence activities can be an ecologically sound means of supporting people in rural Alaska.
4. Subsistence use remains an economic necessity for many rural Alaskans.
5. Subsistence use has always been a natural part of true wilderness, contrary to today's popular notion of wilderness as "...a place where animals live, but people only visit."

Hunting:

Hunting, fishing and trapping are pursuits that figure prominently in virtually the whole spectrum of Alaskan life styles. However, given the current "mobility" of individuals with respect to life styles, some people are often involved in the exploitation of living resources for different reasons at different times. Similarly, the use of a given species can, at different times, be for different purposes by the same person. This is true with respect to hunting, trapping and fishing. For these and other reasons, attempts to distinguish among

commercial-sport-subsistence fishing or subsistence-sport-trophy hunting as practiced by many Alaskans have been unsuccessful. The material, physical and psychological rewards of these pursuits are all of importance; the degree of each depending on circumstances.

Although fishes and fishing are of great importance, and the factors affecting fish populations and aquatic habitats are, in a broad sense, quite similar to those affecting birds and mammals, the question of fishing does not currently engender the kind of debate that hunting and trapping do. Current attention within Alaska and nationally is focused on the issue of hunting.

Hunting wild game is a pursuit as old as mankind; in fact, hunting was crucial to man's evolutionary development. However, in modern life, relatively few people are confronted with the necessity of hunting or gathering food, nor with the reality that their life depends upon the death of other living things. Hunting brings this relationship into sharp focus, and emphasizes man's need for a more responsible attitude toward other species and their habitat.

Because of the contributions of hunting to Alaskan life styles through its physical and psychological challenges and rewards, we believe that hunting in its various forms should be provided for in land dedication and management. We consider hunting to be very important among the array of potential wildland uses. Again, a continuum exists between the extremes of hunting as a dominant desirable use of wildlands in some circumstances to those situations, such as national parks and monuments, within which it is neither desirable nor compatible with other important uses.

However, if hunting is to survive as a positive element, some hard realities must be recognized and reckoned with.

1. Biological productivity. The basic long-term productivity of Alaskan lands is low, and the abundance of plants and animals varies dramatically over any period of years. Hunting and other wildland uses must be regulated in accord with these basic principles, or neither the wildland uses nor the wildland resources will survive in a healthy condition.
2. Human Population Density. For subsistence life styles with a high direct dependence on hunting and gathering to be perpetuated, low densities of users in relation to resources must be maintained. In the past, availability of resources limited human numbers, but today many constraints on human population have been removed. Therefore, regulations are necessary to insure that increased human use does not damage wildland resources.
3. Modern Technology. Technology has increased the efficiency of all

ON LAND AND ITS RESOURCES.

Subsistence:

Within the existing, broad spectrum of life styles there is an array of "Alaskan" life styles including many so-called "subsistence" life styles. Subsistence life styles are a complex mixture of traditionally native, traditionally non-native, and completely new elements that vary tremendously from place to place, from one individual to another and from year to year. For these and other reasons, WE BELIEVE IT IS

KODIAK AREA NATIVE ASSOCIATION

BOX 172
KODIAK, ALASKA 99615
PHONE: (907) 486-5726

STATEMENT OF THE
KODIAK AREA NATIVE ASSOCIATION
ON SUBSISTENCE
FOR THE INTERIM COMMITTEE ON SUBSISTENCE

October 17, 1977

Mr. Chairman, members of the Interim Committee on Subsistence, and guests:
My name is Frank R. Peterson, President of KANA,
On behalf of the officers, directors and staff of the Kodiak

Area Native Association, I wish to express our appreciation for this opportunity to present testimony regarding subsistence in the Kodiak area.

Sitting with me today to continue discussing and learning about subsistence are Messrs., Iver Malutin of Kodiak, Larry Matfay of Old Harbor, Gust Rastopsoff of Larsen Bay, Arthur Panamaroff of Karluk. Other participants who were involved in discussing subsistence prior to this day are: Nick Peterson, Wayne Marshall, Bob Worl, Emil Christiansen, Walter Stanley, Lois Stover, Martha Matfay, Senafont Zeedar, Matt Jamin, Janet Wente, and Fred Zharoff.

I wish to commend the committee on its efforts and undertaking to address the issue of subsistence. In reviewing the committee's letter announcing these public hearings today, we found ourselves unable to respond or to react to the stated goals of this committee. In regard to the specific questions the committee is seeking public comment on, it was our consensus that we are presently unable to respond completely enough to adequately express and represent the views of the people in our village communities, without adequate time and cash resource with which to gather and collect such information from the village people. Since the issue of subsistence has not been collectively nor publicly discussed or addressed here in the Kodiak area before, we have determined not to respond to the

to the questions posed by the committee without adequate research and discussion with those who would be directly affected by any control on subsistence.

However, in our discussions concerning subsistence, we have come up with some comments and statements of concern on subsistence which we think should be reviewed and included in the committee's report of findings and recommendations to the 1978 session of the Legislature:

Laws are generally predicated on the assumption that the cash economy exists everywhere in the State, urban and rural alike! Just as it does in places like Anchorage, Kodiak or Fairbanks. This is not so in our villages.

A national concern every year is the percentage rate of unemployment, whereby anything above seven percentile unemployment rate is an issue of grave national concern! In the village the unemployment rate, for the majority of eligible workers, is 70% to 90%! What is referred to as subsistence here is and has been a natural activity for all or most Native people in the Kodiak areas. In the villages, the law of the empty stomach prevails over any other law.

There is a saying that applies here as well as in other coastal villages that, "when the tide is out, the table is set..."

We present the following discussion regarding the issue of subsistence for your information and review:

AREAS OF CONCERN FOR "SUBSISTENCE"

Definitions set too tight on limitations - it should be descriptive and qualitative in scope.

Economics of Subsistence

Subsistence, as we understand it, is oriented towards pursuing/acquiring

Natural Resources for food, clothing, shelter, fuel, utilitarian items, and arts and crafts.

Aboriginally Native people were dependant solely on an exchange, or barter economy; trading foods, tools, clothing or raw materials with others, so that natural resources were well distributed. Modern times have seen some addition of cash to this system for purchase of equipment and transportation but it is still a traditional system and the person who accepts cash for a share of a subsistence resources makes no profit since no amount is charged for time, labor, and often equipment use such as snow machine, boat and even charter flight costs. The money received seldom, if ever, covers these costs. Therefore, the Native economic exchange of goods and food, is not solely dollar oriented.

There is no direct relation between cash income and need for subsistence foods. Some places, cash serves only to supplement what we can obtain from the sea and land. To replace the foods we get would be more expensive than the cash we have left over from fishing.

Socio-economics of Subsistence

Social Aspects of Subsistence

The social structure of a Native group or tribe is tied up in the organization for subsistence. It is not something that one person does alone, but he depends on help from family or friends, sometimes, even from other communities. Subsistence, as we know it, is a cooperative, community and group oriented affair.

The distribution of subsistence resources is the same; it goes to family, friends and those in need. Much of this aspect of subsistence is tied to traditions as old as a group's history.

The organization for subsistence has three types of people involved:

1. Harvesters - who actually go after the resource.
2. Users - who receive the bounty?
3. Cash providers - who may support activities of harvesters with cash

services, equipment, in exchange for a share of the resources.

Cultural Values of Subsistence

This aspect is often founded in antiquity and has continued, modified over time, to the present day. Kinship based activity, sharing between families and communities are examples of this.

Food preferences, choices of occupation, and choice of a place to live one's life are other examples of cultural influences which also relate to subsistence. It is the total relationship of a group to their chosen environment and its resources - the way people feel. It is often difficult to put into words. These things are often called a "cultural heritage." Certain subsistence activities provide status in the community and family and self-esteem. It effects the way people feel about themselves. The expectations they have learned from parents and grandparents.

Certain methods of exploiting resources for subsistence are cultural. Feelings about spiritual life of animals, winds and the land and their expression and enhancement in songs, stories and artwork are expressions of the importance of subsistence. These areas are seldom clearly understood or easily articulated but are vital to a cultural way of life.

The National Environmental Protection Act of 1969 recognizes the social, cultural, psychological and economic importance of subsistence to Native life.

We ask these questions of the Interim Committee on Subsistence:

- 1) Why are they having a hearing in Kodiak?
- 2) What regulations or suggestions does the State have on subsistence?
- 3) No one has ever discussed subsistence before, especially in the Villages.
- 4) Do we have to be so limited in our use that we can't feed visiting

family and friends?

- 5) Is the State considering on how much someone can earn and still do subsistence hunting & fishing?
- 6) Will there be subsistence zones? Who will set up and control subsistence zones? Will they be regional or community, or state-wide?
- 7) Will people be restricted by these?
- 8) Fish is the major concern regarding subsistence. What kind of rules is the State considering concerning subsistence fishing? Some people in town don't really need the fish but they fill their permits. Sometimes things happen to the catch such as rain ruins drying fish, and those who need them can't go out and get another limit. Most Native people in the villages don't understand the present way of regulations and only know to take what they need, when they need it.
- 9) Reindeer - 600-700 of them, why keep the season open? Or are they caribou? We used to herd them and now the herders are gone and instead of being available to us when we need them, they are not regulated and are declining in numbers.

In most Native homes you don't always know how many people will be eating meals (four to a dozen or more). It's easy to go through a hind quarter of deer at a meal. During social events (bingo, church suppers, etc.) more meat is put out. The whole community shares in these events. Some families could easily use a whole deer or more a week.

- 10) Generally, people don't really pay much attention to this sharing of food because they never had to explain it until now. If sub-

sistence is tightly controlled and regulated, will these important social and family uses of subsistence foods have to end? Some people are concerned about listing the foods they eat and the amounts. We could get locked up with having only so much of certain things based on a few statements and this doesn't take into consideration that needs can be different from year to year.

- 11) What happens when there is a conflict between commercial use and subsistence use? In Southeast Alaska seaweed and herring roe and fish have all been restricted. Caribou in the North and moose and fish in the Interior are other examples. Now the Eskimos are facing total restriction of their Bowhead whale hunting. In 1971 or 2 the Federal government took control of all sea mammals but Native subsistence use was protected. Now the State has taken control again and there may be new restrictions based on the sportsman's needs, for use of these species.

General Comments and Reactions to Press Coverage on Subsistence

- * Welfare should NEVER be considered as an alternative to subsistence!
- * "Subsistence is a dead or dying way of life", is not true. It shows no understanding of tradition and change and the strength of culture.
- * "There are very few subsistence users in the State..." True only if subsistence is strictly defined on the basis of cash use as a supplement.
- * "The number one priority should be the protection of the resource", is meant to say only for guides and sportsman, claiming a prior right over those who have always depended on the game for their livelihood.
- * Cash is used more like a subsistence resource in rural Native communities, it supports a wider circle of people and is often distributed based on need or social obligation when it is available. It is a tool to use, not an end goal as in the Non-Native society.

MORE QUESTIONS

1) Subsistence Zoning viewed as important:

what will be the time frame for establishing zones?

what will be the method of setting boundaries?

who will set regulations within zones? how?

who will enforce? regulate? manage?

village people would have a strong voice in these matters

fear that boundaries may be restrictive and unchanging.

2) Resources:

protected for present subsistence use.

managed for future generations and subsistence use

conflict between sports, commercial, and subsistence users - who has priority?

what subsistence resources do we have to worry about?

3) Permits:

the right to a subsistence permit may be lost if a person doesn't turn permits in each time with harvest information from the last year

subsistence seasons are not always based on need or Native life style, but, as in the case of caribou, on the seasons for sport hunting

4) Right to subsistence hunting/fishing:

could be lost on the basis of income

not based on pounds of resource catalogued

not based on a determined dollar value of resource

not tied to "minimal nutritional needs"

5) Definition of Subsistence:

fear of restrictive definitions

not well understood within the Native community and time is needed to discuss and think about this

money should be made available to KANA so that information and discussion could occur at the village level

"We don't understand definitions, or rules, and regulations in the village. We only understand to go and get what we need."

fear that commercial involvement will lock people out of subsistence use

6) Regulations:

presently more oriented to sportsmans needs, than to subsistence needs

In concluding, we appreciate your efforts in addressing this very important issue of subsistence. We hope you understand our reluctance to respond to your specific questions at this time, and that this committee would consider our request for financial resources adequate to generate the answers to the questions you raise; from Native people here in the city, as well as in the villages. We estimate that a period up to one year would be adequate to develop a more specific statement regarding subsistence in the Kodiak area. We would request that recommendations and legislation you propose will have built in to them ways to consider our future recommendations and to amend any laws which apply.

Thank you.

1b

90 General Delivery
Kodiak, Alaska 99615
October 7, 1977

Nels A. Anderson, Chairman
Interim Committee on Subsistence
Box 234
Ellingsham, Alaska 99576

Dear Mr. Anderson:

I have read recently of your activities on behalf of the subsistence lifestyle in Alaska. I notice that you are proposing "subsistence zoning" under Alaska statutes. This is similar to the terminology in the Udall Bill Title VII, Sec. 701 (a) where it talks about "subsistence management zones". In neither case can I find the use of the word "Native" applied in these attempts to protect the subsistence way of life in Alaska.

But according to the paper, "The Alaska Natives and Their Subsistence Rights: A Discussion of the Constitutional Questions", written by former Secy. of the Interior Stewart L. Udall for the Alaska Federation of Natives, he claims that "the Alaska legislature cannot grant meaningful subsistence rights to the Alaska Natives" because to do so would violate the State's Constitution. He claims that only the Congress "has the authority to set up a subsistence system giving preference to the Natives" and that this would not be a violation of the U.S. Constitution. If this is true what is the value of your State Committee on Subsistence?

Very truly yours,

George Brider

My name is Gene Sundberg.
I am the Vice President in charge
of Fund for the Koyuk Regional
Native Corporation. My statement
will be brief, but basic, and I
use the word basic because, you
know and I know, that for the
Eskimos, Indians, and we, of
the Aleut race, subsistence
is basic.

We all subsist in this life one
way or another, but in Alaska,
due to the harshness of the
land and sea, it is more
noticeable. We live in areas
that are inaccessible, some in
areas that have no stores, others

whose residents are scattered,
villages that travel with the
herd or follow the sea mammals,
and there are many more reasons
that I'm sure you will hear on
this tour of hearings. But the
reason that you are hearing this
and others, testimonies, is because
they want to tell you that in order
for them to live through any of
the above mentioned reasons, they
must live off the land and sea.

They must. Nobody, but themselves
are going to drop by and feed
them. They have few jobs to
provide them with cash for food.
Village life is a poor life, but

I'm sure they'd tell you, it's a good self-rewarding life. You and I like the way we're living, too. It's our choice. People live the way they want to, in most cases. And in those cases they must have the right to live their lives in the traditional manner that they are used to. They shouldn't be told that they cannot hunt and fish for the food that keeps them alive, now, and has kept them alive for centuries, and should keep them alive for centuries more. And why are they being told? Because the resource is being depleted? The resource is

near extinction? That they must
call a 10 year moratorium in order
to increase the stock? That you
may only kill a few in order
~~to~~ to preserve a certain species?
Why all the absurd reasoning?

Simply, because somebody in the regulatory
agencies made some bad mistakes
in years past. And now the
Natives and subsistence users
must suffer. Why should they
~~not~~ have their food and lively-
hoods now ~~be~~ challenged
and possibly taken away because
certain agencies gave away the
resource without thinking of
the Native concern.

This point has been proven
time and time again. We all
remember the willful problem
at Barrow, the recent caribou
count difference, the Walrus,
Seal and the other day the
Bowhead whale. These same agencies
are trying to take away all the
subsistence resources. The
fisheries of the State are in
trouble. Who's to blame??

Who's responsible? Mr. Chairman,
I say it isn't the Eskimo, Indian
or Aleut. You'll remember them
as the original environmentalist,
who certainly wouldn't bite the
hand that feeds them.

The answer lies with the people who manage these resources, and the mistakes they made in years past and continue to make in our time. It's about time these problem areas are recognized and we put people on our local, state and national boards, who are cognizant of the problems of the subsistence users and recognize that the people who rely on the land & sea for their food, clothing & shelter are also guaranteed their happiness in life & liberty by allowing their traditional heritage of the hunting & gathering process.

· PLEASE NOTE: THE PRECEDING PAGES WERE TREATED
· AS A UNIT IN THE ORIGINAL DOCUMENT.

PLEASE NOTE: THE FOLLOWING PAGES WERE TREATED
AS A UNIT IN THE ORIGINAL DOCUMENT.

PUBLIC HEARING TESTIMONY

BY THE ALASKA STATE LEGISLATURE
INTERIM COMMITTEE ON SUBSISTENCE

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT

Representative Nels A. Anderson, Jr.,
Chairman
Representative Steve Cowper
Senator Pat Rodey

STAFF PRESENT

Adelheid Herrmann

PUBLIC HEARING LOCATION

NANA Regional Corporation Museum
Kotzebue, Alaska

Date September 16, 1977
Time 3 00 P.M.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PAGE

1.	TESTIMONY OF	John Schaeffer, Kotzebue.....	2
2.	TESTIMONY OF	Lena Sours, Kotzebue.....	15
3.	TESTIMONY OF	Willie Goodwin, Kotzebue.....	17
4.	TESTIMONY OF	Keith Lawton.....	21
5.	TESTIMONY OF	Fletcher Gregg, Sr., Kotzebue.....	24
6.	TESTIMONY OF	Elvira Downey, Kotzebue.....	28
7.	TESTIMONY OF	Levi Kowunna, Point Hope.....	29
8.	TESTIMONY OF	Judith Allen, Kotzebue.....	30
9.	TESTIMONY OF	Robert Newlin, Kotzebue.....	32
10.	STATEMENT OF	Marty Strauss, (Mauneluk).....	attached..



JUNEAU ALASKA

Alaska State Legislature

House

INTERIM COMMITTEE ON SUBSISTENCE
Nels A. Anderson, Jr., Chairman
P. O. Box 234
Dillingham, AK 99576 Tel: 842-5970

September 16, 1977 - KOTZEBUE PUBLIC HEARING

Representative Nels A. Anderson, Jr., Chairman, called the Interim Committee on Subsistence to order at this time and made a very brief statement. I know that you people have been having alot of meetings up here lately, and I know that subsistence got lost in the whaling hearings. But, we do want to hear whatever comments people may have at this time. Mr. Anderson introduced himself, Pat Rodey and Steve Cowper and Adelheid Herrmann, Secretary.

Representative Steve Cowper One of the reasons we want to hear the people on subsistence is that on the D-2 Hearings on the bill in Washington. I'm involved in trying to put across the Alaska viewpoint in Washington and we are going to make every effort to make sure that D-2 law takes care of subsistence rights on federal land and in order to do that, we have to know what those subsistence needs are and that is one of the main reasons for this hearing today.

John Schaeffer - President of NANA I'd like to make a few comments on what my idea of subsistence is and explain why it cannot be defined to any great degree and try to give you my perception of what is involved in subsistence.

Subsistence, I feel if anything, is a style of living in the State of Alaska and it has to be perceived as such if it's going to be regulated

for the benefit of those citizens in the State that want to live this kind of a lifestyle. The Eskimo people have a little bit more involvement than just the lifestyle and we have tried to show it here in our museum and I think in the whaling hearings that have gone on this has been brought out and it's more a part of the spiritual part of our culture that we have had in the past we feel a closer tie to the land, to the animals, the game that live on the land and provide for our survival. That is the only difference between how the Natives perceive a subsistence lifestyle and the non-Natives and I'm not sure that there's that great difference. I think we look at as being a little closer because we have had 100 years to change from our old culture to the new one and our ties are a little closer to using the land, whereas, non-Natives have 200 years to change in the U. S. and that is the only difference.

The subsistence consists of the use of natural resources by the people in the State of Alaska - it is not a Native issue. We have many non-Native subsistence users. The degree of use may be more - where you can define on racial lines because the bulk of the Natives in the State live in the rural areas where the resources are more available and more necessary for survival. The non-Natives who live in Anchorage or Fairbanks and who move from other states up here to be in an area where it is a little bit more open, more wilderness where they can go out and hunt and utilize wild game are just as much subsistence users as the Natives are, maybe they can get by without it. We have got to

differentiate the subsistence user from the big game trophy hunter. We have a few of those in Alaska, but not many, most of those come from other states and other parts of the world. I'm not talking about these people. They are a different class, they are a different taker.

They may, in some cases, be subsistence users, too, although it is very difficult to transport wild game meat from Alaska to Germany to Mexico City or someplace like that. So most of them couldn't or it isn't practical for them to be subsistence users. Subsistence from what we can see is a use of resources and not just game. Although game, because it is harder to manage is what we look at the most. It's the use in some cases, up here, of the furs of the animals that are trapped to take care of the people when other resources are not available so trapping even is a part of the subsistence lifestyle. It takes you out in the country that we, Alaskans, love so much.

The regulation of subsistence is no different than the regulation on any other game species or any other use as far as I can see. It is a matter more of need. Who needs it the most when a population of species is down? Where there are so many users, you have to regulate it. It's not a matter of regulating color, this is a problem with regulation that people in the State of Alaska have because in the rural area, the greatest user is Native. They tend to look at subsistence use as a Native issue, it is not a Native issue. We have tried to maintain that and the problem is that with this kind of attitude is that we start defining things on racial lines and it is unconstitutional for the State government to regulate on the basis

of race. You can't do it, the feds can do it. And when the State starts to pressure us on racial lines, we have no alternative than to go to the federal government for protection. This is why we worked so hard to get subsistence regulations into D-2 management from a practical standpoint. The management of all game resources in the State should be handled by the State government. We know that. But the State has been unwilling, up to this point, to regulate subsistence use on the basis of need. They want to define it on racial lines.

All the incidents, and I can go over them, that have occurred have been along these lines (racial lines) and it is not necessary. I don't care what you say or what anybody says, it is not necessary in my mind to regulate the game in such a way that the office worker in Anchorage gets the same use of game as somebody who is living out in the bush who has no job that I feel requires it more. The State can, I believe, manage subsistence properly if it does two things. If the Department would dig out the old resolution on priority use of game resources for subsistence that the Fish and Game Board several years ago passed, which was well-written. I think it hit the nail on the head. As soon as it was passed, they threw it in the trash can and if they can find it, they ought to dig it back up and use it as a policy. I think the Board of Fish and Game saw that the problem, the need as it existed and they passed a very fine resolution. The trouble is the Administration of the Department of Fish and Game did not take it into consideration as far as management of game resources. That would work.

The other thing is that the way the Fish and Game Department is structured and where it is located, and the way that we handle the formulation of regulations and the management is a little lopsided. Several years ago the guides became a very powerful lobbying force in the State and they maintained that political power. They have been able to put pressure on the State and the Fish and Game Department so that the regulations are in their favor and no one else's which means that our game is regulated for the benefit of outside hunters and fisherman. Our whole funding structure is based the same way, I understand. The Fish and Game Department even if they might be sympathetic to what I'm talking about that the game should be managed for the use of the people of Alaska can't do it because their bucks are coming from outside license fees and permits and they have got to look to that.

Our society is set up so that all of us tend to have some respect if not total respect for where the dollars come from and this is true with the Fish and Game Department. Their reliance on these outside dollars is enormous and it tends to dictate the way they manage the game. I think that has to be changed, they should not have to be reliant on one source of income because through the guide organizations, and this income from out of state, they are able to influence the Department of Fish and Game too greatly. That should be cut off first of all.

The other thing is that the people of the State need to have a bigger say in what is going on. We tried that with the cooperation of Fish

and Game last year when we had the problem with the Western Arctic caribou herd. After months of name-calling and dirt-throwing, where the Department of Fish and Game blamed the Eskimos for the depletion of the herd and we blamed them for mismanagement. Then, we all blamed the wolves. We finally sat down, and say, hey, let's quit throwing mud at each other and come up with a solution. They felt that they could not discriminate on the basis of need and we said, okay, let us do it and in effect, they turned the authority to issue permits over to the local community and of course, a court decision was made that this was unconstitutional which I don't believe is right because the judge acted on wrong information. The point I want to make is that we need more local input from the local areas. The one way to do this is to delegate some of this authority for management of the game resources to the local level. I know it's not possible to get any further than on a regional basis but I think that is a step in the right direction. It's going to be necessary in order to work with these new parks and refuges that are being formed under the D-2 legislation because all the trend is to regionalize the game management on these parks and refuges. It's going to be done by the federal government and in order for the state to interface with that, they are going to have to do it too.

I think it's going to be forced on us if the legislature doesn't take the initiative and do it ahead of time. If you do it early on I think it will solve a lot of problems. The last comment I want to make is on the attitude of the Department of Fish and Game - their attitude is that subsistence is a Native problem and if they

didn't have this attitude I think we could get along very well even with the system as it exists today but they choose to make it a racial issue and we will continue to have problems if their attitude continues in this direction. It's not going to help anybody, right now we have this year some very powerful U.S. Congressmen on our problem and they are willing to take some of the regulatory management powers of the State away as far as federal lands are concerned. Which I don't think is good for the State in the long run and we're supporting that because of the attitude of the Department of Fish and Game. If they want to make it racial, then we have only one recourse and that is to go to the one body in the U.S. that can regulate on a racial basis for our own protection. I don't think we are talking about just protecting the Native peoples' lifestyle. We're talking about protecting the lifestyle of the people - a lot of the people of the state of Alaska and it should be viewed this way. That's it."

Representative Nels Anderson - "Steve Cowper has a question."

Representative Steve Cowper - Asked about the Fish and Game regulation - when it was and who was on the Board? How can I find it?

John Schaeffer - The Department of Fish and Game should have it. It was prior to when the Fish and Game Board was divided."

Representative Steve Cowper - "How would you feel about the subsistence use priority written into legislation based on a locality. In other words, local subsistence users get priority as to use of fish

and game in their area and you would define subsistence somehow so it evolves around a lifestyle for people who depend on the fish and game for food would receive a priority. Do you think it would work?"

John Schaeffer - "Well, I think that was the intent of the policy statement that was approved by the Board of Fish and Game was if the resource needed to be regulated because of the size of the species going down so that all the users could not continue to use it with very little regulation then it got to the point where you have too many users and not enough - you've got 400 hunters and only 200 caribou could be taken then you would have to break that down and it would be on the basis of need. The head hunter, the trophy hunter getting the lowest priority."

Senator Pat Rodey - "In regard to funding, you mentioned this as a crucial issue in the Department, how might we move away from this problem?"

John Schaeffer - I'm not that familiar with the way the funding works but your licenses and fees should go right to the general fund and not be earmarked for use by the Department of Fish and Game."

Senator Pat Rodey - "One other question. It has been mentioned that Fish and Game should be a title 26 organization much like the Department of Education and free of political interference. It has been kicked around in Juneau, as you know."

John Schaeffer - Well, that happens, and I think our state is probably better than other states as far as political influence on

John Schaeffer's testimony cont.

running the Departments - we're much more free than other states because we're young. I don't think we need to put anyone free of political influence because this is one process where the people can get something in if the bureaucracy falls down on its face. I don't like to see the legislature regulating say, for instance, cow moose. That has nothing to do with management but what it points out is that the Department is not doing their job. The legislature steps in - I think this is a good part of the political process that has made America what it is.

If the game is managed properly you're going to have a lot of scientists working for the Department of Fish and Game who are going to be concerned about the biology or zoology or whatever they're are interested in - unfortunately these people but blind-folders on themselves when they are doing these things and they look at only one aspect of what that species means to the detriment of others. I'm not saying that there's anything wrong with these people - it's true of all of us when we're concerned with one thing, we let other things go and sometimes the scientific type can get pretty powerful - these scientific types - the technicians and very impractical and then that is when it is necessary for people like you in the legislature to step in and straighten them out."

Representative Nels Anderson - Well, John, I have a couple of observations and I wanted to share some of the ideas that have been cropping up from other parts of the State. I think that just about every place that I have been, Dillingham, we had a hearing and a

hearing in Kipnuk and basically the people are saying what you are and I wanted to ask you a question and it is one that one of the people in Kipnuk brought out - He said that because of the ANCSA the Federal people in Washington and a lot of people in our state itself in the Administration think that the shareholders of regional corporations are rich and this for some reason is having a sort of negative affect that is contributing to what you said that the Department of Fish and Game has an attitude that the subsistence problem is a Native problem but then what contributes to that thinking is people are saying well you're a shareholder and you have all this land, etc....Do you have any observations on that?

