Y4
.C 73/2
92-56/
PT. 2
1041
92-56
Pt. 2
C 73/2
92/4

OCEAN MAMMAL PROTECTION

GOVERNMENT
Storage
DOCUMENTS
SEP 1 1972
THE LIBRARY
SAS STATE UNIVERSITY

HEARINGS

BEFORE THE

SUBCOMMITTEE ON OCEANS AND ATMOSPHERE

OF THE

COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE
UNITED STATES SENATE

NINETY-SECOND CONGRESS

SECOND SESSION

ON

S. 685, 1315, 2579, 2639, 2871, 3112, 3161, and amendment 1048, ocean mammal legislation

MAY 11, 12, AND 13, 1972

Part 2

Serial No. 92–56

Printed for the use of the Committee on Commerce

KSU LIBRARIES
A11900 966830

AUTHENTICATED
U.S. GOVERNMENT
INFORMATION
GPO

OCEAN MAMMAL PROTECTION

HEARINGS

BEFORE THE

SUBCOMMITTEE ON OCEANS AND ATMOSPHERE

OF THE

COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE
UNITED STATES SENATE

NINETY-SECOND CONGRESS

SECOND SESSION

ON

S. 685, 1315, 2579, 2639, 2871, 3112, 3161, and amendment 1048, ocean mammal legislation

---

MAY 11, 12, AND 13, 1972

Part 2

Serial No. 92–56

Printed for the use of the Committee on Commerce



U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
76-491 WASHINGTON : 1972

For sale by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office
Washington, D.C. 20402 - Price $1.50

COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE

WARREN G. MAGNUSON, Washington, *Chairman*

JOHN O. PASTORE, Rhode Island
VANCE HARTKE, Indiana
PHILIP A. HART, Michigan
HOWARD W. CANNON, Nevada
RUSSELL B. LONG, Louisiana
FRANK E. MOSS, Utah
ERNEST F. HOLLINGS, South Carolina
DANIEL K. INOUYE, Hawaii
WILLIAM B. SPONG, JR., Virginia

NORRIS COTTON, New Hampshire
JAMES B. PEARSON, Kansas
ROBERT P. GRIFFIN, Michigan
HOWARD H. BAKER, JR., Tennessee
MARLOW W. COOK, Kentucky
TED STEVENS, Alaska
J. GLENN BEALL, Maryland
LOWELL P. WEICKER, JR., Connecticut

FREDERICK J. LORDAN, *Staff Director*
MICHAEL PERTSCHUK, *Chief Counsel*
JOHN HUSSEY, *Professional Staff Member*
ARTHUR PANKOPF, JR., *Minority Staff Director*
DAVID A. CLANTON, *Minority Staff Counsel*

SUBCOMMITTEE ON OCEANS AND ATMOSPHERE

ERNEST F. HOLLINGS, South Carolina, *Chairman*

JOHN O. PASTORE, Rhode Island
PHILIP A. HART, Michigan
RUSSELL B. LONG, Louisiana
DANIEL K. INOUYE, Hawaii
WILLIAM B. SPONG, JR., Virginia

TED STEVENS, Alaska
ROBERT P. GRIFFIN, Michigan
MARLOW W. COOK, Kentucky
LOWELL P. WEICKER, JR., Connecticut

CONTENTS

	Page
Opening statement by Senator Stevens	839
Opening statement by Senator Gravel	840

CHRONOLOGICAL LIST OF WITNESSES

MAY 11, 1972

Adams, Frank	899
Aiken, Martha	934
Angnaboogok, David	842
Apangalook, John	847
Barr, Bill	872
Bodfish, Waldo	878, 928
Bundy, Robert	957
Burns, John	884
Calvillo, Oscar, Nome Chamber of Commerce	905
Chambers, Lynn	945
Curtis, Dick	855
Davidson, Art, representative, Friends of the Earth	909
Degnan, Frank	876
Evans, Robert, Western District Commander, American Legion	903
Flavin, Frank	957
Gely, Gabriel	946
Gologergen, Abner	861
Goodwin, Willie	955
Prepared statement	956
Goodwin, Willy, Jr	917
Henry, John	924
Hoogendorn, Betty Jean	938
Hurd, Charles	942
Igtanloc, Irving	915
Itta, Irene	929
Johnson, Myrtle	939
Johnson, Tommy	943
Kanayurak, Henry	843
Katchatag, Clarence A., Sr	867
Katchatag, Fred, mayor, Unalakleet, Alaska	926
Kowalsky, James	932
Kugzruk, Vernon	857
Menadelook, Thomas	874
Moto, Emerson	926
Muller, Ernest, president, Alaska Conservation Society	906
Murray, Wilfred	846
Olson, Martin	852
Orr, Sharon	859
Perkins, Donald	919
Poling, John	882
Punguk, Edwin	930
Sagoonik, Edith	931
Savok, Sigwien	895
Seeganna, Margaret	918
Seganna, Peter	849
Senungetuk, Joe	951
Stone, David	900

	Page
Swan, Davis	897
Takak, William	921
Tiffany, Henry	948
Trigg, Jerome, president of Bering Straits Native Association and Arctic Native Brotherhood, Nome, Alaska	936
Tuilana, Paul	904
Uhl, William R	954
Vania, John S	886
Willard, Robert, executive director, Alaska Human Rights Commission	901
Willoya, Emma	870

MAY 12, 1972

Opening statement by Senator Stevens	961
Opening statement by Senator Gravel	962
Alexie, Willie	974
Anaver, James	1015
Anaver, Mary	1018
Andrew, Edna	1023A
Andrew, Ella, letter	982
Azean, Evon	1019
Beaver, Joe	1004
Carl, Karl	1016
Chaniguk, Susie	1025
Charlie, Phillip	995
Chikoyak, Andrew	1000
Cleveland, Kenneth	998
Elukak, Nicholi	980
Evan, Joe	972
Friday, Joe	1008
Guy, Phillip	981
Hare, David	1014
Hawk, Isaac	1005
Jimmie, Adolph	1026
Jimmy, Carl	1021
Jimmy, Julia	1024
John, Larry	990
Kiunya, Dick	1020
Kiunya, Paul	973
Lewis, David	997
Lind, Maggie	964
Mike, Joseph	978
Moore, Peter	976
Nick, Robert	963
Nick, Robert	969
O'Brien, Ivan	993
Paul, James	1014
Philemonoff, Iliodor	1009
Phillip, Tommy	967
Phillips, John	1022
Samuels, Peter	1006
Shively, John	983
Toots, Nathan	965
White, Moses	1002
Wilde, Harry	1012

MAY 13, 1972

Anaver, James K	1031
Andrew, Frank	1035
Bourdukofsky, Jason	1040
Clark, Teddy	1045
David, David O	1034
David, Owen	1050
Evon Henry	1031

	Page
Evon, Wassilie	1046
Fratis, Gregory	1039
Fratis, Mary	1042
Gregory, Mary	1050
Lewis, Agnes	1036
Lewis, Milton	1033
Manchuak, Lucy	1037
Mann, Daniel	1032
Mute, Issac	1030
Peter, Hazel	1048
Phillip, Charles	1035
Shantz, Janet	1047
Simon, Winston	1050
Stepetin, Gabriel	1038
Stepetin, Tikhon	1041
Wentworth, Cynthia	1029

ADDITIONAL ARTICLES, LETTERS, AND STATEMENTS

Halley, Sam and Raymond E. Lee., Sr., letter	895
Katchatoq, Frederick, Sr., mayor, Unalakleet, Alaska, letter	881
Lafferty, Charles W., director, University of Alaska, statement	953
Moto, Paul, statement	881
Nicholai, Della F., letter	982
Savok, Annie, letter	895

OCEAN MAMMAL PROTECTION

THURSDAY, MAY 11, 1972

U.S. SENATE,
SUBCOMMITTEE ON OCEANS AND ATMOSPHERE
OF THE COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE,
Nome, Alaska.

The subcommittee met pursuant to call, in Nome, Alaska, Hon. Ted Stevens, presiding.

Present: Senators Stevens and Gravel.

OPENING STATEMENT BY SENATOR STEVENS

Senator STEVENS. May I call this hearing of the Senate Commerce Committee to order, please? Ladies and gentlemen, it is a great pleasure for us to be here this morning to take testimony on the Ocean Mammal bills as they effect Alaska's Natives. We know how important this subject is to you and that is why we are here to have these hearings in Nome, as well as in Bethel, rather than to hold the portions of these hearings in Washington, D.C. Let me give you the schedule, first. We continue this hearing until noon and we will break for an hour and a half, for lunch. We will reconvene again at 1:30 and continue until 5:00 p.m. tonight. After dinner, we will reconvene again at 7:30 and will continue as long as we have to to make certain that everyone that wishes to be heard, may be heard. So there will be no misunderstanding about it, we have received an authorization to hold these hearings to take testimony on the very important section of the ocean mammals' bill that relates to an exemption for Alaska Natives. In order to do this, our prime task, of course, is to hear representatives from the villages first. We will take testimony from non-Natives, but we do want to have the testimony of the villages first. We know how difficult the trip was for some of you to come here today, and, we are very glad to see that you are able to be here. Senator Gravel and I very much appreciate the work the villages have gone to to send a representative here and we are certain that the testimony will add a great deal to our efforts in Washington to try and preserve this exemption. There are many people here who want to speak and our time, unfortunately, is limited. We must go on to Bethel tomorrow and we have hearings morning, afternoon and evening. Then, we will have hearings on another subject in Juneau, on Monday; so, we must keep our schedule. In order that we may be able to hear a representative, and I emphasize that, a representative from each village which has responded to the opportunity to testify at these hearings, we are going to set two limits. In the first place, we ask each representative of each village, in the beginning session, as we go

Staff member assigned to these hearings: John Hussey

through the villages, to limit testimony to 10 minutes. And, I have called on my good friend, who is well known, throughout the area, Frank Degnan, to keep the time clock. He will let you know when you have reached your ten minutes. I hope that that reminder will enable you to windup your testimony and to make way for the representative from other villages to come behind you. In addition to that, we will hear, as we said, one representative from each village, in order, until we have heard from all the villages. After that, we will hear from the people who want to testify who are not representatives of villages including non-Natives, as well as Natives. If any of you have not indicated a desire to testify, I would ask you to speak to my Legislative Assistant, this good looking young fellow that's losing some of his hair, because I work him too hard, Max Gruenberg. Max will make up the list and work with us and with you in this regard. We would like to have you tell us, what villages you who are representing the type of marine mammals that are used by your village, how many of each species of marine mammals that your village takes and what use do you make of each type of animal; specifically, what part you use of the marine mammal, and how you use each portion of the mammal that is taken. I am most pleased that Senator Gravel has come this long distance also to be with us. He will, I am certain, have some remarks to make to you. I would call your attention to the gentlemen, who are here. John Hussey, who is on my immediate left, is one of the staff members of the Commerce Committee who works with the Chairman of our Subcommittee, Senator Fritz Hollings. He is very familiar with this legislation. Next to him and beyond Max Gruenberg is Dave Clanton, who also works with the Commerce Committee. We have with us today representatives of the Department of Commerce and the National Oceanographic and Atmospheric Agency. Howard Pollock, who is the Deputy Administrator, and Dr. William Aron, the Director of the Office of Ecology and Environmental Conservation, is here to be helpful. These gentlemen are not going to testify. They are here to aid us in any questions that might come up. I am pleased to see that there will be a representative from Representative Begich's office. And a representative of the Governor's office, Eben Hobson, is expected here also, sometime today. We are very pleased that the Department of Fish and Game has sent John Burns and John Vania. It is our intention that if any of those people wish to testify, that we hear from them after the testimony of the representatives of the Alaska villages. Now, having gone through the details of the hearing, I am most pleased to call on Alaska's—what do I say, other Senator. I'm older than he is, so I can say Alaska's Junior Senator, Senator Mike Gravel.