John Schaeffer - "Well, I think that is a misconception that has been cleared up by many people over the years. The first time people started looking at a billion dollar settlement I think this may have been true but since then there has been enough press and conversation about this that it shouldn't be anymore cause they know how much money the people have gotten from this settlement. In our case here most corporations that are rural based the land has no value except for subsistence which brings no money in so the value is in the use of the natural resource and not in the monetary sense. But it does propose some problems for a few people, I'm sure for instance myself because I'm a spokesman for continued subsistence use of resources. I get a lot of flack from people, some of my own stockholders some from non-stockholders about me being a corporate official with a good steady job and a good income, and, what am I doing taking these resources that other people that I say need it more are having trouble getting, and what I did was

stop hunting..that's contrary to my lifestyle - I grew up a hunter, too, but in order to continue to speak for the subsistence hunter, I quit hunting. I just won't hunt. And I think they're right there is a lot more people who need it more than I do..they can't afford it - they can't afford not to do without the resource. We can talk about figures and we have had studies made that where they have tried to put a dollar value on a pound of caribou meat and it's just not replaceable at this time unless you change the whole lifestyle and I don't think - I know our people don't want to change than much. The people in the rest of the State don't want to change their lifestyle either. What we have to do is bring the management of these resources around to fit the needs of the people of the State."

Representative Nels Anderson - "You know, John, the kind of work that we're doing now is that we're beginning to, at least I am as Chairman of the Committee, beginning to realize that subsistence is shaking out a lot of ways of doing things in the State that I think that people had some idea that we did have some problems but we didn't quite know how to resolve it so this year when the Interim Committee on Subsistence was created and supported by the Legislative Council this is in as far as I know, is the first time we will take on the word subsistence. One of the things I told you about yesterday that I got kicked around on was the attempt to try to define subsistence and one of the first guys that took me on was Willie. To try to define it I have to come to the conclusion based on conversation with guys like yourself and Willie and other people throughout the State is that, to attempt to define the word is going to be a self-

defeating exercise. But we are getting into things that the State of Alaska has failed to really recognize. One is the funding policy for the State of Alaska - I really believe that has to be looked into but it's coming out in hearing people talking about subsistence and it's all interrelated - bringing the authority back to the local people - management authority down closer to the local level. That is beginning to filter out.

The administration as I said yesterday, the administration is recognizing that they have to bring back the management authority down because we're never going to straighten this thing out if you're going to have one person down in Juneau making all the decisions. The attitude problem is something that I think has been prevalent in a lot of minds but has never been articulated like you just did. That attitude has to change, I don't know how we're going to change it but I think talking about it I think we're going to be able to make those people realize that we don't like it and there are a lot of people that feel very strongly about that and I think your idea of getting the subsistence policy that was developed in 1973 reactivated as a real policy of that the Department of Fish and Game uses I think we've got to make sure that they do that and what you have told us in line what we have been hearing throughout the State and it seems to be a commonality of the feeling or purpose on this.

John Schaeffer - It can't be any other way Nels, because like I say, the subsistence issue is not a Native issue. It's a statewide issue, the people in Anchorage and Fairbanks are subsistence users too. This is why it's so hard to define - you can't define it.

The corporate executive in Anchorage that needs to go out and get his moose every year because that is why he quit his job in some other state and moved up here and every year he goes out and gets that moose and has a moose burger sometime during the year and invites friends over for moose is just as much a subsistence user as Bob Yule who is a non-native who lives out here and lives off of the land throughout the year and has no employment who uses subsistence totally throughout the year and the other some of them native people who do the same thing. There are no racial lines unless you want to make them racial. You can't define subsistence as this, you have to utilize game resources 50% of the year. What you're going to do is start excluding a lot of people in the State who are subsistence users. We have to define subsistence user only generally and as a priority for use over other things that we can define fairly well - head hunters and that type of thing. When it's necessary to reduce the take. Other things they keep trying to throw in - the use of airplanes, that type of thing. I think that is a separate issue. It is a method of take and that can be handled very easily by the Fish and Game if they want to do it. It gets to be difficult when they start throwing it in on a racial basis - most of the pilots are non-native - so they make that anti-airplane hunting is a Native issue. It's not."

Representative Nels Anderson - One other comment - "When the legislature steps in and starts making management decisions you know there's something wrong someplace because I really hesitate to pass laws that say you can't hunt moose or you can't do this but sometimes it becomes necessary, we've got a situation right not in

Bristol Bay down in the Peninsula where our moose season starts on September 10th because on September 10th the moose are getting wild and gamey and I think that's what a sports hunter wants, he wants a real wild animal to go after - to go after him so he gets some sport out of it and thrill. But that moose that they killed is not worth eating and it is my intent this year that if the department doesn't do something about that situation, changing that season to August sometime, I intend to enter some legislation to change that season."

John Schaeffer - "This is why I think you shouldn't make the Department of Fish and Game an autonomous organization because it's things like that and it's this dependence on outside funds from the sports hunter so that they regulate by the influence of these outside hunters. This regulating for outside hunters as opposed to someone else causes a lot of wasted meat. This is the type of thing that if the subsistence user in the state being Native or non-Native is the prime user that will benefit from the management of the game resources and the Department of Fish and Game regulates for that purpose then we wouldn't have this problem. It's only when they don't take this attitude the legislature needs to step in. I don't think the problem is when you do it it takes so long to come back and change that legislation which may be detriment to that particular species. If the whole attitude of the Department of Fish and Game is wrong and we can't change it then I think the legislature might as well make a whole bunch of laws and regulate the game because you're not going to do it any worse than they are."

Representative Steve Cowper left to go to the Budget and Audit meeting.

John Schaeffer - This is an important issue to the people in this area because we have nothing else to go on. Most people depend very heavily on the game resources and if they didn't have it they would have to go on welfare because there is no other alternative. We keep our welfare rolls down mainly because the people are able to use our limited fish and game resources that are available."

Lena Sours - (translated by Robert Newlin) - "She was raised and taught how to preserve the meat and whatever greens that grew off this land. The meat of the seal, the oogruk, the Beluga have always been preserved and put in seal pokes - that was the best way that these were preserved. This type of preserving resists the heat - it gets put in oil and it lasts longer. The furs and the sinews of all animals were dried and used by the natives.

When she grew up there were no caribou in the Kotzebue area. The men had to go way up into Noatak to hunt for caribou. The caribou that they caught were all used and dried up and packed into, or taken back. The skins and the sinew were saved for winter clothing. All other fur bearing animals were taken for the same reasons which were also used for clothing. There was no cloth or other fabrics being used by the natives - only the skins were used for clothing at that time. There were no other activities outside of hunting at that time. They worked very hard and had no time for recreation or other type of things during the gathering time..Most of their time was spent in hunting and putting away these resources that they use.

And now she says that times have changed. These have been reversed now from subsistence to the present economy - she says that even the

fish, the catching of fish, has changed. - the fish are now regulated by Fish and Game. If a person had license the fish and game would restrict this person from subsistence fishing so there is a conflict in problem that she sees. Other than fish and game, ducks has also been regulated by Fish and Game, also the bears are being restricted being taken by the natives. She said she seen in her camp, lots of bear. Bear tracks or bear droppings and she said after she left her camp a bear had gone into her cabin. She has a report that her things have been torn up on the Noatak just up the river. The thing she complains is that these bears aren't allowed to be shot by natives even the natives know that these bears are dangerous and kind of a nuisance in camps. She say in order to get a bear, a native has to purchase a \$25.00 tag first so the natives have resisted getting these bears because of this regulation.

Game was used by natives at all times, the fish, the game and she mentions squirrels, muskrats and all the fur-bearing animals were being used by natives. She couldn't understand why Fish and Game are saying that these game are not scarce. She says lots of people are using the staple goods they can buy from the store now, supplementing the Native food. She say that there are lots of physically fit people here in Kotzebue which have lots of food stamps which they purchase or which are granted. This spring she was contacted by the welfare people, she purchased food stamps for one month. She only had these food stamps for one month and she discontinued getting the food stamps because she was paying more for the food stamps than these physically fit people who are just lazy or have been buying booze and trying to get the food stamps for free this is why she discontinued her food stamps. Other people have the

same feeling now about people who are doing nothing in the village and are asking the other people for meat and food. These people have resisted giving the lazy people the meat or food.

She also stated that her feeling that getting one caribou....It will not last long - at the most one or two months. One moose per hunter or per family will go quite a ways but there are people who would come in and ask for meat and being a Native she has had bad feelings if she refuse to give a little anyway. So she gives a little anyway even knowing that these people who have made lots of money and use most of that money to buy alcohol which is a problem in Kotzebue as she stated. She stated that if it wasn't for misuse of alcohol some people would real fine and lots of money to buy food with. This is a problem. She thanks you very much for letting her testify.

Marty Strauss - Working with Mauneluk since last October as an environmental planner, most of my work has been dealing with socio-biological impact due to growth. His statement is attached.....

Willie Goodwin - "I was born and raised here in Kotzebue and I apologize for not having a written statement but I do have a few comments that I would like to bring out on the issue. I don't have a definition for the word subsistence although I practice or I do participate in the subsistence that we have here in the region - from the sea and from the land.

Yesterday's comments will bring out the importance of the whale and the sea mammals that the people use. Some of the comments that were brought out about the resources of the land. However, there

were some comments that were not brought out like cooperative management concept, the state actions resource management for instance, the crash of the caribou herd. Always the state reacted after the fact - then they had some reactions after something happened. They said they had not money to study the caribou which is not true because part of the plan for the resources of the whole state is the legislature which you are part of which allocates money for that purpose and as I see it, it was an oversight on their part for not watching the caribou in the first place.

The federal concerns that we have now, The D-2 lands, whether or not the Feds or the Congress is debating and the Federal Government whether or not to leave that in State control on the Federal lands their resource management. As John pointed out as long as we continue to get the treatment we have from the State, we here at the N.W. would push for Federal control of the resources. Right now the activities that have taken place - fishing in the Noatak, the seining that they do now - there's a lot of people up along the Noatak River. They're hunting caribou, they're fishing, hunting moose. We're in a position now where we are in competition for these resources. By competition, I mean the head hunter, the big game hunter, the guy that has an airplane vs. the people that go out with a boat. Take myself for example, I went up the Kobuk River to hunt but I had to spend about \$200.00 to go up there and come back to get a moose. I still didn't see any caribou. I think that through regulations of accessability these subsistence issue could be eased or the needs could be met by the people. They would have an equal chance to get the resource if the accessability regulations were a little bit stricter.

In the cooperative management concept we have made all of our land selections already - all the natives - there's some native allotments that are scattered throughout the State that have to be taken into consideration when the State or Federal governments start to make their management concepts for certain parcels of land for State parks, Federal parks, wildlife refuges or the natives themselves when they start to make their own regulations to fit their peoples' needs. We have to keep in mind that the resources don't know or they don't have any idea of where the boundaries are - they just come marching right across. Take the caribou - they start from Pet 4, they go through the proposed Noatak Ecological Range, they cross the Kobuk Valley National Monument, through the proposed Selawik Wildlife Refuge and in between there is all of our lands - the native lands (native allotments or some of our selections). Our village or regional corporation selections that are within the migration paths of the caribou. The feds know even though the state has control of the resources now they have to take into consideration our land because the same resources use the same habitat which is our lands or native allotments. We have a lot of problems with the Department of Fish and Game. That concludes my statement - if you have any questions."

Representative Nels Anderson - You mentioned accessability - In what context are you saying it - are you saying that we ought to be a little bit more restrictive in controlling methods we use in getting into an area.?"

Willie Goodwin - "That, plus the airplanes - it took me a whole day

to go up there. Airplanes - Fish and Game can't be all over at once enforcing the law that you can't fly and shoot the same day."

Representative Nels Anderson - Willie, is it true that guides have created exclusive areas for themselves that map out the line very carefully and don't allow any other person to go in and hunt in that area?"

Willie Goodwin - That's true. Here in the N.W. there's some guides that have mapped out their own areas that we've never even heard of or seen. Large areas outside of Kotzebue that have been claimed by these guides from Anchorage or Fairbanks areas."

Representative Nels Anderson - One of the earlier comments made by Lena Sours was she was saying that she felt that because of the additional restrictions that were being placed on people that it's getting harder and harder for local people to go out and get or have access to where the meat is. Is that what she was referring to - could this be a problem?"

Willie Goodwin - I'm not too sure - I wasn't here to hear her questions or her points but it probably would have an effect on the subsistence because the guides do have a powerful lobbying force - they could make it tough for us down in Juneau.

Representative Nels Anderson - On the cooperative management deal - as you know we did develop that legislation with your help down there and it did pass the Senate, House and was signed into our statutes. And we do now have the capability of cooperatively managing lands within the State of Alaska in cooperation with the

Federal government, regional cooperations, villages and private individuals. And we've got the system all set up now and all we have to do is get the state to establish some kind of a management policy so that we can take into consideration things like you've been talking about migration of our game, fish, birds - they do use a lot of land and they do go through several jurisdictions - federal, state and private land holdings. It seems to me that we are going to have to diffuse this very intense feeling of that people are getting about competing uses. How are we going to establish the strata of use? Who are going to be the ones to have access to the fish and game? The way it is right now as I indicated earlier down in my part of the country, the Fish and Game regulates the taking of moose to suit the interest of sport hunters and September 10th is when the season is open and this is when the meat starts to get pretty gamey and I don't like it."

Keith Lawton - I'm a representative of the Episcopal Church and the Arctic Coast for the Episcopal Diocese of Alaska. My concern is one that involves the difficulties between subsistence hunting and sports hunting on the one hand and also the great number of pressures that are being placed upon the culture of the people of this area. It may well be that the question of subsistence hunting is but one of many pressures being put upon these people for many different kinds of reasons by many different kinds of groups.

First let me address the question of subsistence hunting or sports hunting. I have lived in Alaska for 8 years and those years were split up by a number of years that I spent on the East Coast. I was able to see when I lived at Point Hope between 1959 - 1965,

the affects of guides who brought game hunters, head hunters up from the lower 48 states who were in competition with the people who used in entirety such an animal as a polar bear whereas the game hunter usually if they are feeling in a pretty good mood might make an extra trip out on the ice to bring back some of the meat for some of the old people in the village. The questions of morals and ethnics which is one of the points of views that I approach things from, it's my opinion that the people who use the game in an entirety stand a much better position before any bars of justice that the universe might have or that nature might bestow. They stand in a much better position than the game hunter who takes a trophy head and leaves the rest of the game on the ground to rot. I have heard trophy hunters make statements that they imply to me that they feel badly about the fact that people who hunt for subsistence sometimes get the trophy head. There by making it impossible for those heads to be secured by those clients of the guides You have people in competition here for a given number of animals of any given species and this is a part of the tension the people in this area are also beset by very high prices for meat. You can go down to the stores here in Kotzebue and pay \$4.10 for a few pieces of chicken. Sometimes that over a long period of time works a great hardship on people who do not have access to good jobs over long periods of time. It would seem to me that some of the people that would be against subsistence hunting would be people who be in a food processing business.

I think you have a lot of things operating in this area of sub-

sistence hunting. There is a syndrome or state of mind that exists in the U.S. and many other places in the world that stands over against the hunter. The person who hunts for their meat - there are many people who would rather think of a human being going to the store and buying food that is being raised for being killed, being processed, being packaged, wrapped up in cellophane and delivered to the grocery store or supermarket thereby to be picked up by an individual who is not a hunter, who is somehow more sophisticated, they might think or stand in some kind of frame or stature than the person who hunts for their meat. I think from the point of view of ethics and morals and maybe one of philosophy and theology there is a sickness involved when people think that if they separate themselves from sacrifice of life that has to take place when someone pulls a trigger and shoots an animal and has to gut it and skin it and has to bring it to their own table...if people are so of a mind that they think that they separate themselves by that by picking up something that has been packaged and cellophaned and processed by someone else, they fool themselves. I have many statements in mind about many people and not just vegetarians who seem to look down upon a person who is a hunter - who hunts for their meat. And to provide their own life by their own hand wherever they may hunt.

I also see over the number of years and that is only 8 that I have been in Alaska, attempts by many different people to move the native culture as well as other people who might live on the land and move them physically off the land. I have lived in Point Hope in the 60's and one of the programs of the Atomic Energy Commission at that

time was to move the people from Point Hope to some other place - they offered places as far away as California and Hawaii as enticements to get people to leave that area. Because the Atomic Energy Commission at that time wanted to make a harbor to test the use of atomic energy for development. Then you have all radioactive debris and fall out and over pressure problems and would create a real problem for the people who are as close as Oogataruk Creek as Point Hope was. But there would also be many other interests who would want to move the people from the land and I think this has already been brought out. This area is great in mineral resources and one of the ways people want to have access to mineral resources - have access to mineral resources is to move the people from the land who own the land or to move them by many different kinds of pressures one way or another so such resources fall into the hands literally of people who have money and the power and access to the ways of development for their own purposes. Part of what I see is the problem that is involved in this whole question of subsistence hunting is power struggles that are between cultures and between peoples who hunt for their meat, that is their life and their food and from where I stand one of the ways that this question can be perhaps not solved but at least helped, for for some of those people who can in federal government, city government and state government to try to approach this whole question on a moral and ethical basis and I thank you for the opportunity to speak today."

Fletcher Gregg, Sr. - From Kotzebue - I have lived nearly most of my life here. As long as you're talking about caribou, moose,

seal,. When I was a little boy we used to be down at Cape Lawson- Pappy used to hunt seal - I go with him. He have to crawl on the ice to hunt seal and I stay with the dogs. When he get a seal I go over with the dogs and we load the seal on the sled. We would be hunting during the day sometimes 6, 8, 10 - just from the top of the ice. Sometimes we get young seals too. And those young seals-the skins we have use for them as seal skin pants. They are waterproof and don't get wet most of the time when you crawl on the ice. They make water mukluks out of them too. Bearded seal they use those for mukluk bottoms. When I was a boy we were raised on seal meat, fish, we'd have seal meat for breakfast, have seal broth, soup, stays longer than whiteman food and you don't get cold because there is blood on that broth. Sometimes we had little hot cakes with it. Mama would skin the seal and sometimes she makes pokes so she can store the blubber into that poke. Dried seal meat or oogruk meat they put them in the poke with the seal oil. That's good - good nutrition. I start in to hunt seal myself too. That's the way we lived when I was a boy - hardly any whiteman's clothes - seal skin mukluks, seal skin pants - no rubber boots. Mama used reindeer sinew for making parkas, mukluks and pants.

After seal hunting we usually go down to Sadie Creek, that's our fishing camp, we get salmon there, dry the fish and sell them to stores for dog feed because there's no snow machines or vehicles when I was a boy - they use dogs and sleds. They use dogs when there is no wind - they use dogs to pull the boat with long line. After fishing we used to go to school when school starts. Kotzebue

has a lot of reindeer in them days. Now the reindeer is gone for awhile until the Caribou came. Then we use caribou skin - the mattress and the meat for our food and the sinews we saved for sewing the back and legs. Caribou legs for mukluks and the hide they made into mukluk soles too - they're warm. They use all of that for subsistence. Now a days one caribou is not enough for a big family for winter use. My wife use to say if you get 12 caribou that's enough for our winter use. That was after we get snow machines. Before we used to get a little more because we use them for dog feed too. The skin once we use for dog feed - the dogs eat the bone and all. Save the head, cook the heads - it makes good broth so does the meat. There was hardly any moose them days - there would be a few strays around and they were closed - no moose hunting then later on when moose were starting to get numerous then the season opened for us and we can get one. Store away and some dried makes good jerky. They don't waste anything - like I said yesterday.

On the waterfowl - they used to come to me sometimes if they can get waterfowl - I said I have no authority but if you if you really get hungry you can get waterfowl - a few for the family - and don't let Fish and Game know about it - cause you got it for your family and don't spread it around - keep it to yourself, that way you won't get into trouble if you keep it to yourself. Sometimes one would come around - Fletcher, I want to talk for a minuter, if you'll keep it secret. I say sure I'll keep it secret. I've got geese and few ducks for you here because you good to us. I accept this and tell no one. That was while Alaska was territorial. Same way

when Alaska became a state - I do the same thing. Sometimes I go out with Fish and Game when I was working for the State as a Magistrate. I had no trouble with the boys they're all good boys. No complaints - I don't know what they get but they keep it to themselves. I guess I advised them not to spread it around but the family got to eat. You get tired of one kind of food. You got to have a little change. Native don't get more than what they should anyhow. They eat, after they when they're satisfied they don't bother with it but when they first came that's the time they get them and I get my share once in awhile. I was Magistrate I take food when it is given to me - it's just like bribing. Nowadays we've got to have something - we've got to have a little more than one caribou per year. If we can get it probably 11 or so would be all right for big family because meat and the chicken and the turkey they are expensive around here. Over \$2.00 a pound and we don't have that kind of money to buy meat.

Representative Nels Anderson - I really thank you for taking time to let us know how you feel because this is basically what we're looking for and it's important to us to let you know how we feel and it is also important I think and I really am glad that you shared some of the history of how things used to be and how things are changing now and I think a lot of people don't understand especially in Anchorage and Fairbanks and I know in Washington, D.C. they don't understand that we don't have a lot of money and that the meat and the game and the fish and the birds, ducks, geese and so forth are needed to keep us alive. It's not a game, it's simply survival and when people try to take this away from us, it really

hurts and the same thing with the whaling problem - that is really a terrible thing and I think the people are going to put up a strong fight and try to get the International Whaling Commission to change their minds and allow the Eskimo people to continue to take whale cause that's the only right thing to do. I'm hoping that this committee will be able to convince at least out state that we have to take another look at what we are trying to do as we manage our fish and game and try to make sure that the people who live off the land have a better opportunity of using the fish and game."

Elvira Downey - From Kotzebue - I've been listening at home to the radio and decided to come down and talk about caribou too because we raised with caribou meat and I don't know how to talk about it but ever we were little kids we start eating caribou. I have large family raised with caribou meat, raised with caribou clothing. I have heard about these meetings about Caribou first time I heard about it I wanted to come down and talk about it because we can't live without caribou. One caribou is not enough for the family, the big family, because I have to cook a big large pot of caribou soup. One caribou don't last about a week in my family as long as I had caribou meat and seal oil my kids won't starve. I was telling the game warden's secretary that when I don't eat caribou in a year, I think I'm sickly now because we were raised with caribou. I think caribou is part of my blood. Since they stop us hunting from caribou I don't see my family eat good no more. We were raised eating caribou even though we were up at Noatak as long as we have caribou meat and seal oil my kids won't starve. Even if they don't have milk, cereal or some kind of

groceries. And we want our kids to be healthy too. And when they get sick I'm always worried about them so I want them to eat good. Since they stopped us from hunting caribou we didn't have much to eat at home. They don't like to eat fish. They're not used to eating fish even if we have lots of fish. I want to talk about caribou a little bit that's why I come down here - I know all the villages, if they had transportation to come down here for this meeting I know they would but I know we're not Eskimos that make money to fly around or anything mostly when they stop us from buying caribou. It's so hard for us Eskimos maybe will just have to start eating mouse pretty soon. Because it's the only one that have no law now. They're stopping us from eating everything, hunting everything. We want our family to be happy and to be healthy and caribou and seal oil are our only health. I could live with caribou and seal oil even if I don't have groceries like sugar, coffee, tea, rice - I could live with only caribou and seal oil.

Senator Pat Rodey - The point Mrs. Downey made is very important because we realize that whiteman food isn't good for us let alone good for anybody else and I think it's a very important point that you made that we do need to preserve traditional lifestyles and diets especially and I wish that we in Anchorage could get back to some of the traditional diets.

Levi Kowunna - I'm from Point Hope and I'm going to bring out my opinions too. I was living in Point Hope this summer and worked up there. When I was up there I went on a trip to Cape Lisbourne,

walked up there and walked back and it took us about 8 days altogether. During that time we saw a lot of game, even saw 13 moose all at one time and I don't see that very much but there it was, 13 moose altogether and they usually run in packs. There was a lot of caribou - we lived off the land - all kinds of game up there. Everyday we saw something - everyday we saw caribou. Climb a mountain and there's caribou over there. Even there's a lot of whales - one day we saw about 80 whales. They try to stop us and they can't do it. That's all my opinion.

Judith Allen - Living here in Kotzebue formerly from Noatak. I'm a housewife and I took up bilingual-bicultural teaching last year. Right now I'm unemployed because of bilingual funds being held. I'm very interested in teaching our children about Eskimo background and the language. This is my first plea to our government to please help us get our language back after all they are the ones who took it from us, the Eskimo race. Last year was the first time here in Kotzebue we had a bilingual program. To me it has been both wonderful for little children and the teacher. I could say this because when I meet my little students on the street they say Hi and they ask me are you going to teach us more Eskimo words? This always encourages me to keep on going.

Another think I want to say today is about subsistence fishing and hunting. I never believe Fish and Game wardens when they say there's no fish and caribou. I say this because ever since I'm born to this world we never lack of fish and meat except for weather conditions. And I've heard Oral stories from our oldest people while they were alive a long time ago they had hard times. That

some of the first Eskimo starve to death. They go from land to land - follow the seasons - like winter is for caribou, spring is for hunting seal, fall time is for fish, summer is for preparing and preserving what you gather in the summer. This is Noatak people's way of life where I was raised. Nobody likes to waste anything and they work very hard in spring and summer getting ready for winter. But when the rules are there it's not much fun and we get headache when the fish and game tell us we can't fish or hunt caribou. About caribou - I strongly feel that each Eskimo needs to feed on it. Last year in 1975 up to 1977 - it was tough for us - families with big families - I tried to buy reindeer from NANA but they said they didn't have any to sell. We buy beef meat sometimes from stores but it doesn't fill up the Eskimo's stomach either forgetting the price. Even though my husband works I had to get food stamps last year because doesn't cover up our needs at home. So expensive in grocery stores just to buy supper for nine people each day without caribou sometimes I pay \$30.00. I'd like to say some things about whaling too. Also I've been listening to peoples testimony too, on the radio - they really say the truth. I'm glad and I'm proud of those people that testified yesterday and today. They really have dignity for themselves. I do understand the struggles like you heard them say in their testimonies. They are telling the truty. The people really work hard to get their whale because that's the biggest mammal we have up here - whenever somebody get a whale from Point Hope, Kivalina, Point Barrow, even at St. Lawrence Island we always really rejoice in our own river villages because we know we'll get to eat that

good stuff again. Even though we've never watched them hunt it. Most of us never watched them hunt it. We always really rejoice over it sometimes we hug each others, that's how much we like to eat Bowhead whale. The person that said in one of the testimonies, I want to pull for her - "When our creator made us he also gave us those animals to feed us." That's so true cause nobody hunt them to get rich or for selfish gain, they get them only for survival and I say this too - they get them only for survival. I've been thinking too when I read on newspaper that the whaling might be banned those people down there somewhere in the Legislature sure don't know what they're talking about. They don't know what they're doing to us Northwest Alaska people. I also remember my little students - what am I going to teach them now? If that banning of the whale - if they keep it up or ban it up here especially because the Bowhead Whale is the greatest animal to teach with. Not only to get it but it makes the Eskimo heart very happy. That's all I have to say and I thank you for this opportunity."

Robert Newlin - I'm from Noorvik. Most of the time I live in Kotzebue - not because of choice but because of making a little money so I can feed my family too. I'm in favor of continuation of subsistence used by natives in the region, on all public and Native lands. Our lands were used by our Native people physically for economical and cultural uses. I've heard stories from the older people prior to the coming of the Western society saying - In evenings the older people would tell stories to the younger group where the best hunting grounds were, how the best ways to dry up their catch. The best meant to preserve their meat - if they were

out on long hunting trips like they used to in them earlier days. People used to go out from Kobuk - walk onto the heads or over the Brooks Range to get skin and meat for their families. Whatever they dry up they pack home. Whatever excess meat they get they would store it underground under rocks and come back in the winter and pick that meat up. These are the things that were taught in the Kazigis. These people were the best conservatives people. They were real concerned that this game - whatever game was in the region was taken rightfully with no waste. I guess doing this and teaching the people in these kazigis was the only means of passing the information to the younger generation. The older people had no written history on their native culture and then the whiteman came and kids start going to school. In the schools the children were restricted from talking their own language which kind of wipes out the culture and the teaching that was done prior to these white people. Like what Mrs. Allen said she taught bilingual and language last year. This brings back some cultural things that was passed on by our ancestors and I'm pretty sure that she was involved in preserving how the old folk and preserved their catch. This type of thing and I'm pretty sure that there was some teaching - that some of this Native culture was on conversation type which the natives now that they see that are misused. The reason for misuse is primarily to the ways that the government and federal agencies drafted up these regulations cause there was no involvement in the natives in drawing up these regulations but with a new cooperative management if the federal and state should select land outside our native

selections. If the natives were involved in drawing up some guidelines on regional level because the state regulations are now drawn up statewide although they are designated for certain areas but like the old people we should get them involved in this cooperative management levels. We do have a lot of designated D-2 lands within our region like Willie said Kobuk, Noatak, the Krusenstern, the Selawik, all the lands outside our regional selections are designated for D-2 selections. I am real happy that if we should get involved in part in management and drafting the guidelines or whatever within these lands. These lands have always been used by our people or by us. We do know that the Noatak people hunt towards upper Noatak, right now and this area is also designated as National lands.

Also we know that all the lands between Ambler and Kiana is designated as part of Federal lands. And these areas are the best land that natives subsist on. We would like to see some language written that these natives be allowed to subsist on these lands. We know that Krusenstern is a very important area because every spring natives from Noatak and Kotzebue spend spring time over there hunting for ooguk and seal for their winter uses. Not only for their winter uses but for all native uses in the region because like I said in my little speech yesterday that all fish, meat, greens and berries, are used by natives with seal oil regardless of how they prepare it. It is part of their diet. It is really important that Krusenstern is open to native hunting because everybody in the region share the catch of these people that hunt in that area. We either trade with the people down here or it's passed on to their

relatives in the other villages which do not get the seal oil. A lot of the seal oil is not traded, it is given - as a native way of sharing their catch with their relatives. This has always been done. There are some techniques that will be lost if this cultural bilingual thing is being stopped because we would like to have our kids being taught of our history also conserving the wildlife within the region. This is part of it. I'm glad we have come up with this museum here, it's part of the history and part of the teaching that these kids come here to see. See the program - I'm pretty sure they have gotten something out of it. When we opened this museum, kids were the first to see this program and I'm really proud of that.

Marty Strauss - I'd like to take the opportunity to supplement the question you had as far as management versus development. With the industrial and subsistence problem colliding with each other. One answer that you had a very good start on was State Natural Resources Planning and Research - Dave Hansen's division has developed an inventory and it's available - a report of the different uses, forest mineral deposits of the land inventory of the state and if this if overlaid by the different subsistence uses that Robert just mentioned of the different areas, I believe then you could come up with tools to start making logical decisions for management versus development.

Adjourned at 12:30.....

DEAR SIR,

Please find enclosed a typed copy of
my testimony given in KOTZELUC
ON September 16, 1977

Sincerely
MARTY STRAUS
ENVIRONMENTAL
PLANNER

BX 256, MANUELUC
KOTZELUC, AK 99752
Ph 907-442-3311

"Get off this land its mine! Well how did you get this land? My Grandfather. How did he get it? He fought for it! Well then I will fight you for it." -Carl Sandbourgh.

I wish to take this time to address the problem of subsistence. In the short time I have been here I have discovered this word, subsistence, impossible for an outsider to truly understand. The closest meaning I have as an outsider now living here, is the ability to live off the land.

I have seen this ability in my travels throughout the world's four corners, Arizona, South America, North Africa; the Sudan in Africa and now here, being destroyed in the name of economic development. This is not the first place where energy hungry cultures destroy another culture due to purposely or absently overlooking the needs and lifestyle of the people now living in the area development is to take place. I am not antidevelopment as my title to some denotes, (Environmentalist), but instead believe in controlled growth. There is no reason to rape the land.

Today Alaska subsistence users are viewing the D-2, issue, mineral exploration, economic development, etc., as threats to their lifestyle. The people have the right to feel this way after past events and the treatment by the government, whether its State or Federal. Rural Alaska is treated like a crown colony being exploited by the mother country.

When a food shortage occurs in this area due to depleting of the natural resource base it cannot be replenished with food stamps. The

stores in rural Alaska do not have the inventory capacity to have the food to be bought. This is caused both by the lack of ready cash and high prices of shipping and food.

The modern world views Alaska as the treasure house of minerals and open land it lost due to its blind industrial economic growth. In its attempt to satisfy its hunger for energy and open recreation land it is also destroying in culture. I question how many people from outside of Alaska will use the Federal lands.

I believe the need for parks is necessary but must not be allowed to destroy a vital part of life, subsistence, here without adequately replacing it. The same problem occurs when minerals and energy development occurs. As the modern world continues to encroach the amount of game for food is restricted; whether it is artificial or natural, with no viable alternative in its place.

Industrial development in this area is not that far away. Several news releases have announced findings of coal on the land; Outer Continental Shelf Oil and Gas Exploration may take place within 7 years and the State has planned ~~road~~^{roads} ~~running~~ throughout this area. Presently they are doing the surveying work to start construction on these roads. The energy hungry world could build these roads in 5-10 years to get at these minerals. Yet few rural Alaskans are aware that such an action is going on that will totally upset their lives.

The trade for one resource for another, human culture vs. minerals, must not be allowed. But it is sad, like other places I have been, as

long as Alaska is a crown colony it will continue.

My last point is that of the price of energy to heat homes here. We, the outside world, have taken a low energy society and created a high energy dependent one. Yet they pay the highest prices in the country even though it is here the energy fuel come from. When requesting funds for research and development to creat alternatives I am told Alaska does not have enough people to justify the high costs of research. I question this!

~~Marty Strauss~~

~~Environmental Planner~~

— Marty Strauss
Environmental Planner

PLEASE NOTE: THE PRECEDING PAGES WERE TREATED
AS A UNIT IN THE ORIGINAL DOCUMENT.

PUBLIC HEARING TESTIMONY

BY THE ALASKA STATE LEGISLATURE
INTERIM COMMITTEE ON SUBSISTENCE

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:

Representative Nels Anderson, Jr.,
Chairman
Representative Steve Cowper

STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT:

Dorothy Larson, Staff Assistant

PUBLIC HEARING LOCATION:

GEORGE HALL
NENANA, ALASKA

DATE: October 5, 1977
TIME: 6:00 P.M.

THOSE REGISTERED IN ATTENDANCE AT PUBLIC HEARING

<u>Name</u>	<u>Address</u>
Winnie Charlie	Nenana
Eli Charlie	Nenana
Colleen Loard	Nenana
Paul Esau	Nenana
Mary Demientieff	Nenana
Daniel Bettis	Nenana
Paul George	Nenana
Joe Williams	Nenana
John C. Gonsazles	Box 320, Clear
Andrew P. Souders	Box 43, Clear
Lawrence A Persley	Nenana
Steve Matthew	1st & Hall Doyon Bldg, Fairbanks
Walter Lord	Box 83, Nenana
Richard Ketzler	Box 23, Nenana
Larry Ketzler	Box 23, Nenana
Victor Lord	Nenana
Henry Ketzler	Box 35, Nenana
Mitch Demientieff	Nenana
Cathy Demientieff	Nenana
Jeff Kennedy	Fairbanks

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1.	TESTIMONY OF Mitch Demientieff.....	Page 2
2.	TESTIMONY OF Lawrence A. Persley.....	Page 11
3.	TESTIMONY OF Ron Nusinginya.....	Page 14
4.	TESTIMONY OF Andrew Souders.....	Page 15
5.	TESTIMONY OF Chris Anderson.....	Page 17
6.	TESTIMONY OF Steve Matthew.....	Page 18
7.	TESTIMONY OF Mary Demientieff.....	Page 21
8.	TESTIMONY OF Joe Williams.....	Page 28
9.	TESTIMONY OF Jeff Kennedy.....	Page 34

NOTE: Mitch Demientieff testified at the Anchorage Public Hearing on November 10, 1977 changing some of his previous testimony noted in this transcript.



JUNEAU ALASKA

Alaska State Legislature

House

INTERIM COMMITTEE ON SUBSISTENCE
Nels A. Anderson, Jr., Chairman
P. O. Box 234
Dillingham, AK 99576 Tel. 842-5970

OCTOBER 5, 1977 - NENANA PUBLIC HEARING

Representative Nels Anderson: We'll call the Interim Committee to order at this time and for those of you who don't know me my name is Nels Anderson, I'm Chairman for the Committee on Subsistence for the State Legislature and Representative Steve Cowper from Fairbanks is also on the Committee and we hoped that other members of the Legislature would be here with us tonight but apparently they had last minute changes of plans so they departed the Fairbanks area and went down to Anchorage. But we are here and we are soliciting comments and your feelings about the term subsistence, we would like to know whether or not the term subsistence should or should not be defined. And if it is to be defined, how should it be defined. We would like to know what your feelings are about the term subsistence, about hunting, fishing and gathering activities and we would also like to know what you think about what the State should do about protecting subsistence hunting and fishing. We have held several hearings around the State and we're hoping that people of Nenana will give us your views.

This may have been a bad time to hold a meeting but if it is a bad time then if people couldn't make it because of subsistence activities then of course we can't blame people for not being here but we would encourage people to let us know how you feel through your representative from the area or write the committee a letter and let us know by letter how you feel about the term because every comment is going to be extremely important and we are going to

be needing your views on this subject. I'd like to at this time ask Representative Cowper if he has any comments before we take our first statement.

Representative Steve Cowper: No comment, Mr. Chairman, except to note that I'm working with the D-2 Legislation in Washington also, so we of course the Federal U. S. Congress is in the process of making a subsistence preference on Federal lands so they've got a problem defining it too.

Representative Nels Anderson: And to my immediate is Dorothy Larson, she is our Staff Assistant for our Committee on Subsistence. Mitch if you would like to start us off we would appreciate it.

Mitch Demientieff: First, I would like to thank you for coming and having the hearing here to give a few of us a (inaudible) opportunity to speak on subsistence and you are correct in realizing that this is a very heavy subsistence time of the year and I know that there a lot of people who are out hunting, people are busy pulling up fish wheels and things of this nature and I'm sure that this has something to do with the light turnout although I don't think that it's - the turnout would be representative of the people in Nenana's concern for the continuation of a subsistence lifestyle.

I think it's, first I would like to address the issue of definition of subsistence, I don't know realistically of the feasibility of the State of Alaska or Congress defining subsistence. It's a funny thing, but I think it's a very conscientious thing at the same time. Let me speak for myself personally, last year I didn't go to work until November, I think of last year and during that time I was very heavily involved with subsistence activities. I got my share of moose, my share of fish and up until the time that I went

in November of 1976 and I worked through August of 1976 during that period of time I didn't hardly catch any fish to speak of. What I could working full time in Fairbanks, 60 miles away, and barely enough to feed dogs and I was mostly feeding them commercial feed at that time which having a job I could afford and did during that time I harvested no meat whatsoever, no moose meat, no caribou, no bear no nothing. The only subsistence foods that I had during that time were what other people essentially gave me from their activities. During August of this year I left my place of employment in Fairbanks returning to Nenana and immediately began fishing and you know getting meat and everything of that nature. So I think if you were to define a subsistence person, for my case personally it would be difficult to do because of the fact that I'm capable of going away, if I should choose to go away to seek employment, that's a very hard thing for myself to do, since who the hell wants to leave home to go to work, you shouldn't have to leave home to go to work. When I'm just as capable of earning a living at home here. Essentially that's what I do when I'm home, I harvest subsistence. There was some concern, maybe it's just been talk around town, but several people have mentioned to me that one of the things that was happening in the State, like I say there may not be any truth to this concern, there may not be I'm not sure.

But there was some concern that people in the State were taking a position that rural people on highways systems have no need for subsistence activities. To this I would like to address a portion of my statement. I think that it would be safe to say that people on highways. The highways system itself have as a whole people have a less dependency as opposed to someone not on a highway or is not on a main transportation system, I think there is a less dependency because of the fact that there are other areas of

employment, businesses would support of a highway system here, truck restaurants, everything that goes with a highway and plus the fact that as far as Nenana is concerned we do a lot of freighting out of here, in the summer months there is a lot of things happening in the Nenana area. So I would say as a whole the people in Nenana have a less dependence on subsistence than do let's say somebody in Juslia or some of the remote areas in Alaska. But that does not mean we are not dependent on subsistence. A great number of people here work seasonally and a significant number of us are not able to gain employment at all. Thus those people that do have the need to live subsistence lifestyle are very dependent on subsistence lifestyle as anybody in Alaska. Towards, that's the comment I would like to make towards the stories that I heard that there was going to be some curtailing of subsistence activities along highway systems. It would hurt us just as much as it would hurt anybody in the State if subsistence activities were curtailed in this area.

We do run into a number of subsistence problems in the State. I talked to Representative Cowper earlier in the day. One of the things that we're most concerned about is with respect to fishing. Right now today we have reached our subsistence egg quota which I understand is set by the Legislature and therefore the people in Nenana are deprived of a source of income. Now, I think that in some parts of the State, and I don't want to address myself to that, at all too much, in some parts of the State I have heard that there is some waste of salmon, people catching the salmon, taking the eggs out and throwing the salmon away. I don't know if there is any truth to that kind of a rumor or not. But I have heard stories, but until I see something for myself and I've never seen anything like that happen, I just don't pay any attention to it but even if it does happen in other areas it does not happen the Tanana River. Nenana, we haven't seen it happen here,

we just don't do that. Those people who fish, some people have stopped fishing for now. They've gotten fish that they need, they pulled up their wheel, I doubt that it has anything to do with the us reaching our salmon roe quota. I'm not sure on the poundage or anything but I just know we have reached our quota.

Now today, I'm fishing yet, I still have the wheel turning in the river, I'm catching eggs and those eggs are going into the dog pot. Our prices this fall were \$2.50 a lb. for those eggs, money that I could use in support of my going out and harvesting those fish and we do run into significant expenses. Outboard motors, are up near \$1,500, river boats are about the same price. The cost of gas is out of sight, so is oil. All the different little breakdowns you have, everything else that you got to have, you got to have cable, you got to have this, you got to have that for your fishing operation. I've got a smoke house down there that I can't afford to put roofing on. You just need a million things to gather these fish in. I think it's very tragic that we would have this opportunity to have an income from those fish while we're catching them and keeping the fish for our own use for subsistence purposes, I think it's very tragic that we'll be deprived of that source of income. Now like I say, I've heard that some people waste but we just haven't seen that around here at all. I don't think that we'll ever see that if a limit for subsistence roe was taken off I don't think we'd ever see anybody fishing just for the eggs and throwing the fish away. It just won't happen. That is a great concern of among people who are fishing in Nenana. I think when it comes down to subsistence hunting, it's damn hard problem for us to deal with here in Nenana.

There are but maybe 2 or 3 people manage to get a moose. I think that

this kind of a thing has really hurt us heavily now. Part of the problem I think is that is also comes from fishing, the same time you're hunting you're going to be fishing. September 1 through the 10th is our season and it just happens to be when the fish are here as well and you can't fishing is a full time job by itself and so is hunting. There was a time you could jump in your car and take ride out to Clear area toward Healy and go out in the morning or in the evening after work or after you take care of fish or before you take care of fish or whatever and you would have a very good chance of getting or running into a moose, moose were plentiful here 10 to 15 years ago. But now your chances of doing that are really astronomical with the amount of traffic with the new highway system. It's damn near impossible to tet a moose using that kind of hunting so really you got togo hunting to get a moose and even if you do your competition is so overwhelming that it is virtually when you get down to prime hunting areas Tolzona River that area, ther's virtually a hunting camp on every bend in the river and Tolzana River has a lot of bends.

You got airboats zipping through inches of water, airplanes zipping around, I think they had an airplane collison down there in Minto this fall, this hunting season. Somebody was out hunting and they ran into a charter outfit over near Minto somewhere. I understand down in the (inaudible)??? River two hunting boats collided- that's how busy. They ought to have turn singles or traffic lights on the river, if traffic is going to be that great. You chuckle about it, it no laughing matter. It is a very serious matter because of the fact that now we're faced with a few fish to get through the winter, but no meat. What kind of a situation is that going to cause 10 to 15 years ago, just about everybody got a moose now hardly anybody is getting a moose. It's about turned around

Completely the number of people that used to not get a moose was just those people that didn't hunt now everybody is hunting and nobody is getting anything. I think it's completely turned around. I think this is really going to cause some problems now.

I know that the legislature and different people around, the decision making people that have the authority to make decisions in Juneau and Washington are heavily pressured to provide opportunities for sports hunters and things of this nature. Well, we've seen our share of that. You know there is no reason for me to run through all the stories of people coming out with the horns and all that sort of thing. Because those things happen and everybody knows they happen. But getting down to it how does it impact us it impacts very significantly. We have to go through the winter with no meat, what are we going to do? We look to the legislature for some leadership in this respect. I think if that is would be totally unrealistic for us to take a position as well - subsistence is the only form that game should be allowed to be taken in Alaska, it's very unrealistic. We know it is not going to happen, case in point: the caribou situation that developed last winter and Tanana Valley Sportsmen took it to court and the Board of Game was shot down on a subsistence stand that they had taken, a very gutsy stand by the Board of Game. But I think that the important, not too much that we try to classify subsistence in terms of limiting it to areas on basis of well, this area is more remote they are more heavily dependent on subsistence. If there are people in Anchorage or Fairbanks who are dependent on subsistence for their lifestyle they ought to have the same opportunities as somebody in a more remote part of the State. I think that it is very important that the Legislature seriously prioritize in some manner and I have no suggestions to offer, that

activities be the number one priority in the taking of a limited resource. The game and the fish in the State of Alaska. Right now this is the first year after commercial season, after the commercial fishing season closed that we got 5 or 6 days this year, we're limited on our subsistence fishing to five days a week. It's the first year, and frankly it was a surprise to me when after commercial closed. Then I was fishing my wheel and then Saturday at 6 o'clock everybody's heading out to close down their wheel and I said what's going on, what are you guys closing down your wheels for? Everybody says well, we've got to close down, we're only fishing subsistence 5 days a week, that was a very big surprise to me because I just never lived with that. Before, we always fished subsistence 7 days a week. We're just getting run out of our lifestyle around here and I think whatever the legislature does they ought to prioritize those people who truly depend on subsistence in the establishing of any quotas or stipulations or legislation that deals with subsistence. I think I'd like to take this occasion and give everybody else a chance to talk.

Representative Nels Anderson: I have a question or two. Okay, you've made some general suggestions on what we ought to do and I think I can understand what you're saying but I'm not quite sure if I understood what you were saying that there were people that were saying that residents who live on the highway system don't need subsistence? I haven't heard that.

Mitch Demientieff: Well, there was some talk going around, it may have been some rumor cooked up because this meeting was coming to town to hold these hearings. But, like I say, if there is an issue with the State, I wanted to comment to it. If it's not an issue with the Committee then just disregard that portion of my testimony.

Representative Nels Anderson: Just to set your mind at ease. It is not an issue of the Committee, at least I speak for myself, I don't know about other committee members. There were some suggestions made last night at the Fairbanks hearing that there is no need for subsistence period. Just across the board throughout the State but the statement wasn't directed to residents who lived along the highway. That did come through pretty clear last night from a couple of individuals.

Mitch Demientieff: I read some of those comments in the paper last night. I just don't know how the hell they make it here if they live here and didn't have a job. I don't know. I say when I'm working in Fairbanks, I've got a job, I can see for myself personally that there is no use for me out harvesting a limited resource. So when I'm here and I don't have a job, if I didn't participate in subsistence activities, hunting, fishing whatever there's just no way I could make it. I'd be I suppose on welfare rolls or something. I just don't see perhaps people have that attitude, switch places with us who depend on subsistence. That they'd have a more clearer, broader outlook at this. And I'd say I've the outlook. If I was there I could see where I wouldn't need it but still I could see where other people would. I think that is a very closed view of an issue. And a very closed one sided view.

Representative Nels Anderson: I think members of the committee are at least those that have been traveling extensively with the committee are beginning to understand that point a lot more now. There isn't only one way of life like Anchorage or Fairbanks people have confined to that area. Don't I think understand beyond what their experience, how far that experience takes them. So there are different sides of the story and I think our committee is beginning to grasp that. But I want to get back to another point that you raised regard-

ing the pressure that the legislature is under by the lobbying force of the sports interest. It is a true statement that you make, that there is a tremendous organized effort on the part of game guides and so forth to make sure that the allocations and access to the resource is fairly much guaranteed by legislation that has been passed by both bodies and also approved by the administration.

Just for your information, you probably already know this, that in the Kotzebue area there are large tracts of land that are exclusive hunting areas for game guides. No other game guides can go in and hunt. I don't think they deny access to meat hunters and so forth but just the idea that they have created exclusive areas it's quite interesting as far as I'm concerned so your statement that the legislature is under pressure by sports hunters interests is true and it is valid statement.

Mitch Demientieff: I think further on that point. That's why I say I think it is important that the committee come to rural as well as urban Alaska because the opportunities for subsistence people to have the money to afford themselves to travel into Fairbanks to attend a hearing are remote at best our chance of having a mechanism to voice our opinions. We're heavily dependent on our regional Native organizations. Those of us who are Native. Those of us who are non-native I suppose are even more hard to get the subsistence issue across. So I commend the committee for coming to Nenana to allow us to express our opinions

Representative Nels Anderson: For those of you who came in a little late. My name is Nels Anderson, and I'm Chairman for the Committee on Subsistence. I'm the Representative from Dillingham, in Bristol Bay and with me is Re-

representative Steve Cowper from Fairbanks. I don't know if the hour was wrong or if the time we picked for the hearing was wrong but I'm pleased that you are able to be here and I appreciate Mitch making this statement but we would like as many people that would like to at least to come forward and make their feelings known about the issue of subsistence.

Lawrence A. Persley: My name is Lawrence Persley. I've lived here for 5 years and 6 years in Fairbanks before that. As far as a definition of subsistence, in my book, being non-native and all, if a person is going to eat it, by god, it's subsistence. I'm sure that the Native people who are losing their lifestyle have a quite legitimate disagreement with that deal but nonetheless. But like you say that is my view of subsistence and when the legislature takes a different view I'm afraid that I'll be a poacher instead of a subsistence hunter or fisherman, and like I say that is one persons' point of view. As far as solutions, I can think of a bunch of those. As far as the Fish and Game Departments methods of dertermining the avialable resources, it's ridiculous in my book. Like in 1969 we had a little letter that went to everybody up on the slope with a hunting license that said you can't shoot moose anymore because there were only 50 of them in the North Slope. And there were 50 of them 120 miles of Sagwon. They go over and they want to fly a grid pattern or whatever, you don't fly a pattern to hunt for moose on the slope, because the moose hide down in the river banks in the willows. And they come out and fly out in a pattern instead of flying right over the rivers and gullies and they are not going to find anyting and they come up with these figures that are just totally unrealistic. I don't really know how they figure available resources on fish but that as far as I'm concerned could be settled by throwing the big boats from Seattle out of the State. There again you have immensley powerful lobbyists to buck on an issue like that. (inaudible)

is rather gigantic but I can't see a 50 ton commercial boat coming from out of State and telling a person that he can't eat salmon. In the State of Alaska and that just doesn't really strike me as being fair at all. And also on a Federal level, if this has anything to do with the federal level. That 200 mile limit is the worst shaft job that the American fishermen took . A lot of people get a surprised look on their face, in by-gone days they couldn't fish within fifteen miles and they faced a very stiff penalty for doing so now they can legally apply for a permit and fish right straight up to the beach and they pay a (inaudible) per ton and when they're shipping in fish at 50 cents a pound from Taiwan and they're paying \$50 a ton, if it's \$5,000 a ton they can still undersell the American fisherman, there's no American fisherman as Mitch said with the cost of gear and operation they could never compete with Taiwan fish. It just can't be done. Nobody can go around selling fish at 50 cents a pound.

Now these things to me are the, well, I don't say the cure-all but I think they go a long way toward rectifying the problem with the subsistence fishermen. Like I say get the foreign and the out-of-state commercial interests. Let them sacrifice some of their catch for what's going to go in somebody's belly. The last issue of Alaska Magazine is something everybody ought to read. The articles on Barrow. What they are eating now. What they have available now. It would really make a person leary about going to Barrow, I wouldn't want to be on your committee going to Barrow, you might get some rather hot remarks up there.

I think that is basically what I wanted to say, is to regear the amounts that the people can catch and also the State Government with their giant royalty nest egg now, historically governments have found fantastic ways to

burn money. They want to burn money and burn money in the Fish and Game Department then let them field 10,000 fish and night life officers, by god, let them go out and skin these rascals that are taking horns, the sports hunters. Just dump the sporting entirely, anybody that doesn't pack the meat out should be skinned right where he's standing. Now if they want to control Fish and Game or game in particular control the sport hunter and that's about the total of what I've given.

Representative Steve Cowper: I 'm well aware of the business of wasting meat just by ways (inaudible) I remember about 10 years ago I tried a case down here in Nenana. I was a prosecutor in those days for wasting meat and people said you'll never get a conviction down here for wasting meat before the local jury and all that sort of stuff. The jury was out for four minutes and the person was convicted so you know I know a lot of people feel that way.

What we're talking about here is setting up priorities of classes of users. We don't have to worry about it if there's plenty of fish and game. When things start getting short, who is going to take the game? Who are we going to allow to have preference. Well, the Federal Government on their lands which is of course is almost 150 million acres, it's more than that as a matter of fact, about 225. They have already set up in the Udall bill a subsistence preference on those lands and one of the reasons why we're holding this meeting is to find out how people feel about setting up a subsistence preference in the same way on State land and among other things. If they're only able to harvest 2,000 fish in a certain area, who should get it, the people in that area? Should it be subsistence users outside, no matter where they come from or should it be any sort of users within that area. That's the kind of questions we're going to be looking at. Whether it should be

broken down in terms of priorities onto geographical basis, whether it ought to be broken down on an economic basis where a person works part of theyear maybe he shouldn't be able to harvest as many fish as a person who doesn't work at all. These are the sorts of things that we have to talk about, you know that we've got to decide here to?

Lawrence Persley: Well, it does explain some things that I wondered about and like I said from my personal standpoint the guys that eat it should be the ones to get fish and I realize that they're going to try to get the entire quota which as I also said you know that they're a powerful interests. The (inaudible) group for one so it's rather unrealistic in some ways but by god when I think about feeding my kid my wife it's not very unrealistic. I'd rather (inaudible)

Ron Nusinginya: My name is Ron Nusinginya. I think the subsistence living should be granted because it was the way of life before time (inaudible) I guess. I'm just a human being born and raised in Barrow, where things are really rough. How I managed to live 58 years going on 59 that should be considered. The subsistence living was from my side long time ago. Arnold Brower in Alaska Magazine said "bowhead whaling has been going on from ever since he could remember, ever since I could remember." Now they say that whale is getting depleted. So, therefore, what the people up at Barrow take is for their - for years. Okay, now they're getting depleted so there's got to be other people hunting those whales. Now for other subsistence living I got a mother in law over 80 years old, she has subsistence living for 80 some years, okay, moose during the winter, fish during the summer, and what is being depleted is being commercialized. Why, I don't have nothing against the commercial fisherman, that's his way of living. I'm lucky enough to get

a job sometimes and most of the time I live off the store, beef, the whole thing. But my way of diet is like my mother-in-law, I like a change. I like a little bit of moose meat, a little bit of fish, ducks, whatever. But I still think that we the people that were born and raised in Alaska should have little bit of a chance should have a little bit of subsistence hunting.

Representative Steve Cowper: Mr. Nusinginya, I went to the Bowhead hearings in Kotzebue, and I think you're exactly right, the people of northwestern Alaska, who have hunted whale for I don't know how many years, are being asked to pay for the excesses of the so called advanced countries. I think you're exactly right.