OPENING STATEMENT BY SENATOR GRAVEL

Senator GRAVEL. Thank you, Ted. I want the record to officially show, at this time, that we, here in Alaska are very grateful to Senator Warren Magnuson, the Chairman of the Commerce Committee who authorized and permitted the funds to be expended for this trip and the Chairman of the Subcommittee, Senator Fritz Hollings, who would have liked to have been here, but, because of the press of other business, couldn't make it. I think Alaskans, with this type of

a turnout, evidence the interest and importance of this bill. We are happy that you have come. I think you can also appreciate the fact that Senator Stevens and I are very much in favor of a bill that will satisfy the needs of Alaska. So, the question becomes. "What good does it do to give testimony to two Alaskans who are with us anyway? The people that we want to impress are the other Senators and the other members of Congress who have the majority vote." Well, this record will be very valuable. It will be very valuable in the markup process which awaits this testimony. The Subcommittee will then be able to evaluate this testimony and translate it into acceptable language. Now, if for some reason, this does not happen to our full satisfaction, in Committee, the Alaskan delegation, your two Senators, will have ample evidence, information that we pickup in the process of these hearings, to debate the legislation on the floor of the United States Senate. So, your contribution is a very direct contribution at this very historic and very important point in time. I have heard comments that these hearings would not be important, but, let me assure you that these hearings are vital and the vital part is taking place right here, in Alaska. And, so, I certainly commend all of the representatives who are coming forth to give testimony, and can only underscore what Senator Stevens has said, that is, that time is of the essence. We would like to hear everybody at great length, but, in order to hear everybody, in order to be fair to everybody, and to try to get the wisdom that each of you may have from the various regions that you know, it is important that you share the time and to adhere as close as possible to the 10-minute limitation. So, with that, I'm very happy that the Committee has permitted me to join with it. I'm not on the Commerce Committee, and this is something that the Commerce Committee has been handling in the Senate. We're very ably represented with Senator Stevens on the committee. It is a very important committee to our interests. I think that this testimony will help to convince state colleagues who serve on that committee to bring out a bill which is considerate and favorable to Alaska's interests. At this time, I turn the floor back to the Chairman.

Senator STEVENS. Thank you very much, Mike. I certainly underscore the very great debt we have to Senator Magnuson and Senator Hollings because it is not really a normal thing to authorize a hearing of this type while Congress is in session. There is very important legislation pending in the Senate today, and we are missing some votes on such things as the future of the Space Shuttle program and other things. It will be unfortunate that we must miss these votes. But, as a practical matter, the Chairman of our full committee and our subcommittee realized from the letters and correspondence that we have already received in Washington from Alaska, how important this subject is to Alaska Natives, and that is why we are here. We are going to go in alphabetical order of the villages for all but one exception. I've been told that the representative of Wales is a very good member of the track team, and he has a track meet today. There has been a special request from his coach to hear him first; so, if the representative from Wales would come forward and be our first witness, we will take him out of order.

I hope that everyone here has heard the announcement that the decision on the Alaska pipeline, is being made in Washington, D.C., at this very moment. Senator Gravel and I have been informed that the decision of the Secretary of Interior will be that the Alaska pipeline permit will be issued as soon as the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia permits the issuance of that permit. There is an injunction that presently prohibits the Secretary from issuing that right-of-way permit, but the decision today is that as soon as that court injunction is lifted, the pipeline will be able to proceed. I think this is signal day for Alaska. Not only are we here holding these hearings, but, we are also here on a day that is very important for the State. We will be receiving messages, I am sure, through the day, from other people and we will either read them or place them in the record.

Incidently, for those people who do not feel that they wish to testify, we are also willing to take written statements that are not to be longer than two typewritten pages, to place in the record.

Is this young man from Wales, here? Yes, sir; come forward, you're going to be our first witness.

STATEMENT OF DAVID ANGNABOOGOK

Mr. ANGNABOOGOK. I am representing some of the students at Beltz High School to speak in opposition to the Sea Mammal bill which states that no ivory or skins may be used for commercial purposes. Here are some various opinions of other students.

I feel that the sea mammals bill is going to make the Eskimos feel that they can not do what they want with the carvings and sewing especially when they want to sell the carvings and sewing which they have done. We know that the Alaska Native people do not want the bill to pass. Some may not do the things they do especially when the carvings and sewings will not be sold. When an Eskimo person kills an animal he uses the skin to make many useful items, he eats the meat, and carves with the ivory if it has any.

I'm against the sea mammal bill because the people that make a living from selling the arts and crafts they make will stop. Then how will they be able to make money of their own. I really think it's a crazy bill.

I do not like the idea in which the bill states. Because where I live, most all the people depend on what is made from the ivory or skin. And as for me I do the same.

I don't like the idea of the sea mammals bill because, most people depend on the animals to make a living. They carve jewelry and other useful things from the ivory, make clothing and other useful items from the skin, eat the meat. I think in some ways it will ruin the Eskimo culture, like for instance the arts and crafts.

Senator STEVENS. Thank you very much, David. Senator Gravel, do you have any questions?

Senator GRAVEL. No questions.

Senator STEVENS. We appreciate your contribution and understand your point of view and we wish you good luck in your track meet.

Mr. ANGNABOOGOK. Thank you.

Senator STEVENS. May we now have the representative from Barrow? David Brower, Martha Aiken, Alfred Hopson, are they here? Will you come up, please? Do you have one person who is going to speak for you? Would you state your name, please, and present your statement? And, would you tell us who is with you to represent Barrow?

STATEMENT OF HENRY KANAYURAK

Mr. KANAYURAK. I have David Brower, Alfred Hopson, and Martha Aiken to testify.

Senator STEVENS. Alright, and would you state your name please?

Mr. KANAYURAK. Senator Stevens, Senator Gravel, ladies and gentlemen: I am Henry Kanayurak of Barrow and I am representing the Eskimos of the North Slope region.

For centuries and time immemorial before white man came to America, Eskimos—(commonly known as meat eaters)—depended on game available to them on land and sea for food, clothing, shelter, weaponry, and many other uses to make life easier for themselves and their families.

Caribou, for me, amongst the land animals, was a hard one to come by for the coastal Eskimo, for they were migratory and seasonal. The summer and fall seasons were the only time in which they were slaughtered for food, clothing, bedding, and shelter, and all parts were stored for winter use. In this present generation, the caribou is as vital to us for food as well as other uses in the early years, only we make more use of its biproducts such as the jaws, horns, and hoofs which are used in arts and crafts, as well as the hide and legs which are made into garments.

Moose, sheep, and the brown bear were used in the same manner as the caribou by the interior Eskimos in the early years.

Foreign trade also created the hunting and trapping of the wolf, wolverine, fox in several species, linx, ermine, and ground squirrel. These animals, in turn, are also used in the making of winter garments, as well as bartering and selling for other commodities. Fish of several species are also caught by use of net throughout the year and stored for everyday use by both coastal and interior Eskimos.

Seal of two species amongst the sea mammals were solely dependent upon throughout the winter for food, clothing, storage poke for food or oil and raw hide rope and these two species are the ring seal and harbor seal. Again every part of this animal is saved for both man and their animals of burden for food.

Walrus, spotted seal, bearded seal, beluga, and whale are all seasonal sea mammals and are a change of diet when caught. All parts of the animals are saved unless the ferocious sea shifting disrupts the harvesting of these animals. The biproduct taken from these animals for trade or selling are as important to us during the jobless years as that of a job in a city to a man.

So you see, the hunting of sea mammals and the very few land game available to us in our game-limited tundra regions has been the only source of survival and livelihood other than bartering and selling of the biproducts taken from the animals.

Meat taken from the seasonal sea mammals and very few land animals and fish that are provided us by God are like "Beef and

Pork with Vegetables" on the table to a white man. Oil or fat off these animals has been proven to be a very perfect and stable substitute for vegetables.

Provisions and restrictions involved in the proposed Senate bill 3161 would be worse than taking them away totally from an Eskimo.

If seasonal hunting was passed in the Senate for the Eskimo, it would involve poaching of these animals which they have depended on for centuries. Eskimo cannot live without meat, so therefore it would involve mass welfare dependence against their pride and against the will of many Congressmen.

Taking these animals is like taking away all the food and clothing from an Eskimo, therefore stripping him of his pride for survival.

Senate bill 3161 is being introduced without consideration to the Eskimo who totally depend on these animals for survival but looking at it from the point of pleasure for those that do not depend on it for survival.

Catching of the Bowhead whale is one of the basic backbones of our traditional customs which our culture is mainly dependent on.

We are but a few people of our proud race and we only take few mammals per season for winter use. Therefore you must not ever compare our lot to other races that take these animals for commercial use.

If the proposed Senate bill 3161 is passed as it is, you will not only succeed in raping us of our provisions for survival but you will have successfully exterminated our aboriginal right, heritage, culture, and pride.

Senator STEVENS. Thank you very much, Henry. How many whales or the Bowhead whales does the Barrow area take per year, do you know?

Mr. KANAYURAK. The study that was made a few years back, I believe a couple years back, which was reported in the 1970 legislature, states that anywhere from 15 to 25 whales are caught each year amongst the Eskimos along the coast.

Senator STEVENS. That's the north coast?

Mr. KANAYURAK. The north coast.

Senator GRAVEL. Are you the only ones that are taking whales?

Mr. KANAYURAK. No, sir.

Senator GRAVEL. Who else is taking whales?

Mr. KANAYURAK. When I——

Senator GRAVEL. I mean, among the natives. Do you have any knowledge of this?

Mr. KANAYURAK. We are the only ones that are taking whales, up there. And, we do not use whales for commercial uses. The only ones that sell any part of the whale are those that need it, when necessary, for other uses in the household such as milk, sugar, flour.

Senator GRAVEL. Have you noticed a decrease in the population of whales or a problem in this regard, or, is it harder to get whales, now, than it used to be?

Mr. KANAYURAK. No, sir; I believe one of our delegates will be talking about that later. About the population or the decreasing of whales.

Senator STEVENS. Just one more question. When you mention selling, you're talking about selling whale products like prepared whale meat or canned?

Mr. KANAYURAK. Bartering is what I should have said, amongst the Eskimos themselves. And, if—there's very little sold outside of Barrow of the whales caught.

Senator STEVENS. That's sold to the other Eskimos, is that right?

Mr. KANAYURAK. To the other Eskimos, yes.

Senator STEVENS. You're not selling any of the whale that is taken, any of these 15 to 25 whales in the form of whale oil or something like that, on a national scale?

Mr. KANAYURAK. No, we don't.

Senator GRAVEL. Is there such a market?

Mr. KANAYURAK. No, sir; I was going to say that we hope that some time in the future that we could use some of this whale oil, blubber, for oil to sell or barter amongst the Eskimos. And, I've noticed, in the past few years, that oil, even in the Interior, amongst the Indians today, is very vital to these people. Why, I can't say. The only thing I can say is that they found out about this oil and it is good for them in the winter. They don't ask for it much during the summer. As a matter of fact, oil will make a person sick in the hot areas during the summer months, but, it is very good for a person, that is used to it during the winter.

Senator GRAVEL. Do you take it internally?

Mr. KANAYURAK. Yes, internally.

Senator GRAVEL. Like castor oil?

Mr. KANAYURAK. You use it along with the meat.

Senator GRAVEL. For cooking?

Mr. KANAYURAK. Like I say, to eat. For cooking and to eat with, both.

Senator GRAVEL. I would hope that you could develop that market.

Mr. KANAYURAK. I was thinking seriously of looking for a grant, somewhere, where we could start this production of the whale oil.

Senator GRAVEL. We have an E. D. A. Vhan here, Clyde Courtnage, who came in with us on the airplane. I think that that would be a good place for a grant. And, I wouldn't let this legislation or the reaction to this type of effort dissuade you from developing other economic sources and uses for this whale.