Andrew Souders: I'm Andy Souders from Clear. I've been in the area for approximately 12 years. I would be considered a sport hunter. What subsistence hunting and fishing is to my mind should be on an (inaudible) I don't see anyone bringing in \$30 or \$40 thousand a year being allowed subsistence rights regardless of their race or whatever. I don't think anyone will argue with that. As far as the sport hunting, the Sportsmans Club at Clear, I petitioned Fish and Game in 1970 or 1972 to close the cow season in the area and to restrict hunting within (inaudible) I admit the State is large enough they don't have enough people they can't afford enough people to properly (inaudible) the State. They should pay attention to local input. Our club has sent several people down to Juneau to testify. Their testimony was ignored completely, regulations were written and they pretty well favor one particular guide in Fairbanks. I don't want to see the sport hunting take all the blame which isn't really the sports hunting, because mostly a sports hunter will take out the meat if they can carry it and it is useable. They also may bring a horn out or a rack or whatever. But they will and I guess that in

general will bring out and they should (inaudible) and definitely prosecute heavily anyone that wastes any meat. Basically, that's all I have to say.

Representative Nels Anderson: Well, Mr. Souders you mentioned something about the Fish and Game, and you state that, is it correct when I heard you say that you feel they are guilty of mismanagement.

Andrew Souders: To a great extent they've been late on all their regulations and restricting the hunting, they've done it with the caribou herd, they've done it with the moose.

Representative Nels Anderson: Do you have any idea why this might be the case? Why they are late, always behind?

Andrew Souders: I think a little bit of it is the size of the State and the personnel they have and the budget they have and also I think a good bit of it is that there's too much political influence.

Representative Nels Anderson: Okay, when you say this, I understand the size of the state and the number of personnel, do you feel there aren't enough personnel to enforce or to go out.

Andrew Souders: For the size of the State I don't see how they can economically afford to get enough coverage on the proper game management without taking local input and paying attention to them. This has been going on since I've been up here, it's not any recent administration or anything else.

Representative Steve Cowper: Yeah, Mr. Souders, if you were going to manage

some population of fish lets say or some animal and you had an area that the animal went he maybe migrated, maybe it's a caribou and he migrates from this place to this place through the years and you discover you have to limit the harvest now how do you think should get precedence if you can say only harvest 600 animals. Do you think the people living right in the area should get precedence? Do you think everybody in the state should have the same chance. How do you think that ought to work?

Andrew Souders: That is a rather tough question. My personal feelings would be if it has to be restricted to give the people in the immediate area a preference.

Chris Anderson: I was born and raised in Fairbanks, and lived there for all my life essentially. Speaking today as a private citizen for the concerned, I testified briefly last night at the hearing in Fairbanks and I'd also like to spend a very brief time just for the record. And that point is something that I read in the Fairbanks Daily News Miner, I believe about a month ago. It was an article dealing with subsistence and I think it centered around the problems that the caribou herds up in the Northwest and Anuktuviik Pass and this and that. Very briefly, what that article said was, it centered around a quote from a nutritionist that is in the Fairbanks area, and what the nutritionist said was that it is very possible for subsistence users or people that live in the rural areas that do eat caribou and live off the marine mammals and things of this sort, to have a very good diet, a very nutritious diet and if something happens where they do have to change their diet, buying hamburgers, big macs or whatever, (inaudible) that could be very damaging to their metabolism, to their diet. I would like to enter that into the record and if possible I would like to have the Committee take a look or

even talk to, this certain nutritionist to get some more information concerning diets and nutrition and things of this sort.

Representative Nels Anderson: Do you have the name of the person?

Chris Anderson: Margariete Stetson.

Representative Nels Anderson: And where does she work?

Chris Anderson: She's in Fairbanks. She works for the University of Alaska Extension service.

Representative Nels Anderson: That's one aspect that was brought out in Nome, I believe by one of the people that worked in the Health Corporation that there is a direct relationship between people that live in rural communities who use moose, caribou, seal, walrus, and whatever and apparently there is some kind of a not only a physiological breakdown if there's a sudden switch to another diet but there's also a psychological problem experience as well. I think that was brought out last night. A gal named Marian Hao made a statement.

Steve Matthew: First of all I'd like to express my gratitude for you being here. My name is Steve Matthew, I'm associated with Tanana Chiefs Health authority. I seem to get carried away with words so I thought I better write down what I'm going to say. I'm here primarily to speak about the health related (inaudible) I've been traveling, first of all I must say to you why my job is in Tanana Chiefs. I'm a village liaison officer with Tanana Chiefs Health. Consequently, I've been traveling these last two weeks soliciting

resolutions for Health Authority to contract with the Federal Government under 638 (inaudible) I've been hearing the Native people in our area saying there's not enough control. There's not enough local control of the game. First of all, migratory birds. Birds, that's okay if you're going to give Alaskans a fair chance but migratory birds are only allowed to be shot there between September 1 and thereafter. And we all know that they go down south and the Mexican Government and the Canadian Government do not have no control over it. We have laws with those two special government. In fact the Mexican Government allows migratory birds to be put on their market year round and why couldn't we get our birds, migrating north in the Spring to be allowed to be killed by Indians and Eskimos and whites, whoever wants those birds in the spring instead of after September 1. They're not here after that.

And secondly, the moose, now I'm getting away from my written testimony. I drove between Anchorage and Fairbanks one time about two year ago. That last 100 miles toward Anchorage I counted 17 cow moose not one bull did I see in the 17 Now those guys that want to to to college to say that we're going to regulate your moose and save all the cows for no bull to service them. That's uncalled for. I mean, you can save all the cows in the world but you're not going to reproduce if there is no bull to service them. 17 cow moose, I saw and not one bull, all cows. That's not very good management. I just heard over the radio just recently, yesterday really, they finally discovered that brown bear and bear especially to moose calves. Well, Indians knew that for 2,000 years. If they just utilize the Indian knowledge of game management our game management would be superb now but just because we don't have a Ph.D. in back of our name they think that's wrong. They think that's absolutely ridiculous to have some uneducated Indian on the board and that's where they're making their mistake. Indians knew that bears were predators

of cows and calves especially in the spring. Just as much as wolves. Christ, they asked us 200 years ago we would have told them that. And you know with my other two jobs, I wouldn't say the figure I make, but I make, but I make a pretty good wage but I still can't hold my head above water. Above flooding with bills and my wife she makes \$16,000 a year. Both of us, you take in Fort Yukon, I was over there for the last couple of weeks and you know what is costs? I went into this one person's house my really good friend. And do you know what I saw? And you people talk about subsistence. \$14.74 for 3 lbs. of coffee and they don't work. And you know another thing I saw two years ago. I'm pretty well acquainted with welfare because a lot of my clients were welfare recipients and in this one (inaudible) he bragged to me about making \$22,000 that year clear and this one woman (my grandchild in Indian) she said to me, she says no I would rather not fool around with that food stamp. It's not worth it to save \$11.00 and this guy who made \$23,000 bucks was getting them for nothing. This is where you people got to clamp down on those people that taking advantage of those old people like that. Those old people are the ones that are the backbone of this country and there's so many laws that's forgetting that.

Another thing subsistence hunting, well, I told you I been on the road for the last two weeks, but I was down Koyukuk, and three years ago there was one Swedish resident that came to Koyukuk (inaudible) Last year there was two. This year there was 15. And only one of those Swedes could speak english. Now there needs to be some control there.

You know as far as I'm concerned what needs to be done, drastic measures, anybody that makes over \$15,000 dollars shouldn't have a hunting license. And restrict the moose population altogether, if we're going to have moose another

50 years from now. We blame the wolves, we blame everybody else, but I did not hear anybody blaming us, humans. We're the worst son of guns, in the whole damn country. I'm associated with pretty prominent people, doctors and stuff and one of my doctor friends told me, that you know when I was hunting, he said this is an educated man, I shot my own dog, I said what you mean, you shot your own dog? He said, this was a brush shot, he said, I heard the brush moving, so I shot. And he shot his own lab. Now, this kind of instance we got to prosecute them buggars.

Representative Nels Anderson: The reason why we would like to ask for your statements is that we're going to need some help in drafting legislation and your views on what we ought to do would be helpful.

Mary Demientieff: My name is Mary Demientieff, and I work for the Tanana Chiefs as the health aide for the Native people in Nenana. Let me go back, not a few hundred years ago, but about 50 when I lived down at Holy Cross with my husband. And we fished and we hunted, that was our way of life. In the spring, my husband would go out hunting beaver, he got his limit of beaver, came home, paid his bills, got enough food to last through the summer then we went fishing. Now, the best part was we could get as much fish as we wanted, there was no wasting, we made our fish wheels and if our neighbor was not able to set up his own fish wheel, everybody helped, we just helped each other. Without pay, and when our wheels were overloaded with fish, what we couldn't handle ourselves, we gave to the neighbors who didn't have much in his fish wheel. This was our way of life, we help each other. There was no laws in those days as to how much fish you could catch. I remember one summer we caught over 300 salmon by nets and 18,000 dog fish by fish wheel and we cut every bit of it. Every bit of the fish, regardless of what it was, we put it away, we dried the heads, the tails,

the eggs, everything, and we had - my husband took care of about 80 or 90 dogs, they belonged to the mail man.

In those days, you know, there was no airplanes and the mail was brought from one village to the other by dog team and he took care of all those dogs in the summer time. I think it was \$4 or \$5 a dog for the whole month. After the fish was all dried, we sold what we couldn't use to the storekeepers and they in turn gave it to us in groceries. Then in the fall time we loaded our boats and went up the Iditirod River and we stayed there all winter, we fished and we hunted and we trapped. My husband trapped. I never did any trapping, I never went behind the dog team in my life, but I helped, in my own way. I raised nine children, of course when they were school age, we had to move back to Holy Cross. We never known among my own people, down at Holy Cross and even here at Nenana, I've never known the people to waste any part of the meat, the head even was boiled and made into head cheese, the meat was put into, if they had freezers, if they were well off they put the meat into freezers or they iced the meat or they bottled it, canned it, there was nothing wasted.

Now, I've sons that go out hunting in the fall time, they go out and they come back and they say - Mom, you know what we seen out there? There's a moose out there at such and such a place and the best parts of the meat, are taken perhaps the horns or the hind quarters or perhaps the front, and all the rest is left there and that's not the first time. That happened several times already. Right now, of course, I don't fish or hunt, but the people here in Nenana and elsewhere, they have to pay for that to have a fish permit, which I don't know how much that fish wheel permit is, they have to have a boat permit, they have to have a permit to go commercial fishing. Now, they have to catch only so much

fish for their own use. It's not like years ago, when you could go out and catch your own fish, get what you want and leave the rest. Why are the laws made so confusing for people now, at least for the Native people. They don't even make enough out of fishing during the summer months to take care of their families during the winter time. That's all I have to say.

Representative Steve Cowper: I would like to ask you a question, I've been asking some of the other witnesses here, if you've only got a certain number of fish or animals that you can harvest - who do you think should have the preference? In other words, who do you think should have the animal?

Mary Demientieff: Well, there are alot of people who make alot of money, who have year round jobs. I think, to me, the ones who have part time jobs or no jobs at all, or people who have large families even if they are working. This would give them a little more money you know, for their families to take care of them. Because coffee, sugar, anything you buy from the stores is sky high right now to what it was 50 years ago. And I've lived in Nenana since 1945 and I've seen the price of food go sky high and every bit of that money goes into paying for something.

Representative Steve Cowper: And you know something about the price of groceries in Holy Cross, too?

Mary Demientieff: Yes, we used to buy one pound can of butter, they had no margarine in those days, and it was \$1.25 and tea was \$.75 and I guess coffee was a little bit higher and flour was \$7.00 and 50 lbs.of sugar was \$8.00. And everybody used coffee in those days, but, of course, we didn't have grocery stores,

we had grocery stores, but there was no baked goods in the stores, there was no baked bread or cookies or anything. We made our own at home. We baked our own bread and made our own cookies and there was no meat in the stores, either, like pork chops, ham, all that fancy food we eat today. The trouble right now, you wonder why a lot of our children are sick, because they don't eat the right kinds of foods. The food right now is all bought in the stores where if the parents were able to go out and hunt moose and catch all the fish that they want, put it away the way they should, the children would grow up strong, their bodies would be strong and they wouldn't get sick all the time. Now this continually sore throats and colds and pneumonia and I don't know what not right here in Nenana, right at the present time. I think it's due to their diet.

Steve Matthew: I would like to say a couple of more words in regard to your question. On who do you think should be allowed to fish. I know there's some people on the Yukon River that take advantage of limitation of fishing for profit and I think, I really don't know what control can be enforced. But on the profit part, I really don't know how to control that, but I really think that Mrs. Demientieff said that subsistence limitation should be lifted because this is my primary concern, for the health of our people. I've seen up in Anaktuvik, I've seen up in Arctic Village, I've seen in Rampart, everybody is talking about subsistence limitation. They can't get enough fish to carry them over through the winter and believe you me, that there is those people out there that live there that have nothing else on their diet. Sometimes in the winter months and they are just lean, lean months, is fish and rice. If our regulations are going to restrict their fishing that means that they are just going to have rice. They're not going to have protein, nothing in it. I really think that if your committee should have any impact to lift those subsistence limitations because

I know our people in the Tanana Chiefs Region have to have that lifted, otherwise, they are going to go hungry.

Representative Nels Anderson: We hope that we'll be able to give the Department of Fish and Game a little bit more direction when it comes to the development of regulations regarding subsistence because I do know for a fact that only in the salmon industry is there some real effort to take into consideration the subsistence use of salmon. We're right now in the process or I should say the State of Alaska is now in the process of defining rules and regulations regarding the take of herring on a commercial basis. There are no rules and regulations now that control access to the herring along the westcoast of Alaska and last year, I think they took something like 1,240 ton of herring out of the Togiak area. People there are really concerned because they're thinking if there's this kind of take on an annual basis, that, that resource is going to disappear in a relatively short period of time. One of the things that we've tried to do and I think that we are going to be successful is that in the development of the herring fishery since there is no really big commercial history of fish taking of herring along the coast of Alaska, but the first allocation shall be for the taking of subsistence for subsistence purposes. We have found in the information that we have developed through research of Fish and Game records and other information that people take approximately, and this is only the recorded take of herring. And it's something like 600 ton of herring on an annual basis on the westcoast of Alaska. That's the sizable amount of protein and so I think that what we're going to be able to do is to allow first allocation - the proposal that's going to be made by the Department of Fish and Game - they are going to say, okay, for commercial activity, you are going to be allowed to take 6,000 tons of herring,

the first 1,000 tons of herring will be allocated to subsistence purposes. We are going to try to have impact in making sure that these kinds of considerations are made.

I wanted to share with you something that I learned, or the Committee learned in Glenallen. She mentioned that she doesn't look at grayling like a sports fish. She looks at it as food on the table and in their area, they are allowed only five per person, I believe, but she was saying that she had a big family, four or five kids and five grayling just doesn't cut it. The people need more. These are the kinds of things we want to hear from you. If you feel like you said, Steve, that there are some unfair limitations placed on people because they need more and we have to know about this, so we can make recommendations to the Department of Fish and Game, the Boards of Fish and the Board of Game to let them know that people, that people in the rural areas and in the State of Alaska, generally, are not being fairly treated and that allocations ought to be more liberally granted than they are now. Is there anyone else at this time who would like to make a statement for the Committee?

Male Participant: May I comment again on Mr. Matthew's and Mr. (inaudible) on Fish and Game licenses that the funds should be put in the general fund like everything is. I run around with a 40 horse Mercury and these Fish and Game have two 50's. It should be put on the general fund like everything else.

Representative Nels Anderson: Well, I get your point and I read you loud and clear. One of the things that I'm going to hopefully get the Committee to adopt for recommendation to the Legislative Council is that we're going to make a recommendation that the sports licenses and the game tags and so forth are not put into - put into a separate fund and matched with federal funds. We're

going to try, at least, I'm going to make an effort to make sure the Department of Fish and Game has their budget taken out of the General Fund so that they are not overly swayed by sports interests. Because I do know, that there is a great deal of pressure applied by the sports interest. I'm not saying that by my statement I'm not trying to alienate sports hunters. I do know that they have tried without success to get the Department of Fish and Game to change their way of management. They've not been successful in doing so. I'm also aware of the fact that there have been citizens on the local level have been trying to tell the Department of Fish and Game that some of their activities have not been correct and because the Department of Fish and Game hasn't adopted the local people's expertise. That we have all suffered and our game and fish resources have declines dramatically. And it's made it harder for all of us to go out and get what we need.

Male Participant: Can you tell me or tell us how, the Governor appoints the Board of Fish and Game? The regulatory boards?

Representative Nels Anderson: The Department of Fish and Game and the appointment of their board members, they've got two boards. We've got a Board of Fish, and a Board of Game. Now, these people that are appointed by the Governor, of course, he uses local representatives from my area. He'll listen to the Senator from that area. And representatives from all over the State. The sportsman's associations will have a say. Every special interest group has an opportunity to write a letter to the Governor and say, okay, we'd like to have this person appointed and we would like you to (inaudible) nominate people and have them appointed to these boards, in other words people in Bristol Bay would have their

own Board of Fish and Game, what you people up here have to do to maintain what you need for your take and so forth would have nothing to do with what we do down in Bristol Bay. And, quite frankly, I'm not satisfied with the amount of voice we don't have on the existing Boards of Fish and Game. I'd like to have another member, or one member on the Board of Game, too, so that our voice could be heard a little bit louder, but it isn't. I'm not satisfied with the status quo, I want to see it with the local people involved.

Steve Matthew: I would like to say one more thing real quick. Regarding what you talk about herring. Half of us in the northern part here don't know what the herring is. I do because I ate damn thing down in Edgcomb so damn long, tired of it. This is what I'm trying to say, you're controlling herring and we're trying to control moose. Up in Anaktuvik and Arctic Village, they're trying to control caribou. I went up there two weeks ago, it's in my statement there, I was up in Arctic Village and the people say and the news media says that all those people up there are wasting caribou. They are not - I was up there and they got about 15 caribou that one day, but everything on that one caribou was used. Only things I can say they wasted was a couple of skins, that's all. They threw it over trees where they'll pick up later. (Inaudible) Cripes, they even eat the marrow, (inaudible). It never rots because it never thaws out. You can go up there nine months later and eat the marrow and it's like its been killed yesterday. So, there's nobody that's wasting the caribou up there. The game biologists go up there and they want a big story, sure you say that.

Joe Williams: My name is Joe Williams, I'm from Nenana, I've been here all my life. There is one thing I would like to substantiate and this was the word

that Steve said in accordance with the people in the lower Kuskokwim area and the lower Yukon with the people that had come in, the outside people, I had a chance to be in Huslia the other day and there were 15 people that had come from out of the country, could not speak the language, and were strictly sports hunters. This is their right. We do have a lot of economic pressures, there is a lot of sportsmen that do make livings. We're not trying to keep someone from making a living in the State. There are regulations in the sporting industry that are pretty strict. I'm sure in the future it's going to be even worse. This is just a matter of regulatory power that what's going to stand up first. Do we need the money, or do we need the people that are subsistence type in this category. One of the things that your Committee might take up is a firm stand. A definite firm stand on the definition of subsistence, I would sure hate to be in your boots, for sure. There was a Fish Board meeting in this town and they tried to come up with a solution on how many fish were actually here and they don't know. To this day, I wouldn't hesitate to say that they still don't know. Through electronic gear and the rest of it, information is just not available. Our fall runs here have been great. One year they are down, to go into the whole international fisheries program, it's just absurd because we're looking at it on a strictly local level. You try to tell them the international program and people have been fishing for years, it's a lost program. Getting back to the reason you're here and the prioritizing of who should or who shouldn't get a definite view. I believe in the aboriginal right of the people that are here, with older people coming first, no doubt. Giving them almost carte blanc to subsistence rights, taking in there an economic and a physical standpoint of view. There's people that are 45, 50 years old, they're not going to be here much longer, how much are they going to actually take if they're making only \$6,000 a year?

The younger people that are coming up, they're subsistence users. I hate to say it, but, there is going to be a lot of people on welfare. It's just a matter of you're going to have to make a priority, it's coming. And it's just a matter of who is going to get it first. Like you said, this is the main reason that you're here and it's just definite view and I really don't have that much else to say. There's so many conflicts of interest when you get into sportsman and the rest of it - subsistence itself. It just should be defined and there is going to be a lot of people trampled on. A lot of people with hurt feelings, but it has to be defined and kept up.

Representative Nels Anderson: Joe, I've got just two comments on your statement. I just want to read to you something that I had written to my constituents in the Bay. I'll just read it verbatim. We had hoped to define subsistence as it relates to Alaskans throughout the State. Arguments against defining subsistence are: "That subsistence values and uses vary greatly across the State and that any attempt to define subsistence in the same way throughout the State will greatly undermine subsistence hunting and fishing in every region of the State." And, in this point in time, at this point of history, I'll tell you I'm not too comfortable with the suggestion you are making that this Committee take a firm stand on the definition of subsistence. I think what we've got to do after hearing the comments that we've heard already is to try to put into language that approximates what people like yourself have been saying and throw back out to the public and see whether or not a general definition of subsistence would be satisfactory, but I'd just really, to be very frank, really afraid of the prospect of just saying, okay, this is it.

Joe Williams: At a certain point in time, which is coming shortly, I don't know whether you really agree with it or not, there's going to be a point that most game hunting is going to be limited to a very few people. And this is why I say that something has to be specifically done. This is to at least maybe you won't end up with 50% of the people that now come under the general subsistence ruling, but there will be the other 50% and like I say, this doesn't meet the rule first by age, aboriginal rights, means of income. Ten years from now, if they cut it off from everybody, fair is fair, because when these people, the older people, especially, that have brought us up in this country have lived their lifestyle the way they see fit have wanted to go fishing, hunting, trapping, more power to them. We should give them carte blanc. Whatever they want. I have been very proud to be a member of this State, and I've been here all my life and been proud to see that older people have been well taken care of, in general. There are specific instances, that we shouldn't be very proud, but in general, we've been very considerate to the older generation and this I'd like to see carried on and this is why I say specifically protect the rights of the older people.

Mitch Demientieff: One more point that I think that I would like to address tonight. In my earlier testimony I didn't deal too much on specifics the first time because I was just trying to get the hearing going and trying to make general comments. Through the meeting, through the reading in the papers of the nature of the hearings, particularly, the one held in Fairbanks last night and I know the issue goes one and one, of different conflicts of interest, different areas of interest, different pressures put on people when it comes to regulating fish and game. I think that there is one universal stand. I think

that this Committee could have some influence in leading a charge of this nature. I think that a real study has to be done on the current management of the Department of Fish and Game. Everybody that I know of has their own particular story of the incompetency of the Department of Fish and Game. The kinds of things that they do, last year, I was involved with the caribou issue of the Western Arctic herd working with the people on the Koyukuk River, Allakaket, Alatna, Hughes and Huslia. I went over and did a personal study on the dependency as an issue. Whether or not the people on the Koyukuk River should be allowed to participate in the taking of the 3,000 subsistence quota allotted for the caribou taken out of the Western Arctic her.

I went over and did a personal study on the dependency of caribou as opposed to the availability of moose and what the dependency breakdown is. I can't recall, it's been a year, I can't recall the exact numbers, but there was a December meeting of the Board of Game. Caribou (inaudible) and on record of that meeting there are the figures I laid out and meeting prior to that one held in September in Fairbanks by the Board of Game in that meeting, the Department laid out alot of their figures on the dependency of different people on moose and on caribou. But, I would wager that I got within five moose and five caribou on the whole Koyukuk River of what people had taken in three years prior to December of 1976. I know I did. I went from house to house, person to person, somebody would say, well, last three years, last year I didn't get any moose. You mean to tell me you lived here all last year and you didn't take any moose? The guy says, well, I did get two. Well, I know that got moose, I know that they need to get moose, I know that they can't make it if they didn't get moose or caribou or fish and bears. I know they can't make it, there's just no way, what are they going to eat? So, I got the figures, I say within five moose,

five caribou in three years time of what was taken out of there and I computed it in, the Department personnel was giving testimony to the Board on the usage, well, we estimate, the Department biologist estimates X number of caribou were taken in the fall and spring hunting season of 1975. They were estimations and they readily admitted they said that these are department estimations.

Supposedly, theoretically, these are supposed to be ball park figures, in the neighborhood, in the vicinity, a thousand moose were taken, those, of course, aren't the figures. They weren't even close, on no counts, no particular year were they close to estimating the actual take and yet when it comes time for the decision to be made by the Board of Game, they used their staff's data and it was incorrect in that particular instance. And, I know that countless people throughout the State, the Department is continually responding to a crisis situation.

The gentleman from Clear said that there were some problems and there are problems. They're constantly responding to crisis situations as opposed to managing to prevent those crisis situations. And, I think that there is one thing that this Committee should do is take a look at the management practices of those department personnel. There's just no way that any university in the world can teach department personnel to manage the game, if when they get their degrees and go to work they can't even come up with ball park figures of what the actual take is, or how many are in there. The way they compute on what the escapement is on salmon, is for instance, which is always an issue with us here on the river. They go into the spawning grounds, fly over, take a look, there must be a 100 fish down there, I can see - clear water streams when they're spawning, there must be a 100 fish down there, and there's their estimation, that's

how they get their figures and they are incorrect and they are making decisions that affect our lives, daily, on those fly over type of things that are just totally out of perspective. There is one thing this Committee should do (inaudible) they ought to take a look at the kinds of things that the department is doing and where taxpayer's dollars are going in support of that department. Because we're frankly getting ripped off, and anything to do in that line would be time and effort well spent.

Jeff Kennedy - My name is Jeff Kennedy and I live in Fairbanks and I would like to make a comment, and Mitch or somebody else may correct me, but it's something that Mitch brought up in the beginning, should there be a way of looking at subsistence hunting and shouldn't people be allotted different quotas or different priorities if they live in a rural area that's connected to the highway. It seems to me that somebody who lives in the rural area connected to a highway has a unique problem because other people can come into their neighborhoods and shoot the fish and game very easily that the people in that area could normally get. It seems to me there should be a higher priority not a lower priority for people who live in the rural areas and are connected by highways. Correct me, if I'm wrong.

Representative Nels Anderson: I would just like to thank you people for coming down and having a chance to hear your views and give us a chance to give us a few of ours if there is anything specific that any of us or the rest of us maybe we could talk on a one to one basis, if you might be around for a little while after this meeting. It's getting closer into the evening.

Well, thank you all very much. I'm not really here to tell you what I feel about subsistence. I think most of you that know me, I have a tremendous feeling

for the people, the land, the resources, and I'm very much interested in hearing your comments and even if there are those of you who may not have expressed yourself this evening, I would invite you to write to members of the Committee or to myself if you'd like to put your thoughts in the form of writing. I want to stress very strongly though, that we do need your comments. Because the issue of subsistence is not going to go away. It is being considered in Congress, it is going to be considered in Juneau, and any comments that substantiates some of the statements that have already been made that will help us create and develop legislation that would not abuse your feelings about the issue would be very helpful to us. And we'll continue to solicit your statements as times goes on. I'd like to thank all of you again for coming and if there is any way that we can help, I would ask that Dorothy make it know what our address is and also urge you to communicate with your senators and representatives and let them know how you feel. If there are no other comments, then, the Committee on Subsistence is adjourned.

Tanana Hearing

Huber
Tritt
Isabel Gilman

Testimony of Steve Matthew

Miss Karen Perdue and myself have been travelling around the villages here in the interior Tanana Chiefs Conference area - Doyon Region lately. Our main purpose was: for Karen, discussing the possibility of relocating or replacing the Tanana Hospital; my travelling was primarily for the Resolution of 638, i.e. soliciting 638 Resolutions from the village because of the fact that they defined a village tribal area in Alaska as a village corporation to go along with what they did in the Lower '48.

What I'm primarily here to speak about would be health-related in the sense that the moose population and the moose production areas. This morning as I rode to town I heard a very interesting discovery as far as the State Management of Wildlife is concerned. They finally discovered the fact that brown bears are as big a predators on moose as wolves are. If they only asked us first inhabitants of Alaska this question we would have given them the answer 200 years ago. When they first came to Alaska we would have told them that brown bears are predators to moose - they kill the calves all the time. That's understandable. And yet now they come to us and ask us "What is subsistence?" What is subsistence? Me, I make \$26,000.00 a year and that's not enough to pay my tax. My wife makes another \$16,000.00 a year. With all this money we barely keep our heads above water. And they want to ask us what subsistence is. Subsistence

in my opinion would be to subsist off the land that you are living on. To live off this land year in and year out requires a lot. First of all, your family needs to be there when you need to work. I'll switch from here to Anaktuvuk Pass and Arctic Village. Those two villages have been under fire for a long time because of the fact that they kill caribou and live off of them. But if you go into those villages you will very seldom see anybody wasting caribou meat. I know that you people will say that it is not true because it has been proven otherwise - how about down in Minto Flats where they kill a moose and drop the whole thing and just cut off a horn. Us consumers never hear about those things. You never hear about all the slaughter that the army people do out on the caribou range. You never hear about those things. The only thing you hear about is Indians and Eskimos slaughtering these animals - slaughter them - that's all they say. It's not true. Everything we take, every part of the animal is used. More so in Anaktuvuk and Arctic Village; those two villages really depend on caribou. For one to sit back and say from this chair that Anaktuvuk and Arctic Village kill caribou for nothing and are wasteful, well, that's a bunch of hogwash. I have talked to these people, I've listened to them, I've met with them, and anything they kill is meant for the table and is used.

In the interior my father once paid my mother's way to Fairbanks for an operation and then paid her way back. This was before the Great White Father came in with all his beautiful money

and spoiled the Indian people. It took the Great White Father 70 years to do the Indian people wrong by taking away his dignity. Tell him, he didn't have to work, all he has to do is fill out this little piece of paper and the Great White Father will take care of him. Now the tide is turned and the Great White Father wants to renig on all his promises so he's telling this little Indian man "You better get your ass on the ball and go to work." If the Great White Father was so concerned thirty years ago about screwing up everybody, I would suggest that he be as concerned to try to help them get back on their feet. What I mean by that is subsistence hunting is extremely related to the Health of the Indian people in their villages. If one person says that it is not, I'd really like to talk to them. Now this is not my usual kind of speech, but I really think that the Indian people should start putting their foot down and say, "Now, this is it. This is the only way we will accept the hunting regulations."

In the last two weeks I was down in Koyukuk. Three years ago there was one Swedish citizen who came to hunt in the Koyukuk basin. Last year there were three. This year there were fifteen Swedes. Now if you take into consideration that moose population are controlled by wolves, bear, and the one predator Man, do you think he would survive without a really workable solution presented? I know all these guys with all their Ph.D.'s

and all their game management certificates are all well and good, but the Indian knew that the brown bear was one of the main causes of decreased moose population 200 years ago and the White man just found out about it day before yesterday. I think there's a need there that needs to be communicated. Utilize the old Indian knowledge of game management, instead of all this hogwash. I guess Jay Hammond wouldn't like that.

Thank you.

What did I see in the last few weeks. Areas of uncontrolled game management. In the sense, meaning of uncontrolled, ~~would~~ be population growth. It has been taken for granted, in past years, that wolves have always been the predator of moose.

PLEASE NOTE: THE FOLLOWING PAGES WERE TREATED
AS A UNIT IN THE ORIGINAL DOCUMENT.

PUBLIC HEARING TESTIMONY

BY THE ALASKA STATE LEGISLATURE
INTERIM COMMITTEE ON SUBSISTENCE

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:

Representative Nels A. Anderson Jr.,
Chairman

STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT

Adelheid Herrmann

PUBLIC HEARING LOCATION:

NAME: ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

DATE: September, 17, 1977
TIME: 7:00 P.M.

THOSE REGISTERED IN ATTENDANCE AT PUBLIC HEARING

<u>Name</u>	<u>Address</u>	<u>Organization</u>
Helen M. Fagerctrom	Nome	Interested Resident
Dan Thomas	Nome	Interested Resident
Teresa Sockpealuk	Nome	Interested Resident
Duane Oozeva	Gambell, Alaska	Interested Resident
Franklin Kanimgak	Gambell, Alaska	Interested Resident
Gerald Trigg	Nome	Interested Resident
Mark A. Hoelskin	Nome	KNOM Radio
Nanci Millheisler	Box 1127, Nome	Interested Resident
Brenda Johnson	Nome	Resident
Charles Johnson	Nome	
Perry Mendenhall	Box 1141, Nome	Citizen-Native
Nancy Mendenhall	Box 1141, Nome	Interested Citizen & Norton Sound Health Corporation
Esther Bourdon	Nome	Interested Resident
Rita Hukill	Nome	Interested Resident
Nick Wongittilin	Nome	Interested Resident

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PAGE

1.	TESTIMONY OF	Gerald Trigg, Nome	4
2.	TESTIMONY OF	Duane Oozeva, Gambell, Alaska.....	7
3.	TESTIMONY OF	Charles Johnson, Nome.....	9
4.	TESTIMONY OF	Perry Mendenhall, Box 1141, Nome.....	10
5.	TESTIMONY OF	Dan Thomas, Nome.....	16
6.	TESTIMONY OF	Nick Wongittilin, Nome.....	17
7.	TESTIMONY OF	Nancy Mendenhall, Box 1141, Nome.....	18
8.	TESTIMONY OF	Teresa Sockpealuk.....	21



JUNEAU ALASKA

Alaska State Legislature

House

INTERIM COMMITTEE ON SUBSISTENCE
Nels A. Anderson, Jr., Chairman
P. O. Box 234
Dillingham, AK 99576 Tel: 842-5970

SEPTEMBER 17, 1977 - NOME PUBLIC HEARING

Representative Nels Anderson called the Interim Committee to order at this time. For those people that don't know me my name is Nels Anderson. I'm in the House of Representatives and I chair the Committee on Subsistence. It was a committee that was created in the late part of the last session. I think most of you know that I went through a pretty tough time getting re-elected into the house again. I was kicked out and had to run again. One of the things that has been of tremendous interest to me as an individual legislator is that the changing land patterns of the State of Alaska are creating some conflicts in competitive uses for our natural renewable resources. I felt it was necessary for the State of Alaska to begin to look at the term subsistence and what it may or may not mean to people who use fish, game berries, ducks and geese, sea mammals and so forth throughout the State of Alaska. The reason why that I felt it was important is that with the D-2 issue we have a very aggressive national group of legislators such as Mr. Udall and Mr. Seiberling who are wanting to create instant wilderness. The kind of wilderness that they are talking about is not going to permit people to move in and to conduct the kind of traditional cultural activities that have been in existence for hundreds even thousands of years in many parts of our state. One of the things that we are trying to do is get as many views as we can on the subject by holding hearings throughout the State and reviewing available information on the issue. I would like for the record

to apologize for our very obvious lack of ability to really drum up the support that we should of in advance of this meeting. I take full responsibility for that. There is no one really responsible for the kind of problem that we have right now because the public does not know that we're here obviously because of the small number of people that are here. Again, I would like you to know that I take full responsibility for that but nevertheless we are here and we have spent State money coming up here. If there is anyone in the audience that would like to say something about the issue of subsistence I would appreciate it. In addition to that the cause now people are going to be upset because they are going to know that we were here. We do want to give people an opportunity to let us know how they feel by mail.

If there is enough strong feeling for this subject and if there are enough people that think the Committee ought to return to Nome to hear the people on the subject I would be more than happy and willing to entertain another proposed time. We do have a limited budget and a stiff schedule but I think that if there were enough people that think that they should have had something to say about the issue I'm sure that we could come up with the money in the budget to come back up here.

We are going to be traveling to Nenana, Fairbanks, Copper Center, Kodiak. We're holding a full scale hearing in Anchorage during the convention on November 10th, 11th and 12th. The convention theme this year is "Subsistence" and the entire convention is going to be a hearing on Subsistence. I have been given the go ahead by the AFN to do just that since there are going to be so many people in Anchorage at that time we felt that since there are going to be so many people in Anchorage at that time we felt that would be an

opportune time to discuss the subject with as many people as possible and we can get down there from all over the State of Alaska so hopefully we will be able to get views that we may have missed. We plan to go to Galena, Juneau and plan to go up to Barrow in December. So we do have a pretty tight schedule and I will repeat that our budget was severely limited. My original amount that I had on the budget was a budget that would have given the Committee more staff and more of an opportunity to study the subject legally and look at it from a legal point of view and economic point of view. We were not able to do that.

I have a staff assistant working with me primarily gathering information that is available throughout the State at this time. I have also Adelheid Herrmann who is our secretary. Originally our budget presentation to the Council was \$100,000 dollars and that was cut to \$90,000 and right at the very end our budget was cut to \$40,400 and most of that money is going into a travel budget.

We had 8 members on the Committee and they have given me the authority to hold all the hearing at the places that I indicated because the money would not allow them to do so. There are going to be hearings in other parts of the state but the full committee will not be present. That just kind of gives you an idea and a background on what the Interim Committee on Subsistence is all about. What we may finally present to the legislature at this point in time is an open question, there is really no way of predicting what our ultimate position or legislative presentation will be to the Legislative Council. Our basic aim though is to try to find out how subsistence contributes to the rural lifestyle in as many places as we can get to. The floor is open at this time for anyone that would like to give us their thoughts on

the subject.

Gerald Trigg: I want to thank you for coming to the area and I think the issue that we are addressing here is of importance to the area especially with the D-2 land in question. With the ever increasing cost of living we in the Bering Straights are need to continue subsistence living; hunting and fishing. Also not only the poor be allowed to hunt and fish for subsistence needs even though income has risen over the years so has medical care, food, insurance, new cars, homes; all aspects of life. Our subsistence needs are greater in rural northern areas because we don't have access to grounds that which would enable us to grow part of our needs. We do not have the access to lower cost of food that is found in other areas of the State. We have always been dependent on fish and game. Instead of decreasing our subsistence needs thanks to a higher standard of living, we are more dependent on subsistence hunting and fishing. It is important that subsistence areas not be decreased by D-2 with the increasing population and the increase in traffic the D-2 area. If subsistence is not approved will bring about a considerable hardship to the people in the Bering Straits area. We also need cooperative efforts by the Fish and Game agencies to assist the area in attaining our needs. I don't know if you have any questions.

Representative Nels Anderson: Jerry I just have a comment or two. I'm not sure what you mean by a more cooperative effort. Are you saying that people in the local area should have more of a say in fish and game management matters?

Gerald Trigg: I think I would like to say that's the case but we do have a Fish and Game Advisory Board. I 'm not a part of it nor have I attended their

meetings but there are a lot of things happening in our area that are brought about by the Department of Fish and Game that I personally don't agree with. Specifically speaking, the area surrounding Nome was, we were stopped from moose hunting within a 50 mile radius of the area. Walrus hunting has been an issue in the area for the last two to three years. One that will serve us in the very near future is the migratory birds. Fishing is another one that will serve us in the very neat future unless the effect of the 200 mile limit will have a better effect. Basically what I'm trying to get at is that we need to have the fish and game possibly assist us in setting up some fish hatcheries in this area. We're getting into the fishing more and more in this area and we don't want to happen in our area what happened in the Southeast there for awhile where the fishing industry went down for awhile until these fish hatcheries came about. There have been a few issues in the area where we had very little assistance from the Department. I don't have any information here with me now to back this, but in our office we do have information regarding this.

Representative Nels Anderson: One of the common complaints that we have been getting throughout the State is that the Department of Fish and Game, because of it's location in Juneau, because of it's inaccessability people don't get to express their feelings on what they ought to be going. And also that I did support the creation of these fish and game advisory boards, they still don't have enough authority.

Gerald Trigg: They don't have no authority! whatsoever. Like with the local one it is strictly people from Nome. They have no one from the outlying areas represented on the council. That's one of the problems.

Representative Nels Anderson: Another thing that people have been saying too that some of the fish and game advisory groups are dominated by special interest groups like guides for instance.

Gerald Trigg: One thing with the fish and game industry in the State of Alaska is one of our major resources yet it is my feeling that the legislature treats it very lightly and it's shown by the small budget that it operates from. Anytime I make inquires this is one of the answers I get is that we don't have the money - we don't have the budget to do what's right.

Representative Nels Anderson: I think you are basically correct there and one of the things that I was going to get at a little later but you have hit on a problem. The Department of Fish and Game is funded by selling licenses as most of you know so that means our moose and our caribou to non-resident people or foreign people for \$200.00 or whatever a bear tag is or caribou tag or moose tag or whatever, our fish and game are for sale and the Department of Fish and Game depends primarily on that source of income for their budget and that in turn is matched by the Federal Government. One of the things is that I intend to do as a recommendation is to have the administration look at the funding policy at the present time and try to make some changes to try to get the money from the general fund like every department of the State does so that these people are not stuck year after year to go out and sell all the licenses they can and at the same time not getting enough money to provide the management programs to properly protect the fish and game of the State of Alaska. It seems to be a problem we have identified and I think it is something we are going to have to work on. One other thing that I have noticed is that the favorite pastime of most politicians including myself, until about six months ago is that we wanted to make the Department

the "Whipping Boy" and basically the reason they have been the whipping boy is because they have not had the money and it has been the politician's fault and to a large degree the public's fault. They have a lot of inbred funding policy problems that make the situation as it is and I know longer am in the camp anymore. I'm more in line with trying to refine the funding process so that those people will have those kinds of funds that will properly manage those resources in the State.

Gerald Trigg: In conclusion I would like to mention that I belong with three organizations, the local Chamber of Commerce, the Arctic Native Brotherhood and the Nome Eskimo Community and we would all welcome the opportunity in the near future whether by mail or by having you return to the area. We would all welcome the opportunity to present testimony on the issue as you stated earlier we had little, very little notice of it and I'm sure they would appreciate it on saying something of such and important matter.

Representative Nels Anderson: Mr. Trigg, I'd like to, if I could after we get done with the formal hearing, to get together with you and discuss my itinerary and if it looks like there's a possibility of my returning I think I would like to do that and perhaps I could do a better job in getting a little bit more publicity out. The criticism is well taken.

Duane Ozeeva: I'm from the village of Gambell. It's about 200 miles from here. To me subsistence is not just a word - it's a lifestyle. It's a way of life to us. Out in the outlying villages we just don't have a grocery store like the one you've got here in Nome. From the majority of our food we get by hunting marine mammals in the village of Gambell. Since I grew up from 1948 to present time all this has been taken away from us piece by piece through regulations

and legislation which effects us as a culture as a people that live there and yet we do not get any representation when they are formulating the laws that affects us as such and that I see very little of even now.

Like Jerry Trigg said the representation like the advisory board on the Department of Fish and Game is mostly formulated by the residents of Nome even though some of them may have lived in a village at one time or another still their view points are different than how we see subsistence. So I'd like to see more of that representation if they ever do come up with something new, that would be more beneficial to both the villages and the regional centers. The definition of subsistence from what I've heard and what I've read there is no clear cut definition on subsistence that is compatible to us, the people, the State of Alaska, and the Federal Government. These need to be studies with everyone thinking on the same level of subsistence. That's all I have for now.

Representative Nels Anderson: Duane, before you leave, I met with the Governor in Juneau about 12 days ago and he was talking about some of the things that were a great concern to him and I think you are absolutely right in that in the formulation policy, rules and regulations for the most part are not done at the local level. The Fish and Game Advisory Boards are just that. That's all they are. They aren't policy making boards. Going back to what Governor Hammond said that it is his intent to work very hard to create fish and game boards at the local level rather than have a statewide Fish and Game Board trying to manage all over the state with only 7 people. It's his idea now to try to develop legislation that will be a let Fish and Game boards out closer to the local areas. And in making sure that villages such as yours have representation on those Fish and Game Boards and these boards would have

the authority to make the rules and regulations on how things are done in those specific regions and we would have a Fish and Game Board created in Bristol Bay and how we ran things down there would be our business and how you guys did things up in your area would be your business and we wouldn't interfere.

Duane Ozeeva: That I would very much like to see!

Representative Nels Anderson: Again, that's something the Governor advised me that he'd like to do and he did at that time ask for his assistance.

Charles Johnson: I'm the Executive Vice President of Kawerak the non-profit association here. My statement is not totally prepared but it is an personal rather than an official, organizational opinion because Caleb Pungowi who is our president would have to give that on behalf of our organization. Duane Ozeeva is one of our board members and would therefore be more able to give an opinion. My comments are related to coming events that have been publicized and relates to the State Highway Departments plans on building a highway connecting Anchorage, Fairbanks, Bethel, Nome, Kotzebue and Barrow and that event will have greater impact than any rules or regulations on our subsistence living. You only have to look at all the areas around Anchorage and Fairbanks that are now accessable by road and the hunting and fishing there has been totally wiped out. You can look along the pipeline route. It's not just the pipeline itself that have cut down the availability of caribou it's the access to the urban centers. The people from the urban centers can go out and hunt.

If we allow that road to be built between here and Anchorage it will totally wipe out the game. It will wipe it out, out here cause we're pictured

as a place where Eskimo and Native people can live off the land we're pictured more as a sportsmans paradise. If we are accessable by road we then will have all our fishing and hunting taken away regardless of the rules and regulations. This is as far as I understand has been planned by the State Department of Highways. Perhaps out of those general funds. The development of the highway system is not compatible with the preservation of our lifestyle and our hunting and fishing. That's the only comment I have.

Representative Nels Anderson: Thank you very much. That opens up a whole new ball game. I honestly had not taken that proposed highway system into consideration. I would assume that the Interim Committee on Subsistence would have to adopt a position on that particular concern of yours.

Charlie Johnson: Well, my personal position is that the highway system should not be built.

Representative Nels Anderson: That's what I'm saying. The committee should adopt that position and as Chairman of the committee I will make that proposal to other members and hope that we could adopt that resolution of your concern; that we not have the road system.

Perry Mendenhall: I'm in favor of subsistence in the villages and those that have grown up with it and lived as a native such as seal oil, blubber and the greens even the greens, the berries are subsistence. The sea mammals that exist along the coast and all the fish within the lakes, streams and oceans have been sustaining the Eskimo for thousands of years and now that we're under the whiteman's system all of a sudden they want to cut us off from this type of lifestyle and means of diet. They are cutting it off by their laws and

regulations but at this time they have no means to replace it economically, socially. Villages that traded among each other developed because of trading of dry fish and seal oil. The trading of black meat and berries between various villages. Like even today on Shishmaref we have to write in order to get black meat; the best quality type of black meat. If we want dry fish we have to write to Teller. We trade or buy.

Being that I've grown up in Nome doesn't mean that I don't appreciate some of the whiteman's food that I eat but I see that the whiteman supplement my diet. When I was growing up and when I came back from college the first thing I wanted was my native food. There's a lot of people that have never left the villages that have grown up and have never been as educated. That's their life, that's all they know. I feel instead of just being an advisory board for subsistence there should be a completely native board that has full control on subsistence and plus the fish and game controls the laws and the regulations in the State. Of course it would have to vary from region to region because each region they sort of have a different means of subsistence. A lot of people feel we have been killing off the bowhead whales but there hasn't been blubber, muktuk around like there was last year just enough to get a lot of the people by on. They take their own lives in their hands when they go out after the whales, walrus and oorguks and even the little harbor seals. When they go out there in their plywood boat or skin boat, a lot of times we had to forage over the ice because we got caught in the ice. Trying to make coffee for two hours on the whiteman's stove that don't work is something else out there. It gets hectic out there. I've hunted out on the ice with friend of mine in town here and realize the danger that they face. They look at and accept it as a means of life like our ancestors have but I feel that the subsistence food that we have is our main-

stay of diet in a way and it will take a long time for the whiteman's food to take a hold and dominate most of the diet of our people in our villages. If you go to any big cities in Alaska you will find the Eskimos requesting their native foods. Because they are hungry for it they want it, that's the way they grew up. There in the big cities not because of choice but because they were trained and sent away and they got used to living out there but still they have that desire for subsistence. Maybe even Ad wanted her native food while she was attending the University. They say that the whiteman's food is the mainstay, but it can't be out in the villages because it is pretty expensive in the villages even the meat. One pound of meat, I don't know how they make that one pound of meat stretch but it is expensive. Maybe just to cut the diet to make it a little bit different once in awhile. Kind of identify that they're within the system and maybe the hunting wasn't that good and they were forced to go to that store.

They also depend on the ivory on the walrus that were caught for commercial value. The whiteman has created this commercial value on the ivory artifacts and ivory carvings and it is good in some ways because it helps alot of Eskimo carvers maintain their living by carving, out in the villages and even in Anchorage and Fairbanks. Subsistence hunting even with permits it's kind of a late coming thing to the Natives. Why they have to buy permits for catching crab, fish things like that. Before they never had to do this. No one jumped on them for catching crab and fish. Today you have to buy \$.25 or some kind of nominal fee for a permit to show that you're a subsistence hunter or fisherman. It's kind of wiping a culture out by having to pay for it. They probably reluctantly buy this just to stay within the law even though they don't like to buy the permits. There is a lot of other things that need to be remedied pertaining to subsistence. It seems like the majority of votes

comes from the urban centers and the rural votes that are in Juneau cannot really carry subsistence it seems that the urban votes could the rural votes in Juneau even if there are a lot of testimonies and sayings on subsistence. I feel that this is a misrepresentation on this subject of subsistence and laws and regulations pertaining to subsistence. When the whiteman wants to do some hunting or trapping on their own without as a means of living they don't really go after him. They go after the Native that does all the hunting and trapping all their life but when the whiteman goes and he makes noise about it they leave him alone maybe because he knows the law a little bit better. There is probably different courses of misunderstanding and courses of reading the law as you might say.

Representative Nels Anderson: Thank you for your comments. I would like to go back to what you were saying about the State of Alaska at this time has no means to replace the loss of any kind of subsistence hunting or fishing. Could you expand on that just a little.

Perry Mendenhall: With the laws and regulations that's been written and revised that would in a way inhibit or prohibit subsistence living or hunting like caribou, Sea Mammal Act and fishing as well. If they are saying no, you can't really depend on subsistence you can't go out as much as you can to do subsistence. That's the way that the Native family has lived most of their life and all of a sudden you said no. How is that person going to make a living. Since he hasn't been trained to or indoctrinated to go in an urban situation to make a living. What type of training or economic system that would take the place of subsistence.

Representative Nels Anderson: Has this area done any kind of survey about what

the family dependence is on the land?

Perry Mendenhall: In fact I wrote a letter to the local newspapers here and stated that there was no such survey done in this area. Fish and Game never did say that they did such a survey. In Nome or in the outlying villages that depended upon subsistence. Nels, the reason why I asked this Perry is that in Bristol Bay and several of our villages and I think throughout the whole region that we have more or less documented by surveys what people do take off the land. The number of ducks and geese and ptarmigan, how many pounds of berries are picked a year, moose harvested, walrus and it's kind of added up and it's really astounding how much dependence there is on the land it seems to me that it might be a worthwhile effort. I wish that it could be done here and every village on the people that depend on Native food and subsistence life. Even though a lot of people have been identified as Eskimo families here this is a part that goes living off the land. Some of them find seasonal work but that's not enough to carry them through so they have to depend on subsistence.

Representative Nels Anderson: Well, I think everybody that lives out in rural Alaska is effected because anyone that lives out in rural Alaska i going to have to depend somewhat on the land and I see it not only being restricted to Native people. It's going to be non-native people too. That do use moose and do use berries, they get their fish.

Perry Mendenhall: It seems like to the restriction that 30 miles up the road and 50 miles to the west of us and 52 miles to the east of us is closed to moose hunting and I know there is a lot of family's in town that don't have the means to go outside these boundaries to hunt moose. I have been taking

some of my friends out to get moose too.

Representative Nels Anderson: Perry, was this created by the Advisory Board or did the Department of Fish and Game that created that.

Perry Mendenhall: I don't know how the Department of Fish and Game came to making these boundaries.

Representative Nels Anderson: What year did this happen?

Perry Mendenhall: Just this year. Nobody knew where the boundaries were going to be until moose season was open. Nobody knew about boundaries at all. I don't see how some of the people here that don't have vehicles or means of transporting themselves outside the boundaries.

Representative Nels Anderson: Was there any notice?

Perry Mendenhall: I don't believe there was any notice. They wanted the tourists to see the moose close to town was the rumor. So even though there's moose walking out at Dry Creek which is about 1 mile away or around Nome-Beltz, which is about 5 miles away and up around Snake River which is about 5 or 10 miles away they can't really get moose. But even though there's moose around in those areas the people can't get them because of no means to. Last year they didn't get many moose close to Nome anyway maybe about 10.

Representative Nels Anderson: Is the Department of Fish and Game represented here now? Has anyone asked them why they did that?

Dan Thomas: I'd kind of just like to add onto what Perry said concerning the access depending on what your economic level is. People that don't have enough money to have a four wheel drive are put at a great disadvantage as far as moose hunting is concerned around here cause that makes it a lot easier to get out to where the moose are and to bring them back in. And the people who aren't making as much money are going to be more economically dependent on the moose, meat, just because they aren't able to buy meat in the stores. If anything is going to be restricted, if there have to be restrictions made because of over hunting or to let the moose population to recover. It should be restricted on the upper income level. The people who are making the most money should be restricted first and allow the lower income level to hunt. Like rather than restricting everybody to 30 and 50 miles away from Nome maybe restrict everybody who makes over \$10,000 and let the other people to continue to hunt closer to Nome where they have access to that area. To make it pay attention to the economic level of the people involved rather than making blanket restrictions.

Representative Nels Anderson: How do you see some program like this being worked out?

Dan Thomas: Just, well, with the advisory board they would know about the situation around Nome and just seems that all you need is a little sensitivity to what's going on. Just make a restricted area without thinking about what affect it will have on the people involved. Right now you have to have a car and be able to get all the way out of town to get moose so only the people that have the cars and you just about have to have a 4-wheel drive and that's a little bit expensive up here to get a moose and unless you have a friend with 4-wheel drive.

I had one other comment about fishing and that is that I worked with Fish and Game here this summer and subsistence fishing was supposed to have priority over commercial fishing so that if anybody that anybody was going to be restricted it would be the commercial that was knocked out first but the way worked out the commercial fishing was going on for a couple of weeks or a month before subsistence fishing really started and the catches were so heavy compared to previous years that it was restricted down from 4 days a week to 2 days a week. Just about when subsistence was going to start so it ended up that the commercial had been fishing for about 4 days a week for quite some time and all of a sudden the subsistence was laid down on this 2 day a week thing. So who is getting priority? The commercial fishing was. It wasn't done on purpose. It just happened to work out that way. And so I think they should just be more cautious on how much they let the commercial catch. Realizing that the subsistence people are going to be fishing later in the year.

Nick Wongitillon: I'm not good speak English. Different island, dialect. I'm growing up in Gambell. I stay in Gambell. I stay in a Eskimo house and I use the Eskimo food mostly walrus and whale, fish. I am hunter too. Before, walrus hunter, we mostly eat walrus and the whale. I think Eskimo mostly like the walrus and whale. Even the little ones we can feed them walrus and whale. If we eat something like that in the store, whiteman food, food very expensive. We see we are liked by some but...if we stay on the island. We hunting, get whale for the Eskimo and right now I'm thinking myself that we like walrus and how can I get it, I can eat any kind but mostly I like walrus and whale.

Representative Nels Anderson: I'm really glad that you told us that because

like I said earlier, that people that live in Anchorage, Fairbanks, the bigger cities, the lower 48 they don't understand what or how you feel and the only way they are going to know is if you tell us and we'll try to tell other people so they understand.