Mr. KANAYURAK. I'm not speaking only for Barrow, but, if we could set up one particular place, set it up for this oil, where the oil could be shipped, then, I believe it would be very helpful.

Senator STEVENS. Thank you very much. We will try to hear the balance of your group. I know they have come a long way, also, but, we would like to make certain that we have a record of everybody. Brevig Mission, is there a representative here? Emma Savok, is she here? I have a note, incidentally, that some of these people may come in here later today, and if we go over them, pickup the villages, at the end, again. Is there a representative from Buckland, here? A representative from Deering? Diomede? Is Diomede's representative here? Is Elim's representative here? Will you state your name? You're a representative of Elim, this morning?

STATEMENT OF WILFRED MURRAY

Mr. MURRAY. Yes, sir. I'm Wilfred Murray and I represent Elim. I don't have a written statement with me, but, I'll give a verbal report. The village of Elim, the only sea mammals we get down there are beluga, hair seal, and oogruk. And, out of these species, we get approximately 20 beluga, annually and about 50 hair seal and about 15 to 20 oogruk, a year. And, beluga, we use the skin or the muktuk for food. And, out of the tail they get the sinew for sewing skin. And, the meat is dried and the intestines, the lungs and liver are used for dog food. So, about the only thing we throw away, out of a whale is the bones. And, on the seal, we use the skin for making mukluks and jackets, slippers and we also sell the skin to other Eskimos, I mean, if they want—if they need the skin to make mukluks or jackets. And the—both the seal and the oogruk, we make seal oil out of the blubber. And, the oogruk, they use the skin to make soles for the mukluks and the slippers. The meat on the oogruk is dried and stored away for food. And, out of all these mammals we get, the intestines are always used for dog food because we don't always have dog food in the store. So, that's about all I have.

Senator STEVENS. How many people do you have there, now?

Mr. MURRAY. We have about a 180 population in Elim.

Senator STEVENS. Senator Gravel?

Senator GRAVEL. Nothing.

Senator STEVENS. That's the kind of information we need. Tell me what would you do if you couldn't hunt? What would you do with your time?

Mr. MURRAY. I don't know what we would do if we can't hunt sea mammals. But, out of all these, seal, the seal skin, and oogruk, the women make these into mukluks and jackets and they use this for—the majority of the people use this for their income because we don't have very many jobs in a little village like Elim. So, if these are taken away, we can't sell any of this byproducts from these mammals. I guess about the only thing—the only other course would be welfare for the people.

Senator GRAVEL. How many whales do you take a year, about, out of your village?

Mr. MURRAY. We take about 20 beluga a year.

Senator GRAVEL. Twenty beluga a year. And, that sustains——

Mr. MURRAY. Annually, yes.

Senator GRAVEL. —160 people. How many seals do you think you take a year?

Mr. MURRAY. About—roughly 50.

Senator GRAVEL. Fifty. Twenty belugas and 50 seals is really all you take. Have you noticed a decrease in the population of seals or belugas? Are they harder to get?

Mr. MURRAY. No, there's always plenty of seals and belugas. The population doesn't seem to decrease.

Senator GRAVEL. Okay, thank you.

Senator STEVENS. Do you have many dogsleds in your village?

Mr. MURRAY. We have one dog team left in Elim.

Senator STEVENS. You're using mostly snowmobiles, now?

Mr. MURRAY. Yes.

Senator STEVENS. Does that increase the demand for cash?

Mr. MURRAY. Yes, it does. In the—for the gas, oil, and miscellaneous parts on the snowmobile.

Senator STEVENS. Thank you very much. We appreciate your coming very much. Is there a representative from Gambell, here? John, would you come forward, please?

STATEMENT OF JOHN APANGALOOK

Mr. APANGALOOK. Thank you, Senator.

Senator STEVENS. Thank you for coming to join us.

Mr. APANGALOOK. I, John Apangalook, a mayor of the city of Gambell on St. Lawrence Island have been selected by the city council to attend this hearing and to give my testimony to the best of my ability and knowledge for the above bill.

If I have to give this in my own language it would give clear and much understanding, but for the lack of English, I have to omit some. I am 61 years old and lived on St. Lawrence Island, and have grown on nothing but sea mammals. I'm sure all the Eskimos of Alaska have the same, and I know my people on the island are. I would call the Bering Sea as a garden to all Eskimos, just like the people of lower States had their gardens, still the sea mammals don't grow on land but daily year round, men goes out to find seal, walrus, and don't come home with it always because animal goes here and there, and in account of weather condition there is disappointment to the families and neighbors as well.

I and the other people of my age grew up in homes not like we are living in now. I was grown in a home of walrus skins roof and with seal oil lamps, so the seal, walrus, whale fats were the most precious part of animals, because it gives each home heat, lights and to cook with. The hunting has been most important to Eskimos.

It was so important I and others have lacked English because we are needed by our fathers for hunting more than to be in school, but the white people come around 1900 and find the hardship of Eskimo living, and say, "Hey, we have better things than seal, walrus and whale oil, for your homes, to heat your homes, and to cook with and for so forth."

The Eskimos say, "We have no money." The white people say, "Do not worry, we will take seal skins, walrus ivory and whale baleen." Then the time has come the Bering Sea with animals becomes more than a garden, but a farm also. It looked so beneficial and the men, women learned to carve ivory and skin sewing and earn to buy good food for the growing children, as advised by health departments, and up to now 90 percent of Eskimos of St. Lawrence Island earns their living on sea animal as a culture.

In this case the sea mammal is only subsistence to all Eskimos, and it will be for long time, even there is education offered and yet our young people are not getting their education to a level to get a job.

Now, if the proposed marine mammal legislation comes into law, it will deal a crashing blow to the economy and culture of our area. I know and have faith in our Congressmen, they won't make it so

hard, but will let the Eskimos take the sea animal for food. But it will be one of the worst health hazards to our young people, because most families will not be able to get white people food for their children. Even a 35 year old will not stay healthy on sea animal meat, they grow on other food. And yet we do not kill walrus for their tusks and teeth when they are around, only time we get them is in month of May and still there is a rule to go by for the daily catch. Each hunter is allowed to kill four bulls and when hunting for female, each kills five with babies. The skins of mother walrus are checked to see if they are good for covering of boats, not all skins come out good, most have scars from fighting, which is not good. Baby skins are always used to make into ropes.

When a boat got to the shore, after unloading, one of the crewmen or boat captain takes the tusks home and chopped them out of head and take them to the store to get gas for next hunt or get what is needed most in the family. And yet this is only for a short period because there isn't animals around, only during the time when sea animals swim north for migration and they are gone most of the year. Even the carvers don't have enough to carve and have to buy the raw ivory from the store and others.

So if this bill comes into law, which I am sure it will not, for the Eskimos of Alaska out if it does then what shall we do. All we will do is watch with heartaches someone else (those are Russian hunters) shooting all they want just beyond 10 miles and somebody may wish and whisper, why did the United States buy Alaska. And then I have to look at myself and my children and others, to see if we can find a job and finds out they are ineligible because of education. We as parents now force our children for education, and when they need education for qualification, even we thought they would end up with more education, but they give up and depend more on carving ivory and skin sewing which is produced from Bering Sea animals.

Now, at this hearing, I am sorry to say this, but I must as it is true to the fact, that, "Why did our legislature try to make a law about the God made animals for one kind of His people to live with." I would say one who introduces the bill needs education of Eskimo way of living and is ineligible to make such a law without understanding the facts. I would call this hearing as a help to our legislature and in the cry of my testimony I have strong faith in our good people in the Congress that after this hearing they will have serious consideration and will find this proposed marine mammal bill needs to be amended.

Senator STEVENS. Very good, mayor. You made a very fine statement. Senator Gravel?

Senator GRAVEL. Very articulate statement, very fine.

Senator STEVENS. Is there a representative from Golovin? Martin Olson, are you here? King Island? Our good friend Peter Seganna. Mr. Hussey who represents the Chairman of our subcommittee, Senator Hollings, today, does have questions from time to time. For instance, he has just asked me if any of the people here have any details of the amount of the Russian kill beyond our limit. If you do have any information, particularly about this last report we've had, concerning the Russian kill, we'd be happy to have it from the witnesses. Good morning.

STATEMENT OF PETER SEGANNA

Mr. SEGANNA. Good morning, Senator, ladies and gentlemen. I'm Peter Seganna from King Island.

All the good things comes to us from the sea. This was said by one of our elderly Eskimos. In the same token a man from Carolinas might say all the good things comes from growing tobacco or a man from Michigan all the good things comes from building cars. We have heard of these men. We are all concern with our environment as you are. I don't go out to the lower 48 very often but when I do, I often find my eyes running from the smog. Now I find myself in a bind that is trying to take away my aboriginal rights as well as constitutional rights, by men that are bowing to the pressure groups that should be concern with the air and their immediate surroundings, and for those that are specfically concerned with sea mammals, the Alaskan Eskimos should not and could not be compared with either commercial hunters or with those that makes business out of the sea mammals. The Eskimo has never gone around clubbing hundreds of seal pups nor the fur seals, those that are doing that are your employees who are just making a living. I would have liked to see you seating in your chair as a part of the TV documentary. We the Eskimo are depended on the weather for our hunting. I myself is married to an orphan of the unfortune hunter that was taken away by the ice condition. Every fall we hear on the news that so many are shot by their fellow man while hunting deer in the lower 48 States. Why don't you do something about that. There are never any reports that a man shot because someone thought that he was a seal, walrus, polar bear or even a whale. The Alaska native land claim bill is settled. Everybody thinks that the natives are rich—why not? Is it not the big American dream to be rich? But we, the natives, have yet to see that money which is at your disposal. No one gave me land it was such a long waited legality that took so long which had to be specified that the natives indeed own the land. Anyone that thinks that the natives are rich, is right in a sense, that we are rich in culture which we are about to lose thanks to you, but we have yet to see the money from the claim bill which will be at least 3 years away. When it in cash it is estimated it will be something like $475 per capita.

It is unfortunate that you have never seen a documentary of the Eskimo year. You would see how he uses the mammals of the sea for his daily need, such as seal being made into a float or raw hide, mukluks and so forth. The walrus first of all, the skin is made to cover our skinboats the stomach is used for the drums every part could be taken home if there were facilities to store it for future use. Oftentimes it is sold to the local stores only to be bought back later because we have no storage for it. The biproducts of the mammals are to mosts of us the only thing that will bring in cash for our other needs. The Eskimo have hunted these mammals since the time immemorable and he has not depleted them. As long as they are not hunted by big commercial boats I believe there aren't any reason why we should be alarmed. What you need is international control of big commercial industry on sea mammals and let the Eskimo live as he has. Perhaps we should ask for exception as the tuna fisherman

has or the fur seal harvest, or would it be to much to give to a second class citizen. To limit the sales of the biproduct to the intrastate would knock out the business. The tourist are our biggest buyers and the tourist is the biggest industry of the State.

I will conclude by saying that the congress cannot see itself sending cavalry as it has in the past so they are trying to take away the roots of the eskimo in hopes that it will be as effective as General Custer or any other general that fits that description.

Senator STEVENS. That's a tough statement, but, we know that you are a direct talker. Sit down for just a minute—we want to chat with you for a minute. Senator Gravel?

Senator GRAVEL. I think it's a good statement.

Senator STEVENS. How much would you get for a walrus tusk if you sold it at one of these stores?

Mr. SEGANNA. Well, it depends on if it is raw or carved. If it is a raw ivory, I think it is something like—the person that's selling it would get about $4 a pound for it.

Senator STEVENS. And, carved, how much would it be?

Mr. SEGANNA. Well, it——

Senator STEVENS. It would depend on what you carve on it, right?

Mr. SEGANNA. It depends on what you carve.