Nancy Mendenhall: I'm a citizen of Nome and a mother of five and I also work for Norton Sound Regional Health Corporation. I just want to talk briefly on the nutritional needs and our concern for the health of the people of the region. I think that as that as the people's capability of hunting goes down they will have to substitute other foods and with a limited income and the cost of living here which is probably 2/3 over the cost of food in Anchorage that most families are in a real bind if they can't get out and get subsistence foods. As their nutritional condition goes down then their health care needs go up and we are really aware of this at Norton Sound where we don't just want to cure disease and so we want to help people live better in the first place so they don't get sick and don't get diseased. We spend a lot of time talking and planning about how to improve the health status of the people of the region and I think it's really strongly connected with the food they are eating and I think we all know that if you have a limited income and that if you're trying to buy food that you end up cutting down your protein and your fresh stuff especially here in Nome and the only fresh meat that you can afford to buy now would be hamburger and chicken. We use to have reindeer in the stores, we don't even have reindeer anymore so if a family is cut off from their source of hunting and fishing they are really going to get cut down on their protein and again the same thing with their fresh vegetables that to buy the fresh produce at the local store is difficult for most families and unless they are getting fresh greens and berries their vitamins and minerals are going to go way down.

Some people just don't take this seriously and they say nobody in Nome really uses subsistence food anymore. This is a fiction, but not a fiction. I know that in my family if we had to buy all our food, it would be \$700 or \$800 a month. Even though we have a good income in our family with 2 people working we still use a lot of subsistence food, and count on them whereas if I go around and visit people and many families that I visit in Nome I never see any store bought food on their tables or in their cupboards except for staples. They'll buy coffee, sugar and flour that are staples but there are many homes and families where I've never seen what you call commercial meat. They always use subsistence meat. It's very, very important part of their diet. If their ability to get this food goes down and their earning power doesn't go up I know they are going to be more and more dependent on welfare and food stamps and so on to supplement their diet and their diet is going to get poorer and poorer and I don't need to tell you that the diet has gone down hill when you look at the dental needs and problems.

As far as health needs to you can see that dental is number one. But there are other ways that it is going down hill besides dental that you can't see as well as dental but there are other ways that the health status goes down when the nutritional needs go down.

In the villages a lot of the stores don't have the things we are talking about like commercial meat, and fresh produce there are very few native stores in the villages that carry that kind of thing only in the larger richer villages. In the smaller ones the only thing the local store will carry will be the staples like coffee, sugar and flour and when I go to the villages I see that the only kind of meat that people have to provide is the native meat is the subsistence meat and fish. They are especially dependent in the villages but

I don't think they realize how dependent they are in Nome too. I think it would be a very good idea that a survey was done in Nome I think they would find out there is a lot more importance in these subsistence foods than people are willing to admit.

Representative Nels Anderson: I brought that up earlier with I don't know who I asked whether or not there had been a survey conducted and the reason why there was such an emphasis on conducting a survey down in the Aleknagik area where I live was that the State of Alaska was extremely interested in a Wood River-Tikchik State park and they were going to prohibit any more subsistence activities in the boundaries of something like 1.4 million acres of land and we tried to think of all kinds of ways of why this shouldn't be done and we figured the best way would be to look at the people's diets and try to find out where the food came from. We conducted a survey and it was impressive to see what the dependence was with the berries, number of pounds harvested every year, the fish, game, greens whatever and it came right Bristol Bay Native Association and they conducted that survey. I don't recall where they got their money from, but it called our attention to another aspect of subsistence. Another thing that you have more or less more clearly emphasized in my mind is that there is a direct relationship between the nutritional intake and subsistence that if one reduces something else has got to come in and replace it. This then causes and increases in welfare and food stamps. Then the nutritional intake quality is another part of that whole question. Is that intake the replacement necessary to maintain a healthy diet for the people. I didn't get that. All this was going around in my mind but I wanted to state to you that you did put the meat and I feel a little bit more clear on that and I can argue a little bit more aggressively and knowledgeably. I do want to thank you for your comment.

Teresa Sockpealuk: I'm originally from Shaktoolik or at heart I'll always be from Shaktoolik. I believe in subsistence and I'm 100% for it. I'll give you a rough estimate for a total home expenses in a village like if you want to live comfortably. Just on the home expenses along, my family \$1059 a month just on home expenses alone that includes food, stove oil, groceries, light bill and accesories and house payments. The rural people are - like if they don't get subsistence they have to turn to welfare or food stamps. I think that when a guy has to turn himself to food stamps he lowers himself to a level where he doesn't care anymore then he starts drinking and he doesn't give a damn then he doesn't become a man anymore to his family.

Representative Nels Anderson: There's something beyond what we're talking about. There's a very definite feeling of pride and dignity that a reduction in subsistence lifestyle there is a erosion of how a people feel about themselves. We're trying to figure how in the world we're going to deal with that but it comes through every time we sit down and talk with people that people really feel strongly about this and they can't find the right words. How are we going to deal with in the legislature.

Teresa Sockpealuk: I think there's a lot of mental anguish if subsistence was taken away totally from them like already walrus hunting might be taken away and the bowhead whale.

Perry Mendenhall: I would like to comment on the hearing here tonight and I sort of feel like there would be a lot more people here if both the radio stations KICY and KNOM had been able to broadcast it on a daily basis on news time and during noon news and even put it on Ptarmigan Telegraph because that's when a lot of native people listen to it I believe that we would have had a

better turnout tonight and I also understand that our local representative is on the same committee that you are serving on and wonder why he has not been able to notify the public of this hearing so they would have been able to participate in this hearing perserving their own subsistence right and culture and we need more local control on subsistence.

"NOME IRA POSITION PAPER"

Topic: "Subsistences"

October 1977

Villages started and exist because of "subsistence living" and it is a way of life up here. Even our Eskimo legends state that it is to be such. It is a traditional and a cultural heritage to live off the land, for each season has ~~an~~ harvest time, whether it is for berries, greens, sea mammals, ducks, birds, caribou, fur bearing animals, etc....and this practice does vary from area to area. What has existed for thousands of years, can't be changed overnight, even under the Alaska Native Land Claims Settlement Act or new State laws. Our way of life satisfies one's body, mind and soul. But we are entrapped into new ways and strange laws, snarled many times over, until now our subsistence way of life is endangered.

Before going on with further comments on "subsistence", we would like to mention Secretary of Interior Andrus's remarks on subsistence: Secretary Andrus stated that in rural Alaska "change from the subsistence to the cash economy has not only been rapid, its been relentless". "...There is a need to recognize legitimate subsistence uses in Alaska..."

The population of Nome consists of approximately 80% or more natives. We know that the majority of their income is low and that unemployment/welfare is high. And that the cost of living in Nome is approximately 165% of Anchorage and 198% of Seattle. The Northwest area of Alaska has the highest cost of living in the State; and the welfare checks/assurances do not go far for living, especially if they have families. *Reasons For Subsistence Rights:*

1. There should be a subsistence survey conducted in rural Alaska to determine dependency upon native foods due to diet customs and cultural health standards. This survey would show the people who depend upon it fully, partially or not at all. This survey would show subsistence rights is essential and should not be mismanaged by the State.
2. Commercial foods are not totally acceptable by natives due to cultural, high cost and health reasons.
3. Subsistence living or dependency is not a political issue, but a means for most of our native people's existence from season to season, day to day, year to year.
4. Subsistence, supplement welfare and BIA assurances. If subsistence rights are taken away or mismanaged, welfare needs/demands would increase.
5. Unemployment and high inflation costs (for living) encourages a subsistence dependency and life style.
6. Due to high cost of living, subsistence dependency should not be restricted because of income, race or life style.
7. State should fund a local control committee (meetings, travel, etc.) to regulate the State Fish and Game's activities in the local area (i.e. Northwest region). That the local control committee will not be just a advisory group, but have the power to control the local State Fish and Game management and to set regulations within the area, concerning subsistence hunting and fishing, commercial fishing, sport hunting and fishing, and to make recommendations to the Government.

elaborate

8. Closure areas around Nome provide hardship on low income people (i.e. moose hunting, etc.)
9. Subsistence fishing should not be regulated along with commercial fishing, to the point that commercial fishing is favored rather than subsistence fishing. Subsistence fishing should be top priority...on all species of fish.
10. Due to the increase of commercial fishing, fish hatcheries should be developed and encouraged, then implemented as soon as possible to ensure subsistence and commercial fishing. (State funded)
11. No State development or assistances (grants/technical assistances) on the economic/social level have been seen in our area, which would encourage tourism, fishing industries, land and resource development, etc. Investments like this by the State would help alleviate the unemployment/welfare rate in this area somewhat.
12. Urban politicians tend to regulate rural subsistence life and dependency by limiting Fish and Game allocations.
13. Hearings on Sea Mammals should be conducted in the areas concerned rather than in Anchorage, Fairbanks or Juneau urban centers. Not very many rural people could afford to make it to the hearings conducted in Anchorage area...(sea mammals). If there is to be hearings on moose or caribou for example, our area would like to be included. Sea Mammal hearing ^{should be} conducted in coastal areas where the people depend upon sea mammals for subsistences.
14. State parks, d-2 lands should take into consideration subsistence hunting and fishing and not to mismanage subsistence rights through new regulations or prohibiting use of such lands for subsistence use.
even the name given to us by the Indian people and now known throughout the world means "raw meat eaters" and the name is "ESKIMO". Eskimos are subsistence hunters and fisherman.

The State should help preserve one of the minority ethnic groups in the world through proper management on subsistence rights. The State should see that subsistence is a means for existing in rural Alaska, and that provisions should be considered for keeping it.

PLEASE NOTE: THE PRECEDING PAGES WERE TREATED
AS A UNIT IN THE ORIGINAL DOCUMENT.

PUBLIC HEARING TESTIMONY

BY THE ALASKA STATE LEGISLATURE
INTERIM COMMITTEE ON SUBSISTENCE

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:

Representative Nels A. Anderson, Jr., Chairman
Representative Al Shakak

STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT:

Adelheid Herrmann, Secretary

PUBLIC HEARING LOCATION:

NOME, ALASKA
KING ISLAND COMMUNITY CENTER

DATE: Thursday, October 27, 1977
TIME: 7:00 P.M.

THOSE REGISTERED IN ATTENDANCE AT PUBLIC HEARING

<u>Name</u>	<u>Address</u>	<u>Organization</u>
Charlie Kowchee	General Delivery	Kawerak
Ralph Kowchee	P.O. Box, Nome	
Mark A. Hoelsken	P.O. Box 988, Nome	KNOM Radio
George Dan, Sr.	General Delivery, Stebbins	
Dan Thomas	Box 1141, Nome	NSHC
Henry Adams	Koyuk, Alaska	Kawerak
John Waghiyi, Sr.	Box 174, Nome	
Della Waghiyi	Box 174, Nome	
Evan Schubert	Box 277, Nome	
Tomi Schubert	Box 277, Nome	Student
Carolyn Schubert	Box 277, Nome	Council Native Corporation
Little Sisters of Jesus	Box 845, Nome	
Charles M. Kokuluk	Box 297, Nome	King Island IRA
Agatha Kokuluk	Box 297, Nome	
Thomas J. Ellanna	Box 148, Nome	King Island IRA & Kawerak, Inc.
Jeanette Martin	Box 966, Nome	NSHC
Heinrich Springer	Box 352, Nome	
Ronald Davena	Box 113, Nome	
Bertha Wilkalkia	Box 419, Nome	
Herbert Wilkalkia	Box 419, Nome	
Harold Ahmasuk, Sr.	Box 729, Nome	
Wesley Ahmasuk	Box 729, Nome	
Ellie Kulukhon	Box 219, Nome	
Bessie Moses	Box 814, Nome	
John Jemewouk	General Delivery, Elim	Elim IRA Council
Caleb Pungowiyi	Box 1013, Nome	Kawerak, Inc.
Mina Pungowiyi	Box 1013, Nome	
Nanci Mill heisler	Box 1127, Nome	
Chuck Blem	Box 788, Nome	
Jacob Ahwinona	Box 746, Nome	
Vernon Kugzruk	Box 833, Nome	
Mike Willoya	Nome	
Perry Mendenhall	Box 1141, Nome	Nome IRA Village
Jackie Wilson	Box 219, Nome	Ault Basic Ed.
Richard Miller	Box 905, Nome	Situasuak Native Corporation
Charles Fagerstrom	Box 946, Nome	
Ralph Willoya	Golovin	
Elmer Seetot, Sr.	Brevig Mission	
Jenny Alowa	Box 1007, Nome	Individual
Bill Dann	Box 966, Nome	NSHC
Aaron Simon	White Mountain 99784	
Andrew Daniels	Elim, Alaska 99739	IRA Council-Elim
Roger Seetot	Nome, Alaska	
Ruth Wright	Nome, Alaska	
Tersa Smith	528 W. 5th Ave., Anch. 99501	State Affairs Commission
Frances Binford	Box 771, Nome	Housewife
Sue Matthenis	Box 811, Nome	
David Roeng	2747 W. 42nd Place, Anch.	Counsel, State Affairs. Comm.

THOSE REGISTERED IN ATTENDANCE AT PUBLIC HEARING

<u>Name</u>	<u>Address</u>	<u>Organization</u>
Jeff Kowchee	Nome, Alaska	
Bernard Kasgnoc	Box 39, Nome	
Brenda Johnson	Nome, Alaska	
Truman Johnson	Nome, Alaska	
Nicole Johnson	Nome, Alaka	
Alfred S. Sahlin	Box 758, Nome	Sitnasusauk
J.J. Pullock	Box 206, Nome	King Island

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PAGE

1. Testimony of....George Dan, Stebbins.....	1
2. Testimony of....Emma Willoya.....	4
3. Testimony of....Tommi Schubert.....	8
4. Testimony of....Eddie Schubert.....	8
5. Testimony of....Evan Schubert.....	8
6. Testimony of....Caleg Pungowiyi.....	8
7. Testimony of....Ralph Willoya.....	10
8. Testimony of....Vernon Kugzruk.....	11
9. Testimony of....Perry Mendenhall.....	13
10. Testimony of....Henry Adams.....	15
11. Testimony of....Richard Miller.....	16
12. Testimony of....Roger Seetot.....	18
13. Testimony of....Elmer Seetot, Sr., Brevig Mission.....	18
14. Testimony of....Ellie Kulukhon.....	20
15. Testimony of....Wesley Ahmasuk.....	20
16. Testimony of....Aaron Simon.....	20
17. Testimony of....Jenny Alowa.....	21
18. Testimony of....Jacob Ahwinona.....	22
19. Testimony of....Bill Dann.....	23
20. Testimony of....Tereasa Sockpealak from Shaktoolik....	25
21. Testimony of....Jeanette Martin.....	25
22. Testimony of....Sue Mathenis.....	27
23. Testimony of....John Larson.....	28
24. Testimony of....Tom Ellanna.....	30
25. Testimony of....Dan Thomas.....	31
26. Testimony of....Carolyn Schubert.....	32
27. Testimony of....John Wahiyi, Sr.....	34
28. Testimony of....Alfred S. Sahlin.....	35
29. Testimony of....Dan Karmun.....	35
30. Testimony of....Ressie Moses.....	37
31. Testimony of....Della Wahiyi.....	39



JUNEAU ALASKA

Alaska State Legislature

House

INTERIM COMMITTEE ON SUBSISTENCE
NELS A. ANDERSON, JR., CHAIRMAN
P.O. Box 234 • 842-5970
Dillingham, Alaska 99576

OCTOBER 17, 1977 - NOME PUBLIC HEARING

George Dan, Stebbins: Our feelings have to be respected before you listen to politicians, I know a lot of people have feelings. Something came up as to what we should talk about, only by verbal our feelings how this is concerned. They listen to the radio what's going on in the village a lot of them be attacking to our people our way of life. People mentioned white man, suppose to live off money instead of boat our subsistence way of life, and little income we get, if you want me to talk about it from way back I could, but to make it real brief I see those changes now to us. Way back I was six years old I can remember I buy flour for \$2.50 a 60 lb. flour, now you buy 50 lb. for \$35.00. You see the difference how are climbing up in the money new standard of living. But more often now, we leave out subsistence. We can't afford to buy beef meat. The lawmakers, they try to standardize their own, they can't do this. Up here our climate is so different, what we get is seasonal and in one month certain game we can catch, now December is a good time to get Tom Cod meat, November, January they be gone. The rest of them is no good. Walrus come in Spring.

Our living catching food for our potential is so different than living in the United States, that what I like to see is lawmaking on a fish for our subsistence way of life separate from a lot bigger control to BIA control. BIA has a lot longer experience better Government than a living standard way of life. A lot of things that we get for living we work for it, we never get paid for it. They don't pay us to get dues, Federal Government don't pay us to get dues. But Federal Government is very fair to us. From my background they put in Fish and Wildlife Organization to govern the fish so people in the local village under IRA they control the village. When an IRA man come and say don't pollute the beach, the people respect it, they do that because the

the Federal Government organized it to get good control. Fish and Game is overdoing it now. They are hurting people in subsistence catch. Instead of hurting Japanese and other Countries, Japanese catch so many herring they wipe out the herring. Back home your lucky if you get two or three herring strings catch in Spring time and alot of things happening other than that. Fish they catch in high seas the commercial fishing is getting little bit lower and lower all the time. The commercial fishing is open for so many days and so much catches the Fish and Game control that. They get so many that even if we try to subsistence catch that when we put out the net no subsistence catch is allowed.

Alot of things I want to talk about including I got a lot of experience on the road, oil, economic development on our land. This our way of life is turning. You think about it for a minute seriously, you guys are try to make a law. If you try to make a road from Fairbanks to Seattle to Nome you going to open the way to catch our game and they are going to wipe them out. Alot of people is rich from outside, they can travel this is open for a way for people to come into our area to take our game, moose and everything they put a four lane highway and the moose disappear, kill our birds whatever they can kill. It would be easier for them to come and kill than going to Saint Lawrence Island if their was roads. Another thing that I am going to change my subject on that is the sea, the oceanside. I try to think about it not only for me and my people that I live with. They're going to give up oil from sea mammal and sea birds whatever you call it, and small people come and their scared of game. They should be strong and protected locally, village IRA control. They know what game is in, in certain time to hunt, how much they can take. And I know the State Representatives do what they do, but they are not doing enough for us.

Looking at the whale people need any kind of ffod extract oil for their shortening like we use lard or some places butter. They use meat for protein. This is not a National law what I understand this applies to this country whaling country. Why don't you set aside law and put BIA control or IRA control in the village to make local limited sets for their own subsistence. Thats what makes easier cooperative work between Federal, State and local. All the fish management control to the local

residents they make good resolution on how they should manage their own resources the State make a law for the whole area and wipe out from plain to plain it doesn't sound sick to me it should be limited to Senators how they got Land Claims Settlement Act, Regional Corporation benefits, Corporation areas.

And up to Barter Island the whaling hunting should be based on to them for their own benefits put a limit to where they can survive on, and bears and so forth. And check how much they can collect for their own resources and from the back history, you know they might limit to about 10 to 30 polar hide and whale that can take care of them a whole winter for the next season, that should be limited to them cause walrus on St. Lawrence Island use them for their own food. That should be based on what the people are getting for their own food. Back home we get 10, 12, maybe 13 walrus if we're lucky, but alot of them need extra food and certain other regulations should be based on higher control by the Federal Government control. State control they put to much restriction, people live on for their own subsistence from way back before Alaska become State. Thats my really feeling right now. We can control ourselves we are strong enough to make decisions. Our code of catch fishing taken and the Federal Government take study it and leave it up to us so we won't kill all or overkill. There are two other things I don't like, oil development in Norton Sound and road connected to State highway to Anchorage and Fairbanks keep it away. Will keep us our own management, I don't mind development of road for getting to places other than water if they put that road into Anchorage, and Fairbanks it opens slaughter for our own things, this my feeling and I would like to make clear to anybody. I was in the Army long time, we living in money economy, and we living in subsistence both sides I was glad to get letter from (inaudible) to attend this meeting I need some lot of backing so we can live like this its going to take long time to develop people to cities, like Anchorage, Fairbanks are big cities who live on money, money, money economy. I worked in the city and you can't spend one week off or two or three days off and get paid for what you been doing, but every move you make you have to pay. We can get wood instead of getting warm and something happens we can still survive. We know how to live on it. But to not practice this so our younger people to education could live like us, they can live under snow, sod houses or they can

dry up after they run into water. They should be taught so our way of life can be kept up. It come to me who really try to take control of our living standard way of life. The State or the Federal Government we got Land Claims Settlement its not doing really functioning, State seem to get more power, the Federal Government seem to lacing to Governmenting on village interest on native interests, but they put more money, but they want to get rid of it schools, BIA Schools to State so State can take care of it. I put my limit to this once I know maybe somebody want to testimony show concern for our own benefit.

Emma Willoya: I have lived in Alaska all my life, born in the Northern part of Alaska but raised in a mission, and the rest of my living has been down in this area of Alaska around Nome. In order to give my children education schooling. I understand that this is a subsistence meeting and as I have gone up in years I think alot of this subsistence as I understand it getting what food you can with not a lot of surplus, thats the way I understand subsistence. Now we older people, we lived off the country, raised our children trying to show them the way we had to live off the country and as we were reindeer harpooners when we were young. Our children did not have that provision to be supplied with reindeer because rules and regulations changed everything in the years of the twenties. But we survived, we kept up with the hunting of the food as they came in seasonally now what I mean is and you all know it too in the winter time you have certain amount of reindeer meat you can get a hold of it or buy it now years ago when we owned reindeer we could kill our own earmarked reindeer, dress it and have it for food, but not these latter years. Theres alot of reindeer owners that had to take it the same way as I did in my family then after the winter was shortening and the days were getting longer they had to look forward to something else. As it came seasonally. Probably ptarmigan and rabbit maybe something else from the ocean like crab or seal, because it was the time that they could be taken, they don't stay all the year around, and so as the days got longer and the ground thawed out to help them with their food like the white people use turnips or onions or lettuce, we use greens like the willow leaf and all the different kinds of greens that grow.

Then as the summer went on came on approaching we think of our fish. Now our fish hunting for fish is much different than when we use seasons

years ago, now we have to follow laws in order to have something put aside for our families and still teach our families how to get it, how to prepare it and put it away for future use, what I mean by that, suppose there was a air raid and pretty soon it might happen we got to have something put aside, we keep it put aside for future uses, then as the summer wears out there is a different kind, fishes, birds that come along and we don't have a whole pile of place to put away this food we don't have refrigerators, frozen ice boxes we had to prepare it a certain way. We plucked the ducks, dry them up a little to cook them and put them away in oil to preserve it for something maybe next week if we had nothing. We'd have that, so we took our food seasonally thats what I mean not a whole pile right now, but we take enough to put away feed on it and be well and strong. And our children same time showing them how to prepare it.

Then as the birds went by, because there is no more they went to lay their eggs somewhere else we can't run after them, we let them go by, we look for something else, follow and return. We get our fish, we dry it, we put it away, so that's the way we live year after year. We might get seal we put it away work on it put away the oil, dry the meat, put that away. If they did not do that years ago, you wouldn't see us here, not one of us would be alive. But we learned it and we learned to take care of it and we have to teach our kids to take care of it too, because you never know what might happen if they don't have the food. They call that famine, starvation, you might work for money and earn lots of money but if that money is gone, you got no meat put away, some kind of meat, some kind of fish your children is going to go hungry, very hungry; they got to learn how to take care of it and learn how to catch it now, not next year, but right now while we're living. And so on in that way they try to hunt what they need when they see it, same way with the walrus and the white whale they can't get whole lot of it in one week to put away for next year, they have to take certain portion and its getting more restirctied now, more than ever, pretty soon there will be no more ivory carving, you go to buy it or dig in the ground to look for it.

In the fall its the same way it comes seasonally according to the month, every month has different types of something to hunt if we are

going to run out of this, we hunt to get something else cause that month is going to bring something else for us to hunt and teach our children. Lots of these people know that and they prepare for the future so there won't be no starving and another thing is that they get a bigger portion that they couldn't handle they know when they see their neighbors don't have very much, because maybe their not very strong to to hunt, maybe their sickly, maybe they have no tools to get something, they help them out, they just don't look at them they help them out, they just don't look at them and let them starve, share with them what they got and that's the way they survive. But things are getting limited more and more, so we got to be ready for it and prepare whatever we can, even if we follow how much we're suppose to take, we got to save it and prepare it and put away for future use. Long time ago during the war they said, if you have tanks, big drums with good tight cover on it put some food away in case of something, in case of war, in case of air-raid. You have that put away, you have nothing else, you got that what you put away. Many many years ago they didn't have their tanks or wooden barrels to put away their food, they used seal pokes, the skins of animals. They learned to take care of their food, and that has been passed on to the children now, so they have a chance according to the months that bring in the food they'll have something ahead to munch on and keep alive. Right now they have help with guns with shells to go hunting. Our forefathers didn't have that, they had their bows and arrows and spears of course. I remember one of the elder ladies that use to talk to many years ago, she survived three famines, they even save heads still on the spring in order to have something to munch or soak and make soup. We don't need to have that, but still we have the chance to put it away according to the season.

Now it's coming towards fall, we have another type to hunt up, like the white whale, and I hope we can all the time keep that in mind put away and store away for they can be dried and preserved in different ways also. The Natives learned that put away things in different ways and they always try to save their oil, seal oil. Years ago the seal oil was a very important food. They used it as a food, they used it as a light, electirc light, not only that they used it like stove oil, they cooked all their food, heat. They used it for different ways before the white man ever knew about it. They have to learn that, they had

to help themselves in different ways and that's why they survived. Lots of people say where did the Eskimo people come from, but you the Eskimo came just the same like all those other people when they built that tower of Babel in Europe, God sent all kinds of languages. I wouldn't understand the Siberian, so I don't walk across to Alaska, and the Siberians walked over on the Russian lands. The Russians they walked up to Russia, because they couldn't understand somebody else. That's what survival is, they had to go where they could survive and build up that's why there is Eskimos now from Point Barrow to way down as far as Alaska is long and they learned to prepare their food in different ways. They're not all alike, but they survived and I hope that everybody understands that the more you try to help yourself and follow the instructions the more you take care of your families and help out. Then you can show the white people how they can survive if they go no canned meat, nothing come in the boat, airplane, they too, can fish and chew on and live side by side with the Eskimos. I wanted to come to this meeting very much because it talks about subsistence. It means that you can help yourself and you can survive even though you're not a millionaire. You don't have to be rich to live through tough life. We had quite a few reindeer when it was taken away and you weren't allowed to kill your own earmarked reindeer, it was tough. Tough with nine children, what were they going to eat when the meat was gone? We got to teach our children how to live, we just got to teach them, teach them where the rivers are where you can get. I know one time when this one good hunter went up the river to fish and they wanted a good school of it because they liked to hang up a lot, they came down with nothing, down the river. My husband had died and I took my children, let's take our turn, we went up and we got a whole school of it, not enough to share with the people who didn't get any. I would like to let everybody know that don't ever be afraid to get your food it's the right time to get it, it's not wrong to go help yourself out of the country, you let them people who look after the papers and books let them know you get it. They have these permits now and they stamp them, but you know that they cannot let you suffer if you have nothing and you are trying to keep yourself alive. People come first, human beings come first for survival. We got to learn to help ourselves. Don't be lazy. White people don't tell us to be lazy, they want us to learn to work, same way with the food. If you or we need that food then get it.

That's the time to get it. It was sent on this earth for people to survive, but use it in the right way. I hope you all understand that you should never be afraid to help and take care of your children by showing them how to help themselves to hunt for that one way of living a good life you don't have to be rich to do it. But live in the right way and God will give you long days of life. I thank you.

Tommi Schubert: I'm twelve years old and I come to Alaska. I love to go set traps before school and check the traps later and see if we caught anything. And if we did catch anything we would bring it home and skin to dry. After they are dry they are tanned and then we give them to our Grandma and she either makes them into parkas or hats. I also like to fish so we can eat the fish for lunch or supper, and I also help my Mom cut and dry the fish for the winter. We eat the dried fish with seal oil at my Grandmas house or our house and really enjoy it very much.

Eddie Schubert: My name is Eddie Schubert and I am a resident of Council, I'm fifteen years old and I have been hunting, fishing and trapping ever since I don't know when. I enjoy hunting, trapping and fishing very much and we use everything I catch. I enjoy eating my catch because its better than store bought meat. I'd very much like to continue to do these and hope I'll always be able to do so.

Evan Schubert: Hello my name is Evan Schubert and I am theirteen years old. I'm from Council, Alaska. I like to hunt and fish very much. I've been doing it so long I can't remeber when I first started. Also I would like to keep on doing it because my whole family like to eat whatever I catch and my Grandma also like to use the fur for making clothing. In the winter I would rather be eating moose meat than beef, because moose meat I think is better tasting.