Senator STEVENS. What do you pay for a gallon of gasoline for a snow machine up here?

Mr. SEGANNA. Oh, somewhere around 70 cents a gallon.

Senator STEVENS. And, what's the range as you get out into the other villages? Have you gone out to other villages?

Mr. SEGANNA. No, I have not, but, I suppose that it's higher in the other villages. I know it's higher in the other villages.

Senator GRAVEL. How about heating oil. What do you pay a gallon for that?

Mr. SEGANNA. Heating oil? I think it's something like 36 cents a gallon, here in Nome. Somewhere in that vicinity.

Senator GRAVEL. And, in the villages?

Mr. SEGANNA. It's a lot more. I've heard people say as high as $50 a drum.

Senator STEVENS. In regard to your statement about the selling of the meat to the store and buying it back, I assume that's because they would have storage——

Mr. SEGANNA. Yes.

Senator STEVENS. Freezer capacity?

Mr. SEGANNA. Yes, I think that's one of the reasons. First of all, they sell it to get money, but, it may look funny, but, later on in the year, you have to buy back the meat that you have sold.

Senator STEVENS. What would you get for it, if you sold it to the store and how much would you have to pay to get it back? Do you know?

Mr. SEGANNA. I'm not sure, but, I think they buy the seal and oogruk for something like 59 cents a pound, at the local stores, here.

Senator STEVENS. That's what they pay for it when you sell it to them?

Mr. SEGANNA. That's what you pay when you buy it from the store.

Senator STEVENS. I see. How much do you think they buy it for?

Mr. SEGANNA. Oh, probably about half that price. I would think.

Senator STEVENS. And, they sell it later on in the year?

Mr. SEGANNA. Uh-huh.

Senator STEVENS. When the supply is exhausted?

Mr. SEGANNA. Yes.

Senator STEVENS. Very good. Now, just so we can get a little of the background, in this record, as Senator Gravel mentioned, we hope that our colleagues will either read it or listen to us, when we're talking about this bill, in the Senate. How far away is King Island from here?

Mr. SEGANNA. It's about 90 miles northwest of Nome. That's air miles. It's a little further by boat.

Senator STEVENS. Your village moved, almost entirely, I guess.

Mr. SEGANNA. The entire village has moved to Nome since 1965 or somewhere around there.

Senator STEVENS. And, you live now on the outskirts of Nome?

Mr. SEGANNA. Yes.

Senator STEVENS. What do you people do now, Peter?

Mr. SEGANNA. Most of the older men and women are sewing and carving for their living. And, others have moved away to Anchorage; most of them have moved to Anchorage.

Senator STEVENS. Those are the younger ones, primarily?

Mr. SEGANNA. Yes. The younger ones with the big families looking for a better place for their families to raise.

Senator STEVENS. Do you still have some hunters here from the village?

Mr. SEGANNA. Oh, yes.

Senator STEVENS. How many people are hunters?

Mr. SEGANNA. I would say about 10 to 15 men are active hunters and then, for walrus season, just about everybody from the village goes.

Senator STEVENS. How many animals do you think you take a year for the King Island villagers?

Mr. SEGANNA. It depends on the winter. Some winters—take for instance, this winter—this winter is very lean. We haven't—we didn't catch very many seals. I myself caught only three. Last year, about that time, I caught about 15 and two oogruks.

Senator STEVENS. But, you don't have any numbers in total, Peter, in terms of what the King Island villagers caught?

Mr. SEGANNA. No, you can't tell the numbers. It varies from year to year. In some years it is fat years and some are lean and some are medium.

Senator STEVENS. Does this change, Peter? Is it getting harder or is it getting easier or is it just the same cycle that you have experienced during your life?

Mr. SEGANNA. Some years it's harder because of the weather conditions of the area and other years it's better because of the weather conditions. Our hunting depends on the weather.

Senator STEVENS. Very good.

Senator GRAVEL. Not at all on the quantity of animals?

Mr. SEGANNA. No.

Senator GRAVEL. Your ability to get the numbers you need to sustain yourself is based upon whether or not the weather permits you to go do it?

Mr. SEGANNA. Right. Even if there—sometimes when the weather is nice, the animal may be feeding in a different area. But, if you don't see one seal—if you don't see a seal today, that don't mean that the seals being depleted.

Senator GRAVEL. Very good. Thank you Peter.

Senator STEVENS. You made a very good contribution and I think you have spoken out very forcefully. Thank you, Peter. Kivalina? I understand that Martin Olson came in from Golovin. We just passed you over, Martin. If you're here, we'd be happy to hear from you at this time.

STATEMENT OF MARTIN OLSON

Mr. OLSON. Do I just address you here?

Senator STEVENS. Yes, sir; if you will. We are recording it, plus, those microphones belong to our friends, here, to our right, the radio station. We're happy to have you here, Mr. Olson, you're representing the village of Golovin?

Mr. OLSON. Yes; unfortunately, I'm not as well prepared as I thought I was going to be. My star witness is still out hunting seal. He didn't come in, in time. And, he was all—really anxious to come, old man Edwin Punik, our oldest hunter, there. But, I have prepared just a little bit, here. I think one of the things that should be realized is that there at Golovin, we're one of the few villages that is not very dependent on sea animals as compared to villages all around us, because we have, oh, we've got fishing, there and we've got a reindeer herd, there. And, but, last night, I went from house to house and took an actual count from each man—I missed two men and had to guess at theirs, but, the figure that I could come up with for last year, for the seals caught, there's no walrus or whale, except once in 3 or 4 years, 5 years, is that there was between 120 and 140 seals caught. And, these were only for meat and local consumption. The——

Senator STEVENS. How many people, Mr. Olson?

Mr. OLSON. Roughly a hundred people. And, we just lost one man this spring who was out hunting seal. I don't know how many of you heard about it. He got pulled under the ice. And, this has actually caused kind of a slowdown in the seal hunting, right in our area, right now. In fact, two or three people made the remark that they was wondering where they could buy some seal oil because the fact that we just lost a friend of ours, it made them more cautious. Not only that, but we've got a housing program going on and there are 10 houses that are working in and we've got a community building going on. So, all of the men have been busy. And, so, this has been a year that we have caught very little seal. And, still, there was that many caught. And, here we're, theoretically not dependent on them, almost. There was some seal that were caught and—that I flew into Nome. Roughly, I remember that these two men got between 30 and

40 seal. And, I brought about a dozen in, two plane loads and there was, I know, a couple other airplanes flew some more in. So, these were brought into town and sold to the local meat markets and these were with hides on. So, whoever got the seal, bought them with the hides and somebody got the benefit of these hides. These two men were not married so they didn't have their wives skin them, because they didn't have any. There is no—the only income we have there in Golovin is just during the summer when the fishing season starts. And, it lasts only a month. When I say a month, that's really stretching it, because, it's actually, roughly, about 12 fishing days. And, to expect these people to live off an income that you make in 12 days, even if they are fabulous fishermen, it's just not enough.

Senator STEVENS. What's the market for a seal? You say you sold it here in Nome for the meat market. I assume that's for consumption by local people? Do you know how much they get for seal?

Mr. OLSON. No, this—I'm sure that this person that's buying the seals was getting $25 a piece for them. And, this was no matter what size, because, there was a couple small ones, there, the guy threw in there and he got $25 for them and there were a couple pretty big ones that he still only got $25 for them.

Senator STEVENS. And, that was for the meat market, here?

Mr. OLSON. That was for the meat market.

Senator STEVENS. Human consumption?

Mr. OLSON. Yes. Uh-huh.

Senator STEVENS. And, what period of the year is that in which they are available?

Mr. OLSON. The biggest amount of hunting is during the fall, there at Golovin. We're right at the bay and there is seal come in there in the fall by the millions—I shouldn't say millions but there's really not. It looks like there's two or three thousand coming on the ice when the ice is moving in and out before it freezes solid. But, just before that time, they're all over. They're in there feeding on herring and they just come in there. They're just like ducks, out there, sitting in the pond, when you see their heads come out of the water. And, actually, if the men wanted to, they would get an awful lot more. But, because they can't use them, they only get just what they need, so there is no waste. There is also about three women down there that make—sew out of the skin and these people, which isn't very much, from what I could see. I figured it looked like about—they made between five and eight hundred dollars a year to supplement their income. And, of course, these women are just trying to help their husbands out to provide money for the family.

Senator STEVENS. They sell that through Nome, do they?

Mr. OLSON. No, they sell it locally. Just to the people around there. And, like, they get $10 a pair for slippers. And, maybe fifteen to twenty depending on how elaborate they want to go in to the mukluk sewing part.

Senator STEVENS. A question has been asked Martin. Do you fish for the same type of fish that the seals are eating when they come into the bay?

Mr. OLSON. Very definitely. Both salmon and herring. There's—in fact, I think if you talked to any fishermen, they'd like to just kill all the seal they can because they feel that the seal is robbing them.

And, especially when you've got salmon that's out and the seal goes right through and just tears a big hole and you've not only lost some of your fish, you've lost—some of the fish that go through that hole that you never see and, of course, in the fall, when they get herring, there's just, oh, just an awful lot of herring.

Senator STEVENS. And, do you take herring, too?

Mr. OLSON. Not so much at Golovin. They do it in Unalakleet. They fish for the herring there, in the spring with purse seines.

Senator STEVENS. Is there a commercial fishery at Golovin?

Mr. OLSON. Yes.

Senator STEVENS. You're talking about the nets that go out from the boats?

Mr. OLSON. Yeah, uh-huh.

Senator STEVENS. Their fixed nets?

Mr. OLSON. See, they have—these are all set nets. They set out in the water. It's against the law to have any of the type of fishing gear, there. And, they're all anchored at both ends. And, so, there's no resistance—I mean, there's resistance when a seal comes up to and decides he wants to go through.

Senator STEVENS. When is your season for taking the reindeer? When do you harvest your reindeer and slaughter it?

Mr. OLSON. The biggest portion is harvested through the winter. For one thing, it's a lot easier to get them, earlier in the winter they're fat and you've got easy storing facilities. Not only that, to transport them out of there, we have had to make a runway out on the ice for the big airplanes to come in; the twin engine and four engine aircraft that come in there. In fact, we just had Sheldon's DC–6 come in there, the other day, with a oil haul.

Senator STEVENS. That's for the reindeer operation?

Mr. OLSON. No, this—in the past, it has been. This particular time, it wasn't. But, in fact, this year was the first year they didn't come in there. This is due to change in ownership and a little different conditions.

Senator STEVENS. I wondered if the time that the seal are available was the same time when the fresh meat is available from reindeer. Is it?

Mr. OLSON. No. Like right now, we're out of meat. There is no meat available, here, where we're right in the midst of the biggest reindeer herd in the country. We've got no meat. I've got a note in my pocket, now, to bring meat down from Nome for the local people. If they had seal, they wouldn't have had to order any.

Senator GRAVEL. So the population of seal—the seal population, you feel, has decreased in this area?

Mr. OLSON. No, no, I'm not saying that. It's just that—what I'm saying, now, is that people——

Senator GRAVEL. The people have not gone out because of the accident?

Mr. OLSON. Not gone out due to this accident, for one thing and the other thing is the guys that are working on the houses, so, they don't feel—they're on this ASHA housing program, so, they don't feel they want to leave. Now, they have gone out at nights, but, they haven't been very successful. And, if you get very much seal, now, there's no way to keep it. There is no cold storage facilities. And, so,

hunting like that, kind of progresses. You just keep going all of the time, or, theoretically all the time. You just keep bringing meat in as you need it, except in the fall when there's an awful lot and you get cold eather right at that time and you try to get as much as you can.

Senator STEVENS. Thank you very much. You're provided us with statistics and information of the type that we want. We appreciate your coming.

Mr. OLSON. Thank you.

Senator STEVENS. Thank you. Is there a representative from Kivalina, here, yet? How about Kotzebue? Did the Kotzebue people get in? Yes, sir. Do you have other people with you?

STATEMENT OF DICK CURTIS

Mr. CURTIS. No, the reservations were full this morning. We tried to get reservations the other day, but the Alaska Airlines was full, so——

Senator STEVENS. I understand some of them will be here this afternoon, right?

Mr. CURTIS. Right.

Senator STEVENS. Fine, will you sign that pad, there and tell us your name and we'll be happy to hear from you and from the others when they get here.

Mr. CURTIS. My name is Dick A. Curtis and I am 52 years old and I've lived all my life in this area, except for four years in which I served in the Army. And, I am a full blooded Eskimo. I am president of the Kotzebue Area Fisheries Co-op in Kotzebue, Alaska. And, the Kotzebue Area Fisheries Co-op was formed in 1968 in order to provide the citizens of Kotzebue area a means of improving their living conditions both economically and otherwise. The people of the Northwest Alaska area for time immemorial, as perhaps the most important part of their diet, used the oil of sea mammals. Trade has gone on between the coastal and inland villages based on the desire of the inland people for sea mammal oil and the desire of the people on the coast for fur and other products produced inland, thereby aiding the economy of both coastal and inland villages. The Kotzebue Area Fisheries Co-op has recently begun a service whereby the co-op acts as a clearinghouse to facilitate the bringing of sea mammal oil to the inland villages, thereby eliminating as much waste as possible. This service would have to be eliminated if the sale of sea mammal by-products is made illegal. The demand for sea mammal oil is relatively constant because of the peculiar taste and buyers are almost exclusively Alaskan Eskimos. Sea mammal oil is such a staple of the diet of the Eskimos of the Northwest Alaska area that, even if the sale or trade of said oil is made illegal, it is my opinion that such trade would continue, despite its illegality, and the nature of illegal operations are such that the waste of the Co-op has been striving to eliminate would increase. To take sea mammal oil from the diet of the Eskimo would be the same as taking bread and butter from the diet of the white American.

Senator STEVENS. That's very good. They took that bread and butter from me because they said I was getting too fat, so, I'd understand it if you'd have said beef, Mr. Curtis. Thank you. You make a good point, though. We were very pleased to hear from you. Senator Gravel, do you have any question?

Senator GRAVEL. No.

Senator STEVENS. Do you have any statistics as to the number of mammals that you have taken in the Kotzebue area?

Mr. CURTIS. Well, no, it's pretty hard to tell. It's pretty hard to tell because before this time, we don't know how many seals we have—have been taken. But, you know, we'd tried to start a Co-op so we could serve the inland people and they are depending on us to furnish them with the seal oil. And, if we get this going, which I hope we do, you know, we'll pretty near know how much seal oil they'll be getting.

Senator STEVENS. It will be a trading company basically serving Eskimo people in other areas?

Mr. CURTIS. Right.

Senator STEVENS. That are not on the coast, is that right?

Mr. CURTIS. Yes. Now our people, we started fishers' Co-op, but we are trying to expand because on fishers alone, we can't earn enough money for wintertime. So, the people in Kotzebue, they do lots of hunting. That's all they live on is hunting seal oil—sea mammals. That's all we catch is the seal and a few belugas. That's all. No walrus or anything like that.

Senator STEVENS. Are you a hunter yourself?

Mr. CURTIS. Yes, I am.

Senator STEVENS. Do you shoot the seals?

Mr. CURTIS. Right.

Senator STEVENS. Do you shoot them in the open sea?

Mr. CURTIS. Right.

Senator STEVENS. Do they float when they're hit?

Mr. CURTIS. Yeah, this time of the year, they float. In the wintertime they float. That's the time we hunt them, in the wintertime.

Senator STEVENS. I see. So, if they are shot in the right time of the year they don't sink to the bottom, as we've heard, is that right?

Mr. CURTIS. Right.

Senator STEVENS. Do they sink in the summertime it they are shot?

Mr. CURTIS. Oh, yes, they sink in the summertime. Especially this hair seal. Now, I'm a fisher all my life and hair seals, they are the ones that we people call a—they eat our salmon. There's lots of that seal that migrate every year, to our area.

Senator STEVENS. Are the seals increasing or decreasing in your area? Are there more or fewer seals now than there used to be?

Mr. CURTIS. As long as I remember, there is—they are the same.

Senator STEVENS. How many people take polar bears for their own use? For meat?

Mr. CURTIS. We don't hunt polar bears. There's no polar bears in our area. We don't hunt—go out that far.

Senator STEVENS. You don't go out far enough for polar bear?

Mr. CURTIS. No. But, is this seal oil mammal bill, I mean for selling, if that is made law, you know, it will make a bootlegger out of

me because that is how I make my living, selling the seal oil. That's the only way I can live this time of year.

Senator STEVENS. Well, when you talk about selling it, you're selling it to other Eskimo people, right?

Mr. CURTIS. The Eskimo people. We, in other words, trade.

Senator STEVENS. And, it's a barter economy——

Mr. CURTIS. Right.

Senator STEVENS. And trade economy and cash economy you have?

Mr. CURTIS. Cash economy.

Senator GRAVEL. So, what you're saying is, even if we passed the law, you couldn't obey it because you have to live?

Mr. CURTIS. Right.

Senator STEVENS. Well, we're doing our best to pass a law you can live with and I hope we can, Mr. Curtis.

Mr. CURTIS. OK.

Senator STEVENS. Thank you very much for coming and we look forward to seeing your friends. When they come in, let me know. Roger Nassuk? Koyuk? Is Koyuk not here? Let me go back and see if any of these are here now? Brevig Mission? Buckland or Deering or Kivalina? Have they come in? Anyone from those areas here? If they do come in, I'd appreciate it if you'd let us know. Mountain Village? Not here yet. With the plane schedules, we understand the problem here. I hope that you will let us know when you come in. Frank Adams from Noatak? And, our host city, Nome? Senator Gravel has just reminded me that it is now a quarter of five in the afternoon for us and we're getting a little hungry and we may want to change that schedule and go to lunch at 11:30, if it doesn't bother too many people. We're all still on Washington time. Vernon, we're happy to have you with us. Would you sign that pad and state your name and give us your statement, please?

STATEMENT OF VERNON KUGZRUK

Mr. KUGZRUK. Mr. Chairman, my name is Vernon Kugzruk and I am an Eskimo from Nome, Alaska. The population of Nome Natives exceeds about 1,800. And, nearly all benefit through some type of mammal bill or another. And, because there are different clans and we do have some unwritten agreements among ourselves, among our old clan that—like, for instance, my clan are usually the seal hunters and we leave things like walrus hunting and whale hunting to those who are better able to hunt these other mammals. This way there is less waste. And, I think I will speak of my own experience as a hunter.

Senator STEVENS. Excuse me, Vernon. If any of you have statements that you have already prepared, and you want to file those for the record and make comments beyond them, we'll be glad to print the statements and let you comment as you desire. You proceed any way you want.

Mr. KUGZRUK. Thank you. I do my hunting in the falltime, a few weeks before it freezes up. And, my usual hunting location is immediately around the Nome and Teller area. I use a 14-foot skiff powered by a 20-horsepower outboard motor. My usual weapons consist

of, usually, a .22 rifle or a bigger rifle, a 222 rifle. I use a hook and a harpoon to retrieve my catch. This is to prevent them from sinking, but, usually, in the fall, they do not sink. Last fall, I harvested a total of 43 seals, five of which were young oogruk, 27 spotted seals and 11 ring seals. The bulk of the meat was dried and stored in seal oil for later consumption and what I had in my family and could not use, I sold to various elderly Natives and to other disabled Natives. The heart and the liver and the intestines were consumed by me and my family or were sold to a few other Natives.

Some of the fresh meat and the blubber were sold to the local meat market. This was necessary to prevent waste because an individual hunter usually does not have proper storage facilities as do our local markets. Skins were sold to various skin sewers. Because of local demands for skins, I did not ship my skins outside the city of Nome. And, if the legislation is passed to ban the harvesting of sea mammals, then many of my people will needlessly suffer directly or indirectly. I will not be permitted to sell or barter to those families who need the meat and blubber to help subsist their livelihood. the elderly and the disabled will suffer enormously because, then, they would be forced to eat other types of meat such as beef or pork. These meats are—these meats, the elderly, who cannot acquire taste for beef or pork would be forced to buy and eat these meats. Just as the majority of the Caucasian cannot acquire a taste for our Native foods, the Natives, too, cannot get used to eating beef or pork, in that respect. Since time immemorial, we have always been a conservative and resourceful people. We have been brought up to respect mother nature and its animal kingdom. Our fathers and their fathers before them had always trained their offspring to practice conservation of animal life. Throughout the centuries, we have been expertly utilizing every part of the animal we catch. Take, for instance, the seal. Every part of the seal is used from the head to the flippers. Even the stomach and the intestines are consumed. The meat is usually dried and stored in its own oil which is rendered from the blubber. The flipper is also eaten. The skin is used to make various types of clothing such as parkas and mukluks. Even some of the tooth of the animal is saved to make trinkets by the ivory carvers. Now, I want to point out that all of this is done without polluting our air and the earth. Not all Natives are able to go out and hunt for themselves. There are many elderly Natives and also, others who are disabled through sickness or various types of injuries who has to depend on the young and the able bodied to supply them with the sea mammal for their use in food, clothing and material to make their products.

Much as the Eskimos like sharing with their fellow man, some of these mammals are sold to other Natives, usually for small tokens of cash or bartered for other types of Native food such as fish. The cash which the hunter gets will then be used to buy gas, shells, and provisions for his family. In this respect, the Eskimo has never liked to receive something without giving something back in return. There are many skilled ivory carvers and skin sewers among my people. The people will be hurt the most for if the taking of sea mammals is banned for commercial use, the ivory carvers and the

skin sewers would cease to exist, mainly because they would not have a place to sell their product. And, as a result of this a very important part of our culture would be lost and buried in ruins of a senseless piece of legislation. Each year, thousands of tourists take home a souvenir, whether it be a carved trinket or a product made by a skin sewer. This product that the natives have to offer is, to a great majority, the only economy and source of income and, it would be lost. There is no doubt, in my mind, that even if our right to eat what we want to eat is taken away from us, the majority of us will still crave for our native food. Where, then, we get our native food. Perhaps, we will have to turn to some other nation who would be willing to sell us these native foods which we dearly love and, no doubt, there are nations which ould pounce on the opportunity to sell these items which would boost their economy. Not only would this bill deprive my epople of their right to eat their choice of food, the cost of living among my people would rise to an excess and some may become weak as a direct result of non-nutrition and, perhaps, even starvation. Welfare payments would soar to extremes and, our already overburdened taxpayer would face the danger of having his taxes increased. In other words, not only would my people suffer, it would also affect the taxpayer indirectly, too. We have not become millionaires as a result of the Land Claims Settlement Act and, in fact, we won't see any meaningful benefits from that settlement for many more years to come. I have not seen 1 penny from the settlement act, yet, and I am just as broke as before. I want you to know, however, that I agree that there should be some type of legislation concerning our mammals. However, provisions should be made for the native population to continue their right to eat these mammals and to continue their right to sell their creation of handmade arts and crafts for, without this provision, we face the danger of extinction. Thank you for your attention.

Senator STEVENS. That's very good. You've made a very strong statement. We appreciate the opportunity to be in your town. Is a representative or Noorvik here, now? Northeast Cape? You sign that pad there, please, and state your name for us? Are you from St. Lawrence? Congratulate your people for sending such an attractive representative.

STATEMENT OF SHARON ORR

Mrs. ORR. Thank you, Mr. Senator. They didn't send me. Northeast Cape is not a village anymore; it's just a camp.

Senator STEVENS. Could you speak a little louder, please, so these people who've come a long way too, can hear you. Give us your name.