Caleb Pungowiyi: President of Kawerak, Inc., and first of all I want to thank the Committee for this opportunity to testify and also holding additional hearings so that more people from this area can be heard on this important issue.

One of the questions that the Committee asked was that should subsistence

be defined? I think that word has already had a definition and what this Committee is seeking is the definition for subsistence use and who is the subsistence user. One of the unfortunate things about the word subsistence is the continued connection with the Native lifestyle and culture. Although the Alaska Native people are the primary people involved with subsistence use, the anti-native backlash because the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act and the Marine-Mammal Protection Act has made subsistence an emotional, racial, and a political issue. I don't believe that one has to work for clothing or use bows and arrows to qualify as a subsistence user, as there are other people that will be much more articulate than me in terms that define what those uses are and who the people are that use those resources. The Committee did come up with a different issue based on the inquiries that people from around the State to come up with the necessary action that you would be taking to protect the resource for subsistence use.

The Fish and Game and other National Renewable resources should definitely be taken into consideration on lands and water policy use or in essence like OCS Development - large land developments or transportation systems. One of our major concerns on subsistence resources in the State on transportation plan for expansion of highway systems. Although there has been constant opposition connecting Nome area to Fairbanks Alaska, those bullheaded people in the Transportation Department seem to think that such transportation network is necessary. We are concerned that if such a highway system is developed it will increase our local population and increase access to the natural resources, increase trespasses on native lands, all in which in turn will lead to the deduction of the resources. For example, in this area here locally, we have one road that connects to another village, namely Teller. And the Department of Transportation turns about the developing plans connecting roads all the way to the States. There will be economic activity that the people in those communities will benefit from such a development, anybody in this area knows that there has been little, if any, economic development in Teller, even though it is connected to Nome. Those few villages that are in essence directly connected to the highway to Teller probably have more problems than any other village in this area, therefore, the highway system is not really that beneficial to the people and it only has increased the access of the people in Nome

to the resource that are within the vicinity of those villages and myself included for that matter.

The State of Alaska should definitely take steps to protect subsistence use and the resources that are primarily used for subsistence. The current Fish & Game regulations are primarily to enhance management control, not so much in terms of developing the resources or anything like that, rather to control the people that use these resources. The much publicized Fish & Game Advisory Boards are not working because they are not involving the village people, and finally for lack of funds, because they don't have funds to hire their own staff. They use the Fish & Game personnel as a primary personnel to work with advisory boards defeats the system of their advisory boards. They should have their own staff that would research and collect data independent of the Department of Fish & Game, so that the advisory boards can make independent recommendations to the Fish & Game Board.

One more thing in reference to the whale ban, although this does not connect or I guess in some way has affected this committee. I have talked to a number of people from the whale ban and also what impact it would have on them and what their response is now that the Government of the United States has not decided to oppose the ban. The majority of the people that I have talked to have indicated that they will go ahead and hunt whales this spring, and I myself will support their position, because I don't believe that the Government or the Conservationists realize the importance or the happenings that take place with the whale and the catching of the whale, it is an event that is beyond the definition in the English translation. It involves not only the villages that catches the whale, but the people in that area as well. And again I want to thank the Committee for this opportunity and I hope that everything that is heard in these hearings will be taken into consideration.

Ralph Willoya - Golovin: One of our Representatives from the State is here, and I believe to my knowledge for our own people here in Alaska and as I live here and I noticed that we are unfairly on this subsistence. What we talk about is when we live here in the past years and I believe when I live with my mother for many years and its a long time and that is on subsistence. And I believe that when we talk about subsistence we

we don't have to worry and ask for any need of welfare, and when we have subsistence we have to break down and go out and get it and that's the truth about subsistence. But I live through that too long and many have to live through that today. I have enjoyed and that is subsistence to me. Today I made only about \$4,500.00 and that isn't enough to survive me. I went out, might say yesterday I went out and get my game through the fall, through the winter, I got my game through the fall and through the winter I go out and get I give my own Grandpa who couldn't hunt I give my whatever it was that was my subsistence to them people and so to tell each and everyone of you that I love to hunt and when I leave here I will do it I know they try to stop me, but they better not or I'm sorry to say I will not say anything again. The laws of today, I live to the laws, it's not anybody's but their laws, and I don't think that anything that we ever do, because when we think, when we feel that there is something that is not there we'll move over there, just because it provides us more and all we try is to help ourselves and we come back again maybe few years again. But survival means a lot to me. Thank you.

Vernon Kugzruk: I'm from Nome, I guess very briefly I would like to testify on some of the issues that might be coming up. And there are few things attempting to find the definition for subsistence. All the fresh and salt water fishes should be included in the subsistence, including crabs and shrimp and also all the ducks that come to this area, the geese, the crane, the ptarmigan and so forth. Now on something about the ducks, I noticed that just this last fall the season of duck and geese, cranes and so forth opened very late for instance the crane season opened by that time the crane were gone and I hope this panel can recommend to the Fish & Game Board whenever such issues of subsistence is taken up elsewhere that something should be made as far as the opening of like say cranes. It should be opened earlier because they mature very fast and they're full grown by at least the middle of August. They mature the same time as ptarmigan and ptarmigan is open the 15th or the 20th of August.

And also I'm sure that subsistence users will be required to use or consume just about all the meat of the catch, but some care in the developing, this definition should be taken because such taking of wolves,

foxes and wolverines and so forth, the meat is not eaten, these are taken for they're fur for garments and so forth, and also last summer I think that every subsistence fishermen was required to document or make out some type of documentation of what they caught, where they caught it and how many they caught. Now we have many elderly people in our area, I'm talking about the Teller area up in the Kupshook area for a lot of them cannot even read, write, very minimal and these people are being required to document whatever they caught. I think that subsistence users should not be required, however helpful that may be, should be on a voluntary basis.

In the event that the development of our offshores course around the country and somewhere, should there be taken that minimum amount of activity due to some type of development of our lands and offshore and so forth. And also I am hoping I think as many are that the definition of subsistence living is not to be drafted or by certain conservationist groups outside of our immediate area, which I mean is Alaska. I'm saying that making sure that people from California or somewhere do not write the definition of subsistence I think you as the panel and the Legislature of Alaska is in a better position of making at least recommendations to the United States Government of making definitions for subsistence.

Finally, I think I would like to state my position on the bowhead whales. I feel quite comfortable, and quite happy that wherever the bowhead whales are used and hunted for subsistence purposes I am very glad that they will continue to hunt these despite the position that the United States Government is taking on the bowhead whales. I think that there is a conflict of interest such as those people, like for instance in the Point Barrow area on down to the Saint Lawrence Island area they have been trained from boyhood times from the time that they are walking to train to get these mammals, because they are very important, that is their livelihood. Now where the conflict comes in, the United States Government says that you can't do that, now this like wasting twenty or thirty years of training to get these type animals for livelihood. And thank you very much.

Perry Mendenhall: From the IRA Village Council, and have been asked to write up a paper, position paper on the topic of subsistence for October 27th subsistence hearing. I would like to thank you for this opportunity for presenting this position, and again to thank you for coming back up here to listen to the people that have come to this hearing and have presented their positions as well. Villages started and existed because of subsistence living and it is the way of life up here. Even our Eskimo Legends state that it is to be such, it is a traditional and cultural heritage to live off the land for each season has a harvest time whether it is for berries, greens, sea mammals, ducks, birds, caribou, fur bearing animals, etc., and this practice does vary from area to area. What has existed for thousands of years can't be changed over night, even under the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act or new state laws. Our way of life satisfies one's body, mind, soul. But we are entrapped into new ways and strange laws, snared many times over and 'til now our subsistence way of life is endangered.

Before going on with further comments on subsistence we would like to mention Secretary of Interior's remarks on subsistence. Secretary stated that rural Alaska changed from subsistence to the cash economy has not only been rapid, its been relentless. There is a need to recognize legitimate subsistence uses in Alaska.

The population of Nome consists of approximately 80% or more natives we know that the majority of their income is low and that unemployment and welfare is high, and that the cost of living in Nome is approximately 165% that of Anchorage, 198% of Seattle. The Northwest area of Alaska has the highest cost of living in the State and the welfare checks assistance do not go far for living, especially if they have families. Reasons for subsistence rights, there should be a subsistence survey conducted in rural Alaska to determine the dependency upon native foods due to diet customs and cultural health standards. This survey would show the people who depend upon it fully, commercially or not at all. This survey would show subsistence rights is essential and should not be mismanaged by the State. Commercial foods are not totally accepted by natives due to cultural, high cost of health reasons. Subsistence living or dependency is not a political issue, but a means for most of our native people existence from season to season, day to day, year to

year. Subsistence supplements, welfare and BIA assistance, subsistence rights are taken away or mismanaged welfare needs demands would increase. Unemployment and inflation costs for living encourages of subsistence dependency and lifestyle. Due to high cost of living subsistence dependency should not be restricted because of income, race or lifestyle.

State should fund a local control committee, this would be meeting travel, and etc. to regulate the State Fish & Game activities in the local area, like in the Northwest Region. That the local control committee will not be just an advisory group, but have the power to control the local State Fish & Game Management and to set regulations within the area concerning subsistence, hunting and fishing, commercial fishing, sport hunting and fishing and to make recommendations to the Government. Closed areas around Nome provide hardship on low income people, like in moose hunting.

Subsistence fishing should not be regulated along with commercial fishing to the point that commercial fishing is favored rather than subsistence fishing, subsistence fishing should be top priority on all species of fish. Due to the increase of commercial fishing fish hatcheries should be developed and encouraged and implemented as soon as possible to ensure subsistence and commercial fishing which is State funded. No State development or subsistence through grants or technical assistance on the economical social level have been seen in our area which would encourage tourism, fishing industries, land, and resource development, etc.. Investments like this by the State would help elevate unemployment welfare rates in this area somewhat. Urban politicians tend to regulate rule subsistence life and dependency by limited Fish & Game allocations.

Hearings on sea mammals should be conducted in the areas concerned rather than in Anchorage, Fairbanks or Juneau urban centers. Not very many rural people could afford to make it to the hearings conducted in the Anchorage area which is concerning the sea mammal. If there is to be hearings on caribou or moose for example our area would like to be included, probably then make regulations for Fairbanks, Anchorage and Juneau area. Sea mammal hearings should be conducted in coastal areas

where people depend on sea mammals for subsistence. State Parkd, D-2 lands should take into consideration subsistence hunting and fishing and not to mismanage subsistence right through new regulations or prohibiting use of such lands for subsistence use. Even the name given to us by the Indian people now known throughout the world means raw meat eater, and the name is Eskimo. Eskimos are subsistence hunters and fishermen. The state should help preserve one of the minority ethnic groups in the world through proper management and subsistence rights. The State should see that subsistence is the means for existing in rural Alaska and that provisions should be considered for keeping it. Thank you.

Representative Nels Anderson: I'd like a little more explanation on your point number eight, could you elaborate just a little on that?

Perry Mendenhall: The first part of the paper it stated that Alaska Natives in Nome are 80% alot of them are low income and perhaps can't even afford a car and to get out to hunt moose that has limitations closure areas like around Nome. Like 50 miles toward Teller, 50 miles towards Council area and 30 miles up toward Samuel Lake area. I believe alot of the local people don't have the means to go out there for moose hunting, and these closure areas seem to be set by Fish & Game without consulting local people and that the local people should be consulted on these closure areas around the Nome area, whether its dealing with moose, or fishing or whatever, sea mammals, hunting seals, walrus that due to closure areas local people should be consulted before they are slapped with a large closure area, which prohibits low income people and especially Natives in Nome for hunting moose.

Henry Adams: Frm Koyuk, Alaska. Since the beginning of Land Claims Settlement Act, the word subsistence finally came up, and I think it was during the Settlement Act or before that, the word subsistence was kind of altered some way during that time or before the Land Claims Settlement Act. Before right after World War II we had, the United States had about 750 million acres in the United States and in Alaska we had 230 million acres to roam in not counting the ocean, Natives of Alaska and since the Land Claims Settlement Act, as we went along more game regulations were imposed on us and I don't know who make those

game laws, but there seem to be no representatives from each village or from one such village, I don't know who picks game management out, but the game proposals they make or the game management proposals to legislation are not doing us any good as time goes along. I think it would be very good for all natives of Alaska could make a stay all they could on the game regulations because as we go along, we will be deprived of our subsistence way of living anyway, so right now these Land Claims Settlement Act don't make us all rich only about 20% of the people that live in Alaska are employed by these Corporations and you don't hardly get no money from these Land Claims Settlement Act. I think that this word subsistence is more like survival of the smartest or the more highly educated at the present era. The real meaning of subsistence as Mrs. Willoya stated before was the real meaning of subsistence to us Alaskans and that's about all I could say.

Richard Miller: President of Situasauk Native Corporation. Mr Chairman first of all we'd like to thank you for this opportunity given to this Corporation of 2,043 stockholders to submit this testimony concerning this important issue. The definition of subsistence by Webster defines it as; subsistence is the condition of remaining in existence, a means of subsiding is a source or means of updating the necessities of life or livelihood. For subsistence users it is a time or a season, we've learned from our Ancestors how to hunt the duck and the geese, when to catch the fish, when to harvest the berries, eggs, roots, and greens. There is a distance feeling that is undescrivable when you speak to subsistence users on what it means. It is an activity we perform because we have to it's a part of our daily life. Our Ancestors have lived in what others would consider a hostile setting, largely because they possessed the skills which enable them to make wise use of the richer way of renewable resources which surround them, out of necessity. Our Ancestors developed intimate ties with the land, sea, and wildlife and all resources were used sufficiently. Today in rural Alaska these living patterns are still dominate. The lives of individuals are closely in tune with the land, sea and its promises and limitations. For our people subsistence rights involve far more than the normal outdoor recreation, the right to hunt and fish and gather food on the land or sea, which is very vital to our way of life.

When Congress passed the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act to settle or aboriginal Land Claims of the Alaska Natives, it directed the Secretary of Interior to take affirmative steps to protect the existing subsistence activities of the Alaska Natives on Federally owned lands in Alaska. It was also anticipated that State of Alaska could and would assist the Secretary of Interior involving policies, likewise protect the subsistence activity of the Natives and the land granted to the State under the Alaska Statehood Act and the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act. The subsistence question is a very complicated one, where it involves Federal and State laws and policies as well as the growing demand from non-natives who are interested in increasing their consumption of Alaska's renewable resources. The boundaries of subsistence areas should be determined according to trends and use as well as consideration of migrations, habitats and etc..

Administrative policies regarding subsistence rights is not sufficient protection, only Legislation can furnish us with the surge upon subsistence rights which our lives depends. The principal owners the Federal, State and Native Corporations should coordinate their approaches to land use development, game management and other matters which will be affective subsistence users. Affirmative action must be taken now by State and Federal Government to give priority and protection to subsistence use and allowing our subsistence use areas or zones. Legislations for the protection of subsistence uses should bind State and Federal Agencies. The Legislative procedure in evaluating the potential impact of land use decisions upon future subsistence uses should have public input and hearings in the village or communities most immediately affected before any decisions are made.

Sport hunting is a concern to all Alaskans and further the people that visit Alaska. Game animals do belong to all people whether Native or Non-Native, but the relationship of native to game animals is vastly diverse from the relationship of non-Natives to game animals. Subsistence hunting has persisted as essential for Natives' very existence. The sports hunter has only one concern and that is to take a trophy. A suggested solution is to allow a limited number of large game animals to be taken by a sportshunter, and the remainder to be preserved for the Native subsistence hunter under a wise game management plan. Statistics

substantiate the fact that the only economic economy employment in Alaskan villages is subsistence hunting, fishing and berry collecting. To jeopardize these activities is to induce immediate genocide to a rapid vanishing race of God's people. Thank you.

Roger Seetot: I'm Eskimo, (talking in the native tongue) You have failed to ask the people what they want to know. I don't need to fish and hunting I'm Eskimo, I eat Eskimo food, what you want to know ask the people, don't let them talk their bashful people -(native words). You as the panel I can talk, you from Kotzebue, right? I'm talking for Eskimos, I'm Eskimo I would like to represent all of you, because I'm Eskimo. Subsistence food applies to all people, when you are out in the country you have to eat something to stay alive and thats what subsistence food is, so theres anybody here that want to ask the panel what it could be in Eskimo or what I will try to translate it as best as I can. Subsistence is a means of getting food to stay alive. Before the white man came along, we go out and catch our own food no matter if we have to dig through the ice, snare them or how, but that's the way we got it, that was subsistence. But is there anybody in the audience that want to ask how we live subsistence. Before I could'nt even speak Eskimo it was to tough for me I grew up with my Grandpa and Grandma I couldn't even speak Eskimo, I mean white man language. So I said to myself I'm going to go to school and I did in school and now I don't have to do to much subsistence because I worked but I still miss that Eskimo food that I grew up with, (stated a bunch of native dishes) everything and thats what they are trying to take away from us. They won't take it away from us I don't think so. It's just a matter of you know, there's people out in the audience that want to respond to what I'm talking about instead of just what other people have to say I'd appreciate it, just ask the Panel what they think about hearing like this. Thats what its for. Don't just sit there and just listen to what other people have to say, ask questions. Anybody? Thats all I have to say. Thank you.

Elmer Seetot, Sr., Brevig Mission: Well lets begin with that 1918 flu. I lost my father. We had a hard time. Really day by day sometimes I never eat my supper because I had no father to feed me, because I had mother, my mother don't hunt, so therefore, we are talking about sub-

sistence hunting right now, thats what this means this meeting is. Eskimos could live by subsistence hunting. Well that 1918 flu had affected 58 year olds that are living right now between 62. Because ask of you when you are 12 years old you don't know much about hunting. In 1930 I was 12 years old and the things have improved little after President Roosevelt was elected because there was a new deal. We had a hard depression, years I remember, before President Roosevelt was elected. There was no welfare and theres hardly any clothing for those who had no father. Well they was (native word) in those days because they never changed clothes, but after that the world was changing little bit. Little by little and therefore the younger generation take it a little easier after President Roosevelt was elected. When President Roosevelt was elected I was working for 50¢ an hour I was under age to alright but that help me alot, the first time I ever make a rich and therefore I promised myself sometimes when I don't eat supper that I'm going to be hunter. I tried to learn how to be hunter took but I never get my rifle until I was almost 16 years old, and I can take care of myself when I 25-30, rifle, well I caught 6 fox it don't pay much alright, \$25.00 I think but it helped me alot and we're talking about subsistence hunting. And I get to learn how to hunt. I'm not a game Biologist by hunting, but you know how to kill animals and how to stop them and then I get to know how to get by subsistence hunting. And then when I'm old enough to work, I work when I was 16 years. \$2.00 a day. \$60.00 a month. Well I never quit because I remember the days when I go to sleep without any supper at all, because I have supper at all, because I have nothing to eat I cannot go the Care Center or anything, and I'll promise myself to take care of myself. Then from that time for when I get 16 I been working hard all my life only time I get is welfare when I broke my arm. I don't really broke my arm, but its split here for two months, thats the only time I get money out of the Bureau of Indian Affairs. There were Indain Alaska Reindeer Service at that time too, because I was able to work at that time they give me the best highest welfare I could get until I get well. So I don't want to take much time because there are some to there, I just want to bring that what we have meeting for that subsistence hunting is, because subsistence hunting have taken care of me from those who can hunt and fill my stomach when I cannot hunt. Thank you.

Ellie Kulukhon: My name is Ellie Kulukhon I'm from Saint Lawrence Island, I'm an old woman. I known ever sine I was a girl I hope our Government doesn't have mistake, if they try to cut it off everything that we try to eat, because if they do whatever the people testimony about this sea mammal, black whale whatever it will, Native of United States will be more expensive on Government because right now real strongly we still everybody eating living by the Eskimo food, if something happen, we will be like some other places. Viet Nam people, help from Government they don't have much money to spend for like white people does. And also most everyone of them in Saint Lawrence Island people live on walrus, seal, whale meat I hope the Government keep the freedom for even for our generation which is everybody proud about that freedom. In this days something happened to us which is really useful try to cut it out for the Native, so I been thinking about we have God also our Government knows that we are not only speaking to the Government or anybody because they listen to us. Thats all.

Wesley Ahmasuk: My name is Wesly Ahmasuk, I'd like to come here and say that I love to hunt. Seem like they are charging us \$15.00 for a license and they turn around and tell us we can't go hunting, well I guess if you get caught out there hunting without a license you get a fine or else its like to me their giving us the soup spoon but not the soup. Its hardly fair, but I'm just trying to say that I think the United States Government is very wrong with this whale hunting and course the Natives are going to go against it, but no telling where they're going to stop. I guess last year they had little phamplets on walrus hunting, when we came back in they said that if we want to fill it out why you could fill it out and tell us how many walrus you got, but I guess this spring of our understanding that we have to tell exactly how many we got. I would just like to say that those environmentalists wherever they are at, I, if they jump in the boat and go out to see how we get it I guess they would have a little different outlook on it. Then I don't think they would want to come along. That's all I have to say.

Aaron Simon: My name is Aaron Simon from White Mountain. I just want to speak up for I think Mrs. Willoya adn Mendenhall spoke up for us, but then since I didn't hear very much from the speaker from the

audience over here. But then all what I heard is that the men folks are for themselves for their subsistence, whereas they didn't speak for the women folks. Maybe the women alright, in line of berry picking there's alot of times I heard in villages they speak about they want to go pick some berries, but then they, which is subsistence alright and then on the other hand they are afraid to go out and pick berries because on account of too many bears in the area. Now if the Fish & Game and or the panel of you here now could update the opening seasons of bear hunting, which is open at what now, the 10th or 15th of May, if they could start it up to the 1st of May or the 15th of April the women folks or the men folks go out and kill the bears off, and the women would have more chance to pick berries and put away. Now the way it is now, the bear season is open the 10th or 15th of May there so many bears around this area now, which is on the mens side for hunting. Where I live, the women folks for picking the berries for their subsistence, but alot of times they are afraid to go out and pick their berries or put their greens away and if the Fish & Game could go out and get the bears and cure the hide, eat the meat or whatever, and the women folks could go out and pick the berries or whatever they want to put away. Thats all I have to say.

Jenny Alowa: My name is Jenny Alowa I'm from Saint Lawrence Island and I live here in Nome now. I have been involved with High School students for the past three years and a bilingual - bicultural teacher. And its been a thrill for me to be able to share ideas and the high school students share their ideas with me, and many years ago alot of these students or when these students were small the teachers use to tell them you can't speak Eskimo and now alot of the Enupiat students around here can understand but cannot speak and alot on Saint Lawrence Islanders do speak and understand and coming from students point of view, they are really into the native way of thinking and they're really into exercising their way of thinking. For instance, like with respect with elders, and lot of these high school students are back in their villages like (she names four to five villages) and when we think about when we talk about subsistence for instance, first of all the ladies will associate themselves to subsistence, okay it's man's world, we can't handle it we're not allowed to go hunt. We talk about berry picking and green picking and on the other hand, the maile students who hardly spoke

in the classes, you can tell they are ready to go out, instead of talking about it, they are ready to go out into the wilderness or be out in the boat and just seeing these real things, and there are so many things I want to get into myself and some of these students will say; we don't learn how to cut a seal or we don't want to learn how to make pockets out satellite T.V., which is out in some of the villages, Savoonga and Gambell, for instance. Lot of us still live in two worlds and myself for instance, but the greatest memory is our past, what we have right now and lot of these students will say sure its nice to be able to go dance or get into clothes and do these things, but you know white man's world has no culture and we do, we have all these things like tradition most of the girls can still sew and we have respect and we have a meaningful way of life and sometimes I sympathize with the high school students, we are talking about non-native high school students, they don't have much to talk about. I guess thats where I'm coming from. I really think that subsistence does have so many interpretations, and one way is with the young people and I think right now the young people have, are going through their identity crisis. They know who they are, its just a matter of motivating them and think that our next generation I, there is so many things going on right with bilingual, bicultural hearings, subsistence and I can imagine what is going through they're heads and subsistence has so many interpretations, and thats my interpretation of subsistence. Thank you.

Jacob Ahwinona: I'm Jacob Ahwinona and I'm originally from White Mountain, but I moved here and lived here the last 25 years. I did some subsistence living, since I was knee high. Now subsistence living is getting heard. We've go rules and regulations, who's regulating them, the Department of Fish & Game. The Department of Fish & Game has an advisory board here in town that I know for a fact, cause there's members in there that haven't seen a front side of a gun, and thats for a fact, why? What does the Department of Fish & Game give the reasons why they don't have representation from villages, which villages, they don't have any money they can't afford to go out there and get representations from the bush villages. Now, we've got big Corporations now, the Native Corporations, it would be a worth while benefit to make donations just to send one native from the outlying villages or one from every village, they could do it if they want too,

and send them here and make out the regulations, who make the regulations? The advisory board advises the Fish & Game right here in town. I never hear any representations from outlying villages, nothing. I've called them, I've asked them why they don't have representation from the villages, they can't afford it. Thats their excuse, thats all baloney!

Now the regulations on subsistence hunting, like the opening season of bears, okay, I heard from these person here awhile ago, I find a bear myself, now the regulations are too far back to late. May, that's too late, that isn't the time to hunt bears, who makes those regulations? The Fish & Game, thats all baloney! I know when to hunt them bears, every Native here knows when to hunt them bears and the advisory boards that are down there, which have never seen the side of a gun, how the hell do they know when it is time to hunt bear. Everybody better wake up here, or you guys better do something about it, everybody is afraid to say anything, why? Well those guys up there they're going to do it thatls all baloney!, you should have your two cents worth, if I'm going to say my two cents work, why can't you. Anyhow we got rules and regulations now the Fish & Game slapped down on us, okay you can't hunt migratory birds now, heck we got those birds since I was that high, and I ate them too. And I'll be dammed if they are going to stop me from shooting now if I want to eat it, cause I've eatin it since I was that high. And then its like taking butter away from a white man over there, okay you can't eat that butter until May, why would he say that? That would be the same way, you can't hunt that, you can't eat it. Pretty soon they'll come by here, pretty soon they'll go back, and who's going to kill it? Some sports hunter out there is going to kill it, instead of me, and me going hungry out there in that 30 below weather out there. Somebody better do something on the game regulations up here or anybody speak up.

Representative Nels Anderson: This is why we're here, to listen.

Jacob Ahwinona: Thats right, thats the truth, I know for a fact that the advisory board down here never seen a front side of a gun and thats all baloney! Thank you.

Bill Dann: I'm Executive Director of the Norton Sound Health Corporation

here in Nome. Our Corporation currently has responsibility for providing comprehensive health services to 62 residences of this region. We were founded in 1970, and since that time have been active in development of health services in the area. During that period there have been incredible changes in the way of life in this region not the least of which is the increasing control upon the subsistence way of life, continued by the majority of the residences of the area. The topic of these hearings are incredibly broad, I don't pretend to have any knowledge of sea mammal populations or other matters vital to your charge. My purpose in coming before you is to outline some of the effects we have seen of the decline in viability of the subsistence way of life for the population of this area.

Our Corporation has operated a family counseling and mental health services program for about three years, today this Department comprises of a staff of 12 throughout the region and a considerable budget. This effort is maintained because of the extent of the family and individual mental and emotional problems constitutes the major health problem of the region. The current suicide rate for this area is more than six times the national average and 1972 and 1973 was better than ten times the national average. Suicide gestures are common although good data is not currently available. Alcoholism is a problem; is well documented especially when viewed as a causal factor in accidental deaths which are the leading causes of death in this area. Juvenile delinquency has long been a problem and is becoming increasingly so in the villages. The current active case load of our family services is about 185 with the total of over 700 active patients have been involved in the program over the past years. In our patient contacts, psychologists on our staff report that a lack of sense of selfworth of unemployed males of the region has played a significant role in the problem seen.