Mrs. ORR. Sharon Orr.

Senator STEVENS. Ott?

Mrs. ORR. Orr. Although Northeast Cape is not a village anymore, there are still some people living there, and a lot of times a lot of people come to Northeast Cape to hunt, so I am involved with the hunters, too. But I was to point out that we depend on the sea mammals as much as other villages do in Savoonga and Gambell, and we never waste anything. Everything is used over there. The meat we

don't eat, we use for trapping as bait, and from the carvings the people buy shells and gas, fuel oil, and other essential needs. If all this were to pass, we would be solely dependent on welfare. Our pride in ourselves would be diminished, and there's not that much ivory taken. There is no way anything is wasted. For generations, we have been taught to conserve because we live off the environment. If this bill were to be passed, the people would have nothing. We would have to depend on trapping, and then the foxes would be endangered because there is now employment in the villages, very little, there are two old people at Northeast Cape; they get welfare checks, but their life depends on their sewing and carving. I don't know the price, but the price of living in the villages is very high. By the time food gets there by ship or plane, it is doubled or even tripled sometimes, and then we are expected to live on this wood carving and welfare checks. People do not want to live on welfare checks. It kills their pride in themselves; we have been humiliated long enough. I am very sorry that this bill was introduced without our being asked beforehand. Nobody consulted us; nobody asked us if or what our feelings were; how we felt about it. That's all; I quit.

Senator STEVENS. The bill has already passed the House of Representatives. Of course, Senator Gravel and I are in the Senate, and the Senate will have an opportunity to review it. That's why we're here—to get your feelings, which you state them very well. What type of mammals do they take at Northeast Cape?

Mrs. ORR. Walrus and mostly seal. There is an overabundance of seal over there because there is not a village there anymore and very few people hunt. There are hundreds of seals around the area, and . . .

Senator STEVENS. And there are still a few people living around there, you say?

Mrs. ORR. Yes.

Senator STEVENS. How many?

Mrs. ORR. Five families; no, there are three families there now.

Senator STEVENS. Have you had to purchase anything over there? Would you know, for instance, what is the price of gasoline?

Mrs. ORR. We have to ship it from Savoonga Native store because there is no store at Northeast Cape.

Senator STEVENS. How much would it cost?

Mrs. ORR. No. I let my husband do all the buying, but I do know that when we don't get shells or other items from Savoonga, we get them from Nome, and freight cost over there is high.

Senator STEVENS. Let me read to you something that Mr. Hussey has given to me as part of the evidence we have to review. Have you gone out to hunt for walrus or seal yourself?

Mrs. ORR. No, I have not.

Senator STEVENS. I think I'll ask a hunter about that. We have to try to see how we can answer some of the charges that have been made, but I think I will ask someone who has actually gone out and hunted to get answers to these items. We appreciate very much your coming to represent the Northeast Cape people.

Mrs. ORR. Nobody asked them to send anybody from there because it is just a camp.

Senator STEVENS. Well, that is good. We are happy that you did, and think you have made a very nice contribution. Thank you very much.

Mrs. ORR. You are welcome.

Senator STEVENS. Is Point Hope here? Point Lay? Saint Michael? We're liable to get our lunch early, until the plane gets in. Saint Paul? How about Savoonga? Yes, please come forward. I have been asked to make an announcement that the Nome library and museum has a mammal exhibit from the University of Alaska, consisting of pictures, models, and hunting equipment and accessories, and general information on mammals of this area. The members of the committee, the members of the public and press have been urged to spend a few moments at this exhibit, which will be open until 6:30 p.m. today and tomorrow; everyday, I guess. Yes sir. Would you state your name for us please?

STATEMENT OF ABNER GOLOGERGEN

Mr. GOLOGERGEN. Senator Stevens, members of the committee, ladies, and gentlemen, my name is Abner Gologergen. I am speaking on behalf of the people of Savoonga, of those about 400 people on St. Lawrence Island. The animals that are most important to our people include walrus, seal, and the bayleen whale. During the period of October 1, 1971—September 30, 1972, we took 551 walruses and 375 seals. We do not have a breakdown of seals by species, but the hair, ribbon, spotted, and braided seals are all important in our lives to have life. I would like to discuss the ways that these animals are valuable to us: As food, as a source of cash income, as raw materials for the manufacture of essential items, and of all of these as a base of our cultural life. First, at the present time, 90 percent of our life comes from these animals. The walrus provides the bulk of our food, seal is of equal importance in our diet and is available at times when walrus are scarce. Beyond this, we cannot see that one animal is more important then the other because they are obtained on a seasonal basis and the number of animals taken depends on weather and ice conditions. The following breakdown details how each animal is used as food: Walrus—all of the animal is eaten except the lungs and the bone. Seals—all of the animal is eaten except the skin and the bone. Whale—the skin and white meats are eaten, and the internal organs are not eaten. All the store-bought foods supplement our diet; our basic food is walrus and seal. Many people have grown up with this food, and preferred to other kinds of meat and food from other animals. We send some of the food to our children at boarding schools and the Native people living in other parts of the State. If we are not allowed to hunt these animals, we would lose our basic food supply. This would create much hardship for our people, so not only would we miss our preferred food; we would not be as able to afford as healthy a diet as we have now if we turn to packaged food. As you will see, our basic source of cash income also comes from these animal mammals and many people would not be able to afford store-bought food. This would lead to a very great increase in the needs for welfare assist-

ance for our people. Second, ivory: Animal skins and bayleens are used as a source of subsistence income. This income makes it possible to supply the necessary materials created for subsistence hunting. Without this income, we would not afford to hunt the animals for food. In addition, cash is needed for clothing and heat suitable for this climate. Walrus—ivory is carved by every member of the village. The carvings are either sold for cash or exchanged at the store for goods. Raw ivory can be sold to the store for cash, skins of bull animals are sent out to be processed as buffing materials for silver. Seal—all seal skins of commercial value, commercially processed skins are the base of the active village industry of skin sewing. Skin of the baby seal is processed and bleached in the village for use as building materials, tents, laces, and many other applications in skin sewing. Whale—bayleen is used as a base and trim in ivory carving and material for craft work. A new and growing source of income is that of big game hunting, which has suddenly grown in the past 3 years. This year, about $25,000 will come into the village of Savoonga as the hunters only take the trophy; the meat and skins of these animals can still be used by our people and the future will be increasingly an important of the spring hunt. This animal also provides the raw materials for many things needed in the village. Walrus—ivory strips from tusks are used on the keel of our winter boats, the boats themselves made from split female hides. Ropes, lines, tacks, gun cases, and many other things are made from the skins of walrus. Walrus stomach is split and scraped and the middle surface is used for drums in Eskimo dances. Seal—skins from the braided seal are used for boot soles. Hair seals and spotted seal skins are used for parkas, pants, boots, and socks. There is no better clothing for winter conditions. Whale bones are used as protective stripes on the keel of our boats. Bayleen is used for the freight sleds in early winter. It is impossible to put economic value on these materials. Their loss would cause a very great increase in the needs of our people, and the only source of assistance would be increased Government help and thus increased dependence on Government welfare. Hunting and its role in our diet and lives and in relationship to our raw materials and skills is at the center of our culture. The real issue at stake in the sea mammal bill is not merely subsistence hunting and the use of its byproducts, but the survival of our village and the survival of our culture. Senator Stevens and the members of the committee, these are very important questions for our people, and I would like to try to answer any questions you may have.

Senator STEVENS. Thank you very much. You say you took 551 walrus?

Mr. GOLOGERGEN. This is on a year-round basis.

Senator STEVENS. How many people in the village?

Mr. GOLOGERGEN. 400 people.

Senator STEVENS. And how many people are actually hunting?

Mr. GOLOGERGEN. Actually, about every man in the village hunts for the meat all year-round.

Senator STEVENS. I mentioned earlier the article about the walrus written by one of our friends who is opposing the right of Eskimos to hunt in the Bering Sea. She has written this. She says:

In their seal skin boats with motors switched off, they coast noiselessly to a point that is a few yards from a herd and shoot indiscriminantly into the mass bodies until the magazines of their rifles are empty. When the remainder flee, panic-stricken, into the water, a few animals lie helplessly on the ice bleeding to death staining the surrounding water, but no effort is made to pursue and harpoon the dying animals.

The article goes on to talk about the taking of walrus. What do you do on your hunt in order to recover the animals that you are hunting once you have shot them?

Mr. GOLOGERGEN. Whenever every boat went out hunting, the first thing you do is try to spot the animal. And after you spot it, you try to kill it a good bit away, without anything discriminatory to the animal or any other way. All we do is kill the animal, cut the meat, and put in the boat and take it home for every family in the village.

Senator STEVENS. She says that herds ride on floating ice bergs which pass through the Bering Strait in May and June heading for the Arctic Ocean. Is that the time when you hunt, in May and June, for the walrus?

Mr. GOLOGERGEN. Yes, in the springtime is the time that we harvest walrus.

Senator STEVENS. Are there other periods in Ocotber and November when the herds come back? What is the winter hunting time?

Mr. GOLOGERGEN. Walrus is present all through the winter and spring, but not in the summer time. First part of the fall, we go out by water before the ice gets in.

Senator STEVENS. You took 551 walrus. How many would be male and how many female?

Mr. GOLOGERGEN. The maturity of those we take mostly is the bulls. And I think it is less than 100 females we took. There are not much female walrus present.

Senator STEVENS. About 4-to-1 bulls for females?

Mr. GOLOGERGEN. Probably. Somewhere along there.

Senator STEVENS. What is the price of fuel oil in Savoonga?

Mr. GOLOGERGEN. Oh, pretty close to $4.98 for 5 gallons or 6 gallons.

Senator STEVENS. A price of $4.98?

Mr. GOLOGERGEN. Well, a drum costs about $48.00 a barrel.

Senator STEVENS. A 50-gallon drum, or a 55-gallon drum?

Mr. GOLOGERGEN. This is a 55-gallon drum.

Senator STEVENS. What about the price of gasoline?

Mr. GOLOGERGEN. Gasoline is 85 cents per gallon.

Senator STEVENS. A gallon is 85 cents?

Mr. GOLOGERGEN. Yes.

Senator STEVENS. Thank very much, Abner.

Senator GRAVEL. When you say you sell portions of these mammals, such as the skin, can you give us any idea what your people get for them? What your people from Savoonga would get for, say, a seal hide, a walrus skin, or the walrus tusk? What are the values there, do you know?

Mr. GOLOGERGEN. Yes. The tusk, when it is sold to the store, about $5 per pound for raw ivory.

Senator GRAVEL. About $5 per pound for raw ivory, and how about the skin?

Mr. GOLOGERGEN. The skin always depends on the size and quality of the skin. Mostly, the spotted seal skins are much more valuable than any other skin.

Senator GRAVEL. A spotted seal? What would you get for a spotted seal skin?

Mr. GOLOGERGEN. If it is a medium size, we get about $15 a skin.

Senator GRAVEL. Do you sell seal meat? We had some testimony from other witnesses saying that they actually sold to the meat market here. Do you ship any of your meat anywhere else off of your island?

Mr. GOLOGERGEN. In the springtime, we have a request from Nome stating they want so much pounds of meat, walrus and seal meat, from the village. So we store this and ship them over at least about 2,000 . . .

Senator GRAVEL. How much of the mammals you sold were sold over here? Do you know? What percentage of meat do you ship over here?

Mr. GOLOGERGEN. I think about 5 percent of it actually goes over to Nome.

Senator GRAVEL. A very small percentage?

Mr. GOLOGERGEN. About 5 percent or 10 percent. Not only do we use a lot but since we got this new freezer over on the island, we have been storing some meat in there for use all through the summer.

Senator STEVENS. Tell us about that freezer because that is one of the charges that one of our opponents has made, that there is no way to keep this meat. How big is your freezer?

Mr. GOLOGERGEN. Actually, I don't have knowledge of actual size, but it holds about 2,000 pounds of meat, I think.

Senator STEVENS. How long, would you say, would it keep?

Mr. GOLOGERGEN. Last year, they took about 17,000 pounds to feed their people.

Senator STEVENS. Your young man, Allan Aloha, has been doing very good work in Washington. He has been back there for quite some time now and has been very well received, you might say. We would be appreciative if you would tell the Savoonga people that we appreciate the fact that he has spent his time back there, and he has a statement in the record already, and I am sure that Senator Gravel has some more. Let me ask you again about the problem of the number of walrus because I think it is a significant number of walrus you are taking there.

Senator GRAVEL. Let me pursue that fact. You stated that there are about 100 females out of the 500 you catch, which means you are taking primarily bulls. Do you go after the bulls because of the tusks, or do you go after them to get the meat, primarily?

Mr. GOLOGERGEN. The main thing is the food we are always trying to accomplish from the animal, and the next thing we try to take is the skin of the female to be used to color the skin boats, the ivory. After the season is over, every boat captain calls his men and divides the animal, I mean the tusks, with the people and get ivory carvings.

Senator STEVENS. Do most of the males congregate around Savoonga on the south side, and the females congregate elsewhere on the island?

Mr. GOLOGERGEN. Most of the bulls are all present around the island. Usually, the females are further out from the village sometimes. And they are hard to catch sometimes.

Senator STEVENS. So it is easier to get the bulls? And so there is no distinction between the desire for ivory tusks. There is more a question of accessibility. Your ability to hunt what is available.

Mr. GOLOGERGEN. I didn't quite get you on that. What did you say again, please?

Senator STEVENS. Your hunting is based upon you ability to hunt what is close by. I was trying to establish the reason why you take four times as many males as you do females. Larry Gage tells me this is because the area that you hunt is mostly made up of bulls and that the females are in other areas. They sort of come together in other areas. So you are not hunting precisely males; you are hunting because the males are there. Is that correct?

Mr. GOLOGERGEN. Actually, the hunting itself, whenever the season comes it doesn't matter what they are as long as we get that walrus. The first chance we get and the weather conditions are the only things so that we go out there are try to catch what we can, what we see during the hunt.

Senator STEVENS. One more question. I am told that the record leaves a question about my comment on the article, specifically the part in it where the allegation was made that there is no effort made to pursue the dying animals. Do your people follow up on animals that have been shot? What do you do about those that are shot and slip off the ice?

Mr. GOLOGERGEN. We try to kill that animal that we shoot at, and after we are close too it harpoon it and retrieve it. I haven't seen anyone who goes out there without actually killing the animals.

Senator STEVENS. Is the implication in this article right, that you come up on a herd that is made up of a fantastic group of walrus, and you just shoot indiscriminantly? Please tell us what you do. My Senator friends back there are going to say, "You didn't ask those people just how they do it." Now what do you do when you go out after these walrus? Where do you find them, and how do you shoot them? Can you tell us?

Mr. GOLOGERGEN. First of all, you look for good weather conditions to go out for the hunt.

Senator STEVENS. What would be the best weather conditions?

Mr. GOLOGERGEN. A mild weather that we could travel by skin boat, because it is not very much, about 30-foot length.

Senator STEVENS. Mild seas, is that what you are talking about?

Mr. GOLOGERGEN. Yes.

Senator STEVENS. What kind of weather in terms of the atmosphere would be best? A clear day like today, or overcast day?

Mr. GOLOGERGEN. Actually, whenever the wind velocity is down to about less than 20 miles, about 15 miles, because if the wind is too strong, we don't go out hunting.

Senator STEVENS. Is that because of its effect on your boat and the wind disturbing the water?

Mr. GOLOGERGEN. Since we have a skin boat, which is sturdy and dependable, there is about five or six men in a crew, and the boat can hold about three or four walrus loaded up.

Senator STEVENS. How much do those walrus weigh?

Mr. GOLOGERGEN. I don't have any, well, the last time, the female one weighed about 2,500 pounds, I think, the female one.

Senator STEVENS. And you have a boat that is made of walrus skin, and it has three or four men in the crew and you are capable of bringing back three of those animals in that boat?

Mr. GOLOGERGEN. Yes.

Senator STEVENS. What kind of a motor do you use?

Mr. GOLOGERGEN. It all depends whatever the men can obtain. About 40, 33; some people have about 18.

Senator STEVENS. Eighteen to 40 horsepower?

Mr. GOLOGERGEN. Yes.

Senator STEVENS. And how far do you have to go in one of those boats before you come to a walrus herd?

Mr. GOLOGERGEN. The farthest out sometimes is about 30 miles out of the village, about 3 hours or 3 to 4 hours' ride sometimes.

Senator STEVENS. Tell me, how do you spot these walruses?

Mr. GOLOGERGEN. They are out on the ice and in the water sometimes.

Senator STEVENS. Do you shoot them when they are in the water?

Mr. GOLOGERGEN. We shoot them in the water.

Senator STEVENS. Do they float when you shoot them?

Mr. GOLOGERGEN. We do not shoot them when they are far. We shoot them when we get close to them. We can, if we hit them, have time enough to harpoon the animal and retrieve it.

Senator STEVENS. How many would you normally find in a herd when you come on them?

Mr. GOLOGERGEN. Actually, you have a large pod.

Senator STEVENS. What is the number for a large group? 15 to 20, or four to five, or is it thousands? I think you should take us all on a hunt.

Mr. GOLOGERGEN. Walrus is about 25.

Senator STEVENS. About 25? And how many would you expect to take out of that herd if you had a boat like you told us about?

Mr. GOLOGERGEN. Actually, you would try to get one out of that. If they are on the water, you would try to get one, and we only get one harpoon sometimes and the only way we can get it with all the meat——

Senator STEVENS. So this charge that you would go indiscriminantly through these and just shooting everything you could, is that true or false?

Mr. GOLOGERGEN. I cannot understand that, since I don't see anyone doing that, and ——

nantly through these and just shoot everything you could, is that

Senator STEVENS. According to your own hunting habits, would you shoot an animal you couldn't recover?

Mr. GOLOGERGEN. I don't think so.

Senator STEVENS. Have you people read some of these articles that we have to face? Well, I hope you don't think that I am being difficult; I am trying to get a record so that we can point to it and say,

"Now this is what our people say." This is in answer to these charges. I hope that you can help us do that. Have you got other people here from Savoonga we are going to hear from today?

Mr. GOLOGERGEN. There are some people who will be testifying later on sometime today.

Senator STEVENS. I would appreciate it if you would tell them the questions that you know that are on my mind. What do we do to answer articles like this? I think the way you have answered some of our questions can be very helpful. Do you have any further questions?

Senator GRAVEL. No. I think the record should be clear that articles like this are obviously irresponsible. Very clearly, people who hunt for subsistence purposes don't kill indiscriminately and don't kill just to let them go out there and die and rot. Because there is no purpose. You can't feed yourself if you kill an animal and don't retrieve it. It's just a logic of it all that destroys this type of writing.

Senator STEVENS. That's true, Mike, but the logic of that article was one of the things that passed the bill through the House without the amendment we are seeking right now. That is why we have to get this record so people can read it. Sometimes the Congress does not always act in the best interests of everyone. I have one more question. The staff wants me to ask again this Russian question. Have you seen any walrus that have been decapitated and left on the ice? Does that happen around your area?

Mr. GOLOGERGEN. Actually——

Senator STEVENS. . . . I'm sorry; we can only go on the record and will get to you in time, Sir; I am asking my friend Abner here right now.

Mr. GOLOGERGEN. Actually, to my knowledge, I have not seen any of that sort of that on the ice being taken by the Russians, but——

Senator STEVENS. Thank you very much. We appreciate it. It is 11:30, and if you will permit us to do so, we will shift the time and be back here at 1:00 instead of 1:30. We appreciae your help. If anyone has the desire to testify, talk to our staff. We urge you to do so.

This commences the afternoon session. [Recess.]

Let's see if we can proceed now. We have Shaktoolik next and then we will hear Shishmaref and Stebbins Village, Teller, Unalakleet, Wainwright, White Mountain, and then we will hear from Congressman Nick Begich's representative here, John Poling, from the representative of the American Legion, and we will be hearing from the representatives from the Governor's office, a representative from the Department of Fish and Game, and then we will go back to those we have missed and also proceed to hear some of the representatives of the individual groups. We want to hear from people who will address themselves to the Interstate Commerce issue, also. So if we could proceed now with Shaktoolik. Is Shaktoolik here? Clarence, would you make sure you have signed in. You have already signed. Thank you.

STATEMENT OF CLARENCE A. KATCHATAG, SR.

Mr. KATCHATAG. Hon. Ted Stevens, Mike Gravel, Ladies & Gentlemen, dear fellow Alaskans, it is a pleasure for me to be here to tes-

tify on behalf of the people of State of Alaska as a whole, concerning the all out right ban on all ocean mammal bill for many years or rather centuries our ancestors, forefathers, and we the younger generations have depended on ocean mammals. The people in the outlying villages have hunted ocean mammals for their existence. When the seals & oogruks are caught we the people dry the skins & dry the meat and when the meat is dried we store them in seal pokes or barrel of seal oil to preserve them since we don't have freezers to store them in. Also, the balugas the blubber is cooked and stored in pokes or barrel in oil and stored away for food. The tendons of the whale is dried to be used as threads for women folks when they sew and many Alaskan Natives, particularly we the Eskimos all along the coast have depended upon ocean mammals for our existence. Furthermore the people who are living on the islands such as St. Lawrence Island, Diomede Island, Nunivak Island just to name a few. These people have lived and depended upon ocean mammals for survival for centuries, as there are no moose, reindeer, et cetera, in their present places for food besides the expensive canned foods they bought from stores with what little cash they made from their sale of carvings and sewing. This includes the people from all the regions and outlying villages in the whole entire State of Alaska.

Therefore the way of life of the Alaska Natives is threatened by the proposed legislation. If Congress enacts provisions outlawing all but subsistence hunting by Alaskan Natives not only will we the proud group of citizens of America will have our economic livelihood stripped from us, and will face the certain fate of cultural extinction. We the Alaskan Native people have above all mankind have been able to survive in the so-called land of ice box as I recall this called by lower forty eights. We the Eskimos have survived the harshest possible climate conditions with the clothing our ancestors have made out of skins. We use as parkas, mukluks, pants, and mittens. These clothing we wear out of doors for centuries have been fashioned from ocean mammals, and are both cold resistent and waterproof. These clothing protect us from the elements, yet permit us freedom of movement. These are the clothing that are light, and are far more superior to anything that the white man has invented. Therefore it is a fact known for centuries that the market for these genuine Eskimo clothing such as parkas, mukluks, mittens and pants are depended upon by the white people especially in the far northern part of the State where the ground is frozen most of the year. Furthermore the Eskimos have invented umiaks and kayaks to travel with from ocean mammal skins. These are light built and they do not wear out nor dent like the boat lumbers nor do they dent like aluminum boats do and for example there are only a few that have steady jobs such as postmasters, store managers, health aides, day school, janitors, and teachers' aides. It is a well-known fact some of these jobs has presently come to reality, and there are a lot more people that are idle. If the Natives of our State are denied the right to carve, sew, and utilize fully the entire animal carcass the results will be disasterous even marginal cash flow will strip us from our priceless cultural heritage will become extinct. For centuries the Alaskan Natives have sewed and carved to support their families with what little cash they made from their carved and

sewed items and in conclusion I'd like to say that we the Alaskan Natives haven't received a red penny from the native land claim since it was recently passed and hoped that the President will veto the bill.

Thank you very much for the opportunity to speak before you.