In our view, the inability of an Eskimo hunter to continue to providing for his family utilizes skills perfected over thousands of years constitutes unemployment and roots of family problems. Research in urban America is repeat of evidence that loss of employment for the head of household contributes to the decline of the family structure, alcohol abuse, child neglect and other problems, unfortunately research of the similar nature for the Alaska Native population is limited. The Barrow

study which was done in 1969 and 1970 showed a direct plank of a sense of inability to control of ones environment and the change that was rapid with increasing mental health problems with that population. Essentially Eskimos of this and other regions are being coerced into a pace of cultural change with it be likened hundreds of years of natural cultural evolution compressed into a ten year period. It is unrealistic to expect such an evolution without significant problems.

Traditional Eskimo culture is structured around hunting activity to eliminate or significantly restrict that activity serves to impede the normal family structure, especially when there is no prospects of meaningful employment to restore a sense of selfworth. Lack of time structuring around hunting activity contribute significantly to the social problems that we see. Loss of subsistence has in the past and will continue to be a major factor in the increasing cost of health care in this area. The return on investment dollars to deal with this problem is unknown at best and yet resources can in good conscience be put into other more valuable effort. These costs must be weighed in your consideration of the subsistence issue. And I would also like to read a testimony of one of our staff members who couldn't be here tonight, this is from:

Tereasa Sockpealak from Shaktoolik: My statement on my views of subsistence as I see it affecting the family way of life. I personally feel that depriving a head of household from hunting various types of subsistence is detrimental to a man's cultural environment. If subsistence such as the sea mammal is totally taken away from the Native's environment, the hierarchy that is depriving the Natives to hunt sea mammal is being disrespectful, since he is taking away the Natives freedom of choice to remain in his born environment. The hunters skills are therefore taken away by means of which he supported his family. A native that knew just subsistence skills will not automatically jump into another skill. The native that survived by subsistence will feel degraded and it is degrading when a capable man is forced to apply for food stamps, BIA and Welfare. Thank you.

Jeanette Martin: Representative Anderson from the Legislature, thank you for coming and hearing us again. My name is Jeanette Martin, I am

Director of Health Care Services for Norton Sound Health Corporation and in that position I speak for the Corporation. We are vitally concerned with any issue that will affect the health status of the people in this Region. Subsistence activities are vital in obtaining adequate food, especially in the villages, but also in Nome.

I would like to quote from the 2-C Studies a report of Federal Programs for Alaska Natives. I quote subsistence activities is therefore most important in those regions made up of entirely villages, it accounts for half or more of family food for 70% of families in the Eskimo Region. Even in non-native places more than a quarter native residents are getting at least half of their food by subsistence and the most of the rest only report a little rather than none. Further documentation has been provided in the 1974 consumer profile of people in the Bering Straits Region prepared for the Norton Sound Health Corporation. On page 134 on that profile it reads, 87.4% of residence indicate that they eat alot of native food. The results of eliminating or unrealistic curtailing subsistence activity will impact adversely on the nutritional status of those who already have limited financial resources. I would like to review with you the consequences of a lower nutritional status to the help of an individual. Meat is the main source of protein and iron on a subsistence dependent diet, if amounts of these consumed is not sufficient the individual will succumb to more health problems than he would if he were well nourished. For example, infant mortality rate is an universal indicator of health status. The leading cause of infant death is premature birth which is directly linked to the health status of the mother. In 1975, the infant mortality rate for the Alaska Native population was 18.9 per 100 thousand births. These statistics have been obtained from the U.S. National Standard of Health Statistics. Another universal indicator of health status is the incidence of iron deficiency anemia. I would like to again quote from a draft of the Health Systems Agency Plan published August 1, 1977, for the Southcentral Healthplanning and Development Agency of which this area is considered a part. I quote, "the incidence of iron deficient anemia particularly among Alaska Natives is a cause for concern. A summary of research done in the State concludes of the 2,234 Alaska Natives tested 13% were anemic, the highest rate occurs among those 16 years and over at 21% and children under the age of six which is 19%, while there is debate over the significance of

of the low hemoglobin levels. Research has linked low levels with increase frequency of serious illnesses increase the susceptibility to infection on expectant lower body weight in children and decrease the attentiveness in learning ability, a problem which hampers good nutrition in Southcentral Alaska is the high price of retail foods. The high prices are especially pronounced in rural and bush areas." If we look for alternate sources of iron and protein rather than the food obtained from subsistence, the picture looks dim, since financial resources and cash are limited, those individuals will depend on cheap food, those high in sugar and other carbohydrates, as a result the protein component of the diet will be of poor quality and incomplete, this cannot but aggravate an already substandard health status. In addition the actual availability of alternate sources of high quality protein is in question.

Most village stores have limited capital for inventory investments which limit the types and amounts of foods they have available for sale. In closing, I would like to emphasize that the needs of the people dependent on subsistence activity for the major portion of their diet, need your consideration in any further legislation or regulation. Thank you.

Sue Mathenis: Hello, my name is Sue Mathenis and I'm a resident of Nome. I hunt and I fish, but I never take more than I can eat. I'm not a subsistence hunter, because I draw income elsewhere. I think that Mrs. Willoya has painted the perfect picture of a subsistence hunter and I think that those people should be allowed to maintain their subsistence hunting. The reason that I'm here is because I also feel that there are a lot of people that are taking animals not under subsistence conditions, and this I don't think we can stand. I specifically referring to the walrus harvest, I can give you a definite number in 1976, there were 738 walrus taken from the village of Diomedes, the total equivalent of thirty six walrus were returned the rest were allowed to sink into the ocean. This was done under the guise of subsistence hunting, I don't think it was subsistence hunting, I don't think these people should go without food, they all should have what they need to eat, but I think that if they are hunting in conditions other than subsistence hunting it should be recognized. I want you to come up with a definition that is realistic of what subsistence hunting is.

People who derive of more than 50% of their food from animals should be considered subsistence hunters, but I think that there are alot of people in this audience who have come to testify on subsistence hunting, I counted 47 people, there were a total of 9 people out of that 47 who were wearing clothing that was from animals. The rest were all wearing store bought clothes. This is an indication that they are mixing two worlds and I think that if they want to be subsistence hunters, they should have the right, and should be able to hunt when they can get seasonally when they can get the food. But if they are deriving income elsewhere are they are hunting for more than they can eat, then they are not subsistence hunters and they should be recognized for that. Mrs. Willoya told all of us beautifully what the subsistence hunter is, but the main point she made was that they did not take surplus, in her own words they did not take surplus. I think that there is a lot of surplus hunting that is going on and I think that it should be recognized it is not subsistence hunting, its commercial hunting.

For the record I would like to say that I agree with the Government in the ruling that they made on the bowhead whales, only because we don't exactly know what the situation is with the bowhead whales. It's like if you don't know what bank balance you don't continue to write checks. Wait until you find out what your balance is then you know how much you can spend. I think that we ought to halt any bowhead killing, while we can figure out how many whales there really are, and if there are enough for true subsistence hunters, then I mean people taking whales that they need to eat, then I think they should be allowed too. I hope that (inaudible) meeting in December will allow a certain quota for the hunters in the Northern part of Alaska I think that people should recognize that we've got to act now what is subsistence hunting and define it very carefully, I think it should be related to the individuals ability to consume the meat. Thank you.

John Larson: My name is John Larson I'd like to address a little bit to the issues that were raised by the last speaker. I have a little different feeling about the harvest of the walrus. And perhaps if this committee is going to be trying to establish a definition for subsistence you ought to also take into consideration of carving definiton, that a person who is taking walrus, taking the tusks, carving those tusks

to produce income to feed his family or to cloth his family, or better his families standard of living and thereby staying off welfare, staying away from the relief that he does not want to get because he doesn't earn it, then I think that that is an important valuable function of subsistence hunting. One of the first kind of educational experiences that I had up here was in going out and catching fish in the lower 48, where I was brought up, we use to cut the heads and throw away the innards, the eggs, etc., but when you watch an Eskimo take a fish, he normally will save that part. If he would look at me and say you're wasting, because I throw away the heads, I throw away the eggs, I throw away valuable parts in his culture, and I do the same thing when I take a moose, I don't take the liver, kidneys, I don't keep the stomach. I've seen Eskimo hunters on Saint Lawrence Island butcher walrus in 1973 when I lived out there. The first walrus that come by everything is taken the stomach, the innards of the stomach, the small intestines, the liver, the heart, all of the meat surrounding the animal is taken, there isn't anything that is thrown away, that's wasted, and yet when I go out and hunt a moose and I discard some of those internals, nobody in the white world in the Caucasian who's written the definition of ways, would accuse me of wasting something, because I threw those parts away. Just last week I participated in a moose kill and I didn't keep the hoofs, and a carver told me, gee If you would have brought those hoofs back, I could have made some money by making something out of those, and I didn't realize that. In his mind I'm wasting because I'm throwing something away that is valuable to him, or perhaps also in your definition you should consider the Eskimo viewpoint, the subsistence hunter's viewpoint of what waste is, rather than having an Anglosaxon's definition. On a moose it would probably be a certain joint below on the leg, that that could be discarded, that the hide could be discarded. And Fish & Game would not prosecute somebody for that. On the fish, the Fish & Game is probably going to accuse somebody of wasting if they throw away the head, if they don't save the eggs. But those are the things the Eskimo would say. And maybe on other animals it would be different.

If they have a good year and they get lots of walrus, lots of walrus are coming by and there is some guy that has five or six kids at home that he wants to stay off welfare, he has a meat supply that is in the

freezer already or in the old icebox type of thing from the walrus. And he wants to take those tusks because he knows that he can make five or six hundred dollars out of carving. Now is that waste, or is that waste from an anglosaxon stand point. Perhaps, to the Eskimo it's not wasted. I think we have to know how many animals there are before we accuse anybody of wasting. The bowhead whale sure seems to be a hot issue, because the Eskimo says we don't know how many whales here are out there. I think there is alot of agreement on that. Stopping us from hunting even though you don't know that we are hurting a resource. The same feelings were expressed last year on Saint Lawrence Island regarding walrus. People the hunters the people that have been with walrus most of their lives, know that there are alot of animals left last year. And they felt upset for the quota that was established on the communities without real input from members of the community, and without any real relationship between the quota that was established and the number of animals in the herd. Those are just some of the things that I've observed in the short time that I have been here. I'm certainly not an expert on subsistence, my brother-in-law on Saint Lawrence Island they keep reminding me that I'm still a beginner, that I haven't quite reached the first grade yet on subsistence. Thats true, I think when if you're making a definiton that you have to encourage the members of the legislature who are Caucaisan, who don't know anything about the bush, to look at it from the viewpoint and the people that live out there, and try to look at it not only the idea of subsistence encompassing an entire lifestyle, which means the carving, which means all of the by-products of the animal, but also the idea of waste what is waste to one group of people is not necessary a waste to another group. Thank you.

Tom Ellanna: IRA Council of King Island which is located in Nome. Our main food sources as King Islanders were sea mammals hunters in which we subsidized. To my knowledge of what is going on here is trying to determine the definition of subsistence. I think the way I feel, which would reflect alot of people, of say my people, the definition of subsistence is to provide food on the table. And of course somebody said earlier that the quoting of the number of walrus taken by the Islanders and yet only so much meat taken back. She's saying that the people are a bunch of headhunters, but again those headhunters to some of us might

be to take the ivory back to bring food to the table for the people of our families. But before trying to give you a definition of subsistence hunter, I would like to remind you that free contact of what man's rules and regulations all the Eskimos, throughout Alaska always have been conservationists in their own ways of never to deplete their sources of game, whenever something is going lower, they go to another game to help bring food to their communities. And to take subsistence hunting away from these people up here, you would be depriving them of their aboriginal rights as subsistence hunters, and which in turn make them culturally deprived. What am I? Am I going to be able to make it on cash income all the time? No. you just can't do it, of my people here, the King Islanders, now residing here in Nome, there is approximately 280 King Islanders living here in Nome, and of those 280 people there is approximately 75% of those people still subsistence hunters. What I'm saying that these people are still going out and bring the wild game into their homes, as their main source of food, so trying to define subsistence, would be very hard, subsistence can be defined not just by Native people, I know a few other than native people that do subsidize on wild game. So you cannot place it on ethnic groups and I wish that whomever and whenever they are going to decide on the definition of subsistence would take into the consideration of local people. Thank you.

Dan Thomas: My name is Dan Thomas, and I'd like to say that what we have here is Fish & Game have been hired they're job is to protect our resources so that we don't have the problem of a species going extinct or being overhunted or overfished. And the problem that we have right now is that because of the lack of knowledge that the Fish & Game does have of exactly what the populations are, we have them being over cautious and they will admit that. We are being over cautious because once you over hunt a population of fish or animals it takes its real hard for them to come back once they are overhunted or overfished in certain degrees and that's what they are doing with the bowhead is, well I'm not quite sure what's going on there, but they have to worry about that if it does get hunted down to a certain level it won't come back. Because it will have been overhunted to the point it might take a hundred years for the population to recover. So my suggestion is that that the State put a whole bunch of funds into research on the part of

Fish & Game and just really get going that so they do know what the exact situation is so that they know what they are doing with the game management, instead of being overly cautious. The people get the shaft is what happens because the Fish & Game is over cautious, when the people are dependent on subsistence and stuff.

This coming summer Commercial Fisheries here in Nome is going to start a tagging they are going to tag fish so that they know where they are going, like one of the issues this summer was, that they didn't know where the fish was going and sure there is alot of fish, but maybe they're going somewhere else, so if we catch them here they might not make it were they are going somewhere else so we'd have lots of fish but someone else down the line if the fish are migrating along the coast is going to have problems. So they are going to be getting some research going, but I think that the, its unrealistic to expect the Government to say its alright, go ahead catch all you want, its unrealistic because there are strong forces of conservationism and nobody wants I mean even subsistence people don't want the population of animals that they are dependent on go extinct. So I would strongly urge the State to really get hopping and put alot of manpower into research and just see exactly what the situation is so that they can do a better job. Thank you.

Carolyn Schubert: I'm Carolyn Schubert and was born and raised on the Fish River, which is about 70 miles to the East of here. My earliest memories were those of life at fish camp and on the river, hunting and fishing, collecting berries and greens and we worked hard all these subsistence hunting and fishing activities by our families from the time that we were very very young. And we always felt a closeness to the land because of the way we were raised. And after we were forced to move to Nome from our village we always wanted to go back to that way of life that we had, hunting fishing and living off the land. After I graduated from High School we moved to Anchorage and I lived there for fourteen years where two of my three children were born, and to the extent possible I began teaching my children those hunting, and fishing and collecting activities that I have been taught. We have lived in the village of Council for four years where my whole family have participated in hunting, and fishing, and food gathering activities and these

activities haven't been limited to the male members in our family. My daughter and go hunting and fishing and collecting greens and we all hunt and fish and work together too. Keep that lifestyle and my children came to testify because they were very concerned about that, they want to continue hunting and fishing and living off the land. Its interesting for me now to see how many restrictions are being placed on subsistence hunting and fishing activities. Not just by the State, but by the Federal Government. I remember when I went to Anchorage in 1961, there were thousands and thousands of caribou that use to migrate accross the Glenn Highway up near Eureka, which is about 110 miles from Anchorage. And during that time I remember that State allowed hunters to get five caribou each and Anchorage has always had a large population base. You can imagine what that did to the caribou. The last time I went down the Glenn Highway I never saw a caribou at the time that from 1961 to 1965 you could see thousands on the highway and the Fish & Game Department can't blame the Natives for killing off all the caribou in the Eureka area. The native people from the Northwestern part of Alaska were not the ones who were down there taking all that game. And yet now they put so much restrictions and put a quota on the number of caribou that the people can take from the herds in Northwestern Alaska and somthing else that I'm concerned about is an issue they were talking about tonight, the bear hunting season. The Fish & Game man that I talked to today said that in this area depending on the weather is good between April 15 and April 30 and yet the bear hunting season doesn't open until May 10 and it goes until May 25th. And last year there were Native hunters from the village of White Mountain that were cited for taking bear out of season. They took the bear out of season when the bear first come out which is when they are in prime condition and the native people know when that is which is when they first come out. According to the man from Fish and Game its usually the male that comes out first and the female with the cubs stay inside until its a little bit warmer. So I don't know maybe the Fish & Game Department are worried that the Native hunters will be taking the females and the young ones, but according to what the Fish & Game man said today when I talked to him, he said its not the females that come out first its the males. And with the respect to the migratory hunting season, I was down in the State of Washington earlier this month, and a place called Brewster, Washington, they have

hunting season from October 15th until the end of January, and they can take ducks and geese and there is a lot of ducks and geese that winter there according to my cousin and her husband and their families that live there. So those birds are available to be hunted by the non-natives that live down in Washington during that time. And yet here in Alaska we can't have a Spring hunt and by the time we are allowed a fall hunt, in some instances the migratory birds don't pass over those same areas they came through in the Spring. So in the fall time in some areas up here they don't get any birds unless in the Spring time. And I think that that should be changed. And it really hurt me to know that here where the ducks and geese wintering in this place down in Washington and those non-native people who don't have to depend on them for food, but for just a recreational activity has access to them and our people are denied that in the spring time when they are here. Thank you.

John Wahiyi, Sr.,: I'm originally from Savoonga, Alaska, and now in Nome for ten years. I am sorry I'm not very educated to speak English. I grew up with my elderly families and they all have died now. I am not educated, our parents took us out hunting ever since we were small boys, so we can learn how to hunt. So we can hunt to get food for our livelihood. That's why I'm not educated, I learn how to hunt since I was small boy. I'm strictly critic to this subsistence limitation why? We have our own subsistence limitation, the weather, Mother Nature gave us subsistence limitation. Everything we hunt is limited by the weather. Since I've been in Nome I been fishing, subsistence fishing. For the last three years or so they gave us times, limits to do subsistence fishing. In order to do some fishing we fish on time limit. When the weather is calm at times we couldn't fish due to the limitation of the time limit. Most of the times when the wind is blowing, the season is open for us to fish, so we couldn't hunt. There is subsistence limitation given by our Mother Nature that's the way we have been since we were born. We were provided, but we can get, and there's no limit on everything that we were supposed to have. Us Eskimos were given enough animals to hunt to survive with, God provide everything that we can take, but as yet now, Fish & Game Board try and limit everything that we have to survive with. Fish and Game Board limits the hunting in every Region. Like every boundary, people can hunt. Fish & Game, local Fish & Game limits moose hunting and give us

boundary limits of their own here in Nome. Why not they give us open season from the time we go out instead of 50 miles, 30 miles, for instance this month is real short limit. And alot of person are not able to get their moose. It will be ending of this end of the money. Every weekend, who of us are employed to out every weekend to hunt moose in order to get food for our families, we couldn't afford steaks, meat from the stores, even though we are employed we cannot afford due to the high living costs in NOME. We try and still hunt for our own food. Every weekend I myself try and go out hunting, that the only time I hunt for my own food right now. I'm employed five days a week like any other people, only time I can hunt is weekends. But still the Mother Nature limits us, some weekends we can't go out hunting so we couldn't get what we wanted to get. I am glad you people come and get our viewpoints from each person. I thank you.

Alfred S. Sahlin: My name is Alfred Sahlin, I'd like to mention the fact that our people here in Nome and our surrounding areas are seasonal hunters. Primarily the hunting seasons starts in the winter and earlier spring for seal. This brings to them their meat. From that season they get their oil, their dried meat and their fresh meat. The next season is fish. Fish arrive in July and there is not much else to hunt thats what they depend on then. From the seal they get the oil and preserve to (inaudible) after that they get the berries. Then after that season comes again the seal its a cycle by the season. They must hunt. Now the way it is now, we are getting more restirctions on hunting which is holding them down in their way of life.

I'm not much of a hunter myself, but I know many of my friends and relatives are. And what hurts is the fact that this game is available for them here, but the Fish & Game they say no hunting you can't do that, you got to have a license. You can't hunt within your own native selection of lands, such as Sitnasusauk land. We can't hunt moose around here for 50 miles that wasy and 32 miles north. What hurts is the fact that, thats one restriction already, since the Native Land Claims Act and its going to get more the way its going, it could. Thank you.

Dan Karmun: Live in Nome. To have people come here to hear the

community out, I think that that's the only logical way to do today is to get yourself heard. You know I feel kind of proud as an Eskimo perhaps you can speak for the Aleuts and the Indians if they're the only ones that know the definition of subsistence. I think that it's up to us to tell the others what it means. I think subsistence here is just getting to come to light to many, that are not aware of what our lifestyle is.

I was kind of alarmed at the D-2 hearings when the word subsistence, you know seem to come everytime there is a testimony and they can't find out what the definition is. I think we as a people who have been living here in Alaska have lived with it worked with it, depend on it, and it's going to be a source of dependence to come. I think if we can tell the others, perhaps subsistence will one day mean the survival of the human race. Because we know how to live subsistence and live on the land, sea, and air. I think we have been accused of wandering on our livelihood, but to me as I see it people that's been living in hardest environment and learning how to survive are the best educated people, they learn to take care of their own resources and wildlife. I think if this could be put across then I think that this will be a means of letting the people allowed to subsistence this land.

I've been fortunate enough to travel about the different communities that are whaling communities which is Barrow, Point Hope, Gambell. I gained a lot of respect from these different people from different lands on their art of survival. And this is something that others don't comprehend the dangers they go through trying to provide for their families, even at times giving up their lives to get whale to provide for the community. And there is arguments that there is a lot of waste in whaling and again issues that others don't realize that they face, even in my community when we are out seal hunting in the fall time I think when you realize how you live in the seas and on the ice, when the ice begin to form and move about, just like a vulture, and I'm sure every hunter will not hang around there if he's got animals that he's killed and loses them because of Mother Nature working against them and this is something they don't realize. I think a lot of our whalers face that same problem when they lose some of their whales because of Mother Nature working against the people that hunt these things. Growing up in

a community where perhaps our own State Government sometime is negligent in if not involving the local people in the many aspects of our way of living. I remember workin up in the mines in the (inaudible), there use to be several gold dredges running in that river and making the river just smuggy all the way down about 20 miles to the mouth of it. I remember how the fish use to come up in just thousands and hundreds, and today we find the restrictions saying that mining is harmful to these fish.

I think if they take a little time and involve the citizens of each community, and I think they would learn alot, and thats been the trouble with our Federal Government, our State Government, not involving the people in each community. Granted that these people have alot of degrees, but sometimes those degrees don't mean a thing when you don't involve the people in the different locations. And thats been our big problem is trying to educate the other people on what our environment is and hopefully with your involment in hearing all these communities that you will stress to the people that get the local people involved in any of their efforts in trying to arrive at the safe level of hunting or trying to place restriction. I think we suffer more than they help us, sometime by not involving the people of different communities. I think this brings about a lot of ways, I know for a fact that during State Engineer when up to survey to build an airport, went out to a place that was just soggy, not trying to ask the people where would be the best place to build an airport, not even taking the time to do that. I think that has been our big problem not involving people in these things that they are trying to set laws to and for the people. I hope this will be stressed strongly and I'm sure there is people in every community that are willing to get out and teach others in how they lived for years. I can say I'm proud that we've learned to live up to this day and if they want to learn something they better start getting out and ask the people in these different communities for these laws that are against us more than help us. Thank you.

Ressie Moses: I'm glad you folks are here to talk to us, but us elderly people were not as old as Emma Willoya, but like her we've been told to put away whatever we can find, so it won't go to waste, cause our parents and grandparents told us the winters are long. Before we moved

to Nome we were at Shishmaref and then before I remember to well they moved us to (inaudible) something like 1912. In order that we would be able to understand and talk the English language. Our folks didn't say yes or no in English if some white people talk to them, no answer, thats the reason why there are no airplanes, we didn't go by boat. The way my folks told me they took us by a dog team, take our skin boat a half a day ahead of our travelling time, that would be about in April cause where we come from, Shishmaref get it starts to get warm, so they make plans and they took us up so we would know how to talk English and understand white people ways and that way we can learn what is good and what is not good for us. I've been listen, when I can, I come to listen when people are going to talk I so glad Emma tell us about old times living. If I was in her place, couldn't see, I wouldn't know how I would do. I'm so proud of her, she is willing to help anybody if she listen to people who ask thats why those things that I was going to come and tell few things she told them I was come to and someone motion me to come and say a little about our way of living. Now with the hunting now that my old man is crippled he turned 78 last week, he couldn't go out with the hunters anymore, so from the ways of Eskimo living from way back all the people told their children and their grandchildren they half to respect the elderly people that was way before white people come along. That way they would be helping them and when the older people was glad and happy that they got their share they always tell them how to do things in way of fishing and hunting and thats why the Eskimo survive even though out language wasn't a written one. They didn't forget it, and they didn't let us forget it. I remember since second world war time when the youngers start to forget it, because our teachers on Shishmaref told them not to talk it during the recess around the school year, thats where the big mistake come from. They should have listen to the older people they talk in Eskimo and tell them what to do tell them what they have to learn in order to make living and survive.

Even though from way back everything was hard they didn't have no rifle or ammunition they had bow and arrow and spears and now that and the boys were taught to learn how to make arrows from their fathers if their grandfather is living. Now like I said James couldn't hunt anymore he was in plane crash in 53 coming back from Bristol Bay fishing August 14, so as the years go by his health failed him so many times he

had to be sent down to Anchorage hospital but all the while he was gone they, the hunters always bring us our share from what they learned from their ancestors. I'm so proud they didn't forget about it. I'm so glad to hear about these talks tonight, because some Eskimos don't even know how to understand to much yet, but us that can talk Eskimo when they as' can explain it in our language and that way they learned it. If some elderly people that come that didn't understand to well in English talking they wouldn't know what they are talking about unless they learned in school tow of them might use in place that they called Husky. They don't have that anymore, they had it from the word so that the younger people could understand about young girls making garments, and boys learned to hunt. But seem to listening we have these community, I'm glad the young people have time they can come and get together and ask questions when the older people are around and so I want to thank Emma, cause what I was going to say Emma had told them to the people here. But whoever tell us its the right thing to do, we always try to do what they tell us to do. But when we know they tell us anything that is going to be harmful to us, cause everything thats given to us I put away in freezer so it won't get no freezer burn, and I'm thankful to all the Nome hunters and people that have been good to us. I just want to thank you folks.

Della Wahiyi: I'm Della Wahiyi originally from Saint Lawrence Island. Moved here 10 years ago. We are still eating Eskimo food. We are still getting some from Saint Lawrence Island. They send us some food walrus meat, seal meat, whale meat, which we couldn't eat them even we are living in different city. Like my husband said we couldn't afford to buy steaks or other food from the store, because they are high priced and alot of time when the people come from other villages and stay with us, the very next day they kind of miss their native food. I remember one time a little boy was coming for ENT, I was fixing the stew for the lunch, he came around and asked me what are you fixing for the lunch? and I said I'm fixing the stew meat from the store, that was the beef meat, and he was saying when I go back I'm going to eat all I want from the Eskimo food. Thats how we will miss, when we are going to have limited hunting from our native food. The other thing I've been wanting to see in this testimony is our Government is trying to limit the food that is good for our health or the skins that are

more dependable than the rubberized from other clothing, which we use for our men for their hunting for the winter or for the waterproof clothing.

I wish the Government would give the money research for the other things that are harmful for our lives, besides they're trying to limit our useful items and the food, which we've been living ever since we've been born. We have been placed on this earth with the food that we should be eating. When we are living in this two cultures, like white and Eskimo sometimes we confuse, especially with our young people. They kind of forget nowadays how to make skins, because they think they get lot of orders and hard work. That is fading away and its still readily useful for us. I even saved a small peice of white leather skin or dyed skin so it could still be useful when I make into things I'm trying to sell to earn money. Just like a small piece of ivory that could be carved and sell it so we could get something from the store. Most of us are not rich, but we are hardworking people that we try to earn besides someone employed in our family. So what I've been thinking and while I'm hearing for these people who are give testimony, I'd like to get in front and speak as best I could a little bit of what we are or what we've been living or how we've been living. Alot of times or taught by our parents to share our foods especially with the people with those that can't get any. Each are habit whenever we get something that more than what we get, we always share with the other people. Even ever since we moved here I liked to share the Eskimo food with the other people. Once in awhile I even share with the elderly people, senior citizens people and white people who have lunches everyday and have Eskimo food on Fridays. They appreciate it very much and with the people who I share it they appreciate it. Thank you.