Senator STEVENS. Thank you very much. You are about the third or fourth person who has mentioned the land claims bill. Just before I left Washington we were working on the incorporation of the first $12½ million, which has been approved. The discussion underway now is whether it is going to be advanced to the regional associations or whether we must wait until the organization of the regional corporations before the money is paid into their hands. This is the first year's payment. This year calls for $12½ million and next fiscal year, $50 million. But I agree with you the money hasn't been paid out yet but we are not behind time yet either. This first $12½ million is to be paid by this fiscal year, by July 1. You make a good point, though. During the debate in the House of Representatives a statement was made by one of the Members of Congress. He said, "I do not believe in view of what the Alaskans have given up and what they have gotten—a billion dollars," and he said, "140 million acres of land—that we need to shower further largest on the Natives." Let them take advantage of the refuges they have there, let them take advantage of the oil, let them take advantage of the $1 billion, and let them take advantage of the 40 million acres of land. And he opposed the amendment that was presented in the House. Could I ask you this? Do you have any statistics on the number of mammals that have been taken?

Mr. KATCHATAG. Well, the seals and oogruks that are caught down in my area there in Shaktoolik is very slight. It all depends on how successful the hunters are. But I could estimate the catch of these seals and oogruks. The people that have caught these seals and oogruks are estimated at about 150 a year.

Senator STEVENS. What is the population of Shaktoolik?

Mr. KATCHATAG. The population of Shaktoolik is 149.

Senator STEVENS. It seems we've been getting a parallel that everybody gets one seal per person, comparing it to the other areas. One seal per person per year seems to be about the figure——

Mr. KATCHATAG. Well, this is just an estimate, you know. But that's about the minimum, you know.

Senator STEVENS. What is the fuel oil cost in Shaktoolik?

Mr. KATCHATAG. The fuel oil cost. The ones that came by the North Star was 72 cents a gallon. And now that they have run out of gas and they traded it to the Mule Creek & NC Co. It is costing them over, probably over a dollar and a half a gallon now.

Senator STEVENS. For gasoline?

Mr. KATCHATAG. Right.

Senator STEVENS. And the fuel oil is 70 cents.

Mr. KATCHATAG. Yes, the fuel oil is $25 something a barrel. These people are paying a fantastic price on these things. I mean, it varies from the other villages.

Senator GRAVEL. For the record, Senator Stevens made mention of Congressman Dingell's statement about living off their oil. So these mammals are a resource too. They have been in use for many, many

years. So we have just as much right to live off of that as we have to live off our new resources.

Senator STEVENS. We certainly appreciate your help and your contribution in coming here today. Thank you very much. I am told that Miss Willoya from Brevig Mission is here now. Would she like to testify at this time? How are you? We are happy to have you here today.

STATEMENT OF EMMA WILLOYA

Miss WILLOYA. I'm very glad to be here.

Senator STEVENS. Can you tell us something about the use of mammals?

Miss WILLOYA. I would very much like to tell about the use of the mammals and also what they contain. The natives groups—our groups—need this mammal food very much because in the line of walrus, why they use the tusks even for their harpoon. The skin, years ago used it for homes, even. That's why there wouldn't have been any Eskimos around here probably when the lumber and logs were short. Now they use it for hides on their skin boats to do their hunting. The meat, they put away and dry. The flippers, they cook and preserve that. The blubber, they put it in pokes or barrels or whatever container they can have. And stomachs, they use as container. Intestines, they use even for making raincoats for themselves years ago. And they also use it as food. The liver, they preserve that so that they can use it later on. Also, the kidney. They can use every bit of it except the lungs. And it is the same way with the oogruk and the seal. Now the seal is a very important part of this survival food, because they use so much of the blubber to preserve their greens. Some of the greens would just wither away if they didn't have the seal oil and lot of the meat wouldn't be put away for later use if they didn't have the seal oil. So the seal oil is a very important part of survival. Also, the skins of the seal—different kinds of seal—there were the fall skin kind are the best kind of skin. The spring skin can also be used in different ways. It can be preserved so that later on it can be used as bleached leather or it can be worked on so that it can be dyed and be used for a bow around the mukluks and make it very attractive. So they have many ways of using the seal skin as well as the larger animal. The seal oil is very important because lots of these herbs that grow wouldn't stand just by putting them away like white man's food. It has to be preserved. And then it is good for the livelihood for whoever puts it away. Now the skins which we use for making into mukluks and slippers and jackets, our purses. They are very important too, because ladies use that for sewing and helping their husbands to make little more money. They can now depend on it as the social security. Just as well as the men carving their ivory. If that's taken away, there will be no social security. I have to depend on social security because I work while I was able to see. Now you've probably noticed that I can't see. In that way I would like to help my native group. It is very important that they have these mammal food, very important that they can be able to get all the skins they need and make money on it. It helps build up their homes and carry it on to their small children. We're grateful that the children can go to school because many of us hardly had

any schooling. I guess I'm one of the least who's had the least schooling. So we'd like to see that the children get good schooling, but we also like to see that they can survive even though they quit school and be able to work on something that they can help to live on if they can't get no work. If they carry on in their fur sewing and ivory carving, they can make a little money and live on it as they did in former years. But if everything is taken away from them they won't be able to learn that. I'm very glad I could come up here and talk because quite a few years back I was also asked to answer questions from the Library of Congress. And I'm glad to let out what little I can for my people. Thank you.

Senator STEVENS. You do a wonderful job. Tell me about the greens. You tell us that you preserve greens in oil?

Miss WILLOYA. Yes; we preserve certain greens in oil. The very first greens we pick as soon as the snow is off is the little willow green. It's no bigger than oh, probably not an inch, maybe an inch long and half an inch wide when they first grow. Now they are very small and it takes many, many hours to fill a barrelful. Then they store that away in oil.

Senator STEVENS. How long do they keep in oil?

Miss WILLOYA. They can keep it all winter. And same way with other greens. I don't know the English names of them but there is quite a number of greens that the natives pick so that they can use that to take the place of all the vegetables the white people use. And it's very healthful for them. That's why it is so important for them to have the seal oil. If that was taken away from them, if that even——

Senator STEVENS. A very interesting contribution. I've never heard that before. What do you think these people could do if they were not able to hunt mammals? What do they do with their time, I'm talking about.

Miss WILLOYA. Now that they have their school they have to look for work. There are a lot of children that go to school. Every one of them won't be experienced in stenography or all kinds of work that they do in advertising, but then those who do not get a hold of that might be able to take the—be interested in the sewing and fixing the old kind way of survival, and held the ones who are experienced in that way. Now these Eskimos they survive through it. What am I to do if all this is taken away from us?

Senator GRAVEL. How much money do you receive in social security?

Miss WILLOYA. I receive $142.50.

Senator GRAVEL. How much does fuel oil cost in Brevig Mission?

Miss WILLOYA. I don't live there right now, but I was raised there. I speak for my people because they are dependent on this mammal food. They go out and get it seasonally. When it comes by, well, they will go for it and do as much hunting as they can according to the weather that permits them to do so. Now, the walrus that comes up here during the spring time, it doesn't stay around here in the winter time. The seal is what they can get during the winter time whenever they had the luck to get it. So is the oogruk. But it is the oil which is very important for them to put away. For those who are inland they can share it to them. That's why the Eskimos

—that's been their custom for years—sharing and helping each other. That's how they survive. They didn't just look after them and left them alone. They helped each other.

Senator STEVENS. You've made a very wonderful presentation. We want to thank you for taking the time to come and be with us. You represent your people very well.

Miss WILLOYA. Thank you.

Senator STEVENS. Is Mr. Barr from Shishmaref here? Just sign your name there so we'll be sure we have spelled your name correctly.

STATEMENT OF BILL BARR

Mr. BARR. Senator Stevens, Senator Gravel, fellow village representatives, ladies and gentlemen, on behalf of the people of Shishmaref, I'd like to thank you people for taking the time for coming over here and holding this mammal bill hearing here. The village of Shishmaref is located on the north side of Seward Peninsula on an island. We have a population of 290 people. Our only survival that we have down there, or way of life, is by hunting sea mammals—seals in the fall and winter time—that is, we have open water. The only time we hunt oogruks is during the springtime, the month of June, shortly after the ice breakup and before the ice leaves the Arctic Ocean. But some years there is times when the hunting is poor, when we have lots of south wind, when the ice breaks up. And during these times and lots of times we have pretty lean winters where we are short of native food. As the year progresses, we hunt various kinds of animals for our own use.

Shishmaref is noted for preserving dried oogruk meat and seal oil, where they don't preserve it in the other places. Therefore, it is in big demand over Alaska. In this way the people help themselves. When they have extra, then they sell it wherever they can get orders from. The price of gasoline is $48.50 a barrel and the price of stove oil is $25—$25 to $26 a barrel. This bearded seal, as we call oogruk, is dried—the meat is dried and preserved in its oil. Now what we preserve it in—we make pokes—seal pokes out of the seals that we caught. So therefore, the sealskin is used for pokes for storing the meat. We also use the oogruk skin for mukluk soles. They can make that in three different colors right now. One is black the way it is—just scrape the hair off and you clip it—and the other way is bleach it white and that makes white bottom. And they 10 years ago or 12 years ago they discovered that they can dye this oogruk skin red, so right now we have red bottom. The yellow oogruk is used mostly for ropes and this rope is used for everyday use when we go out hunting and things like this. Now the seal skin——

Senator STEVENS. Let me interrupt you Mr. Barr. I know there are a lot of young people standing back there. There are seats that are available in some of the rows. It would be helpful to everyone else if you will indicate where there are seats and we might be able to get more people in here. I hope you don't mind the interruption Mr. Barr. It seems there are some up here that are just occupied by coats including one of mine, so we'll throw it out on the floor. Pardon me, Mr. Barr. Please proceed.

Mr. BARR. The sealskin, the common seal, is also—we use the hide for pokes for storing this native food. And, it is also used for skin sewing for making slippers, mukluks, and it is also worked in various ways to make different kinds of things like the white bleached skins, too. They make white bleached skins out of the seal hide and they also make dyed red skins used for mukluk trims and mukluk strings. This is also in demand for the people that live in the interior, like Kobuk. We always get orders from that area there where bleached and dyed sealskin, and we trade them off for things that we don't have, of course, like beaver and things like this here. Hardly any of it is ever sold for cash to the people: we mostly trade with those people. And this has been the custom ever since we can remember back.

Now the spotted seals we also hunt down there but the only time we hunt spotted seals in our villages is during the falltime when they are migrating south when they are migrating back from up north. They go to there, but we don't get the big ones, we get the small ones. Very seldom the big ones come through there but the only ones we ever get are the small spotted ones. Now, these are in big demand for jackets, mukluks, and slippers. Some fall we get quite a few of them and when there is a lot of wind during the falltime we don't have too much luck at all. So some years it's good and some years it's bad. It's the same way with these oogruks: when we get a lot of south wind, we don't have too much luck, like I mentioned earlier.

We very seldom get walrus at our village. Last spring was a good season for walrus back home because after the ice had broken up there was lot of north wind. Instead of this ice going straight out to Bering Strait here, it followed the coast on that area, so we had a pretty good season last year of walrus. The walrus—we preserve that in various ways. The, ah—we cook it and preserve it in oil for winter use. We also store it underground and preserve it in that manner. The tusks we use for carving ivory—carving anything—bracelets and whatnot.

We started to co-op—arts and crafts co-op—2 years ago with a loan from the Small Business Administration in the amount of $24,000 that alone. Right now we still owe about $19,000 on this loan. Now when this bill passes the Senate there we will have to go to somebody to help us pay this loan back to SBA because we won't be able to sell the ivory work to our co-op and pay our loan back eventually. We sell only to—mostly to Anchorage. Most of our arts and crafts products that we produce there are sold mostly to Anchorage—some to Fairbanks but not ery much. Most of it is sold to Anchorage.

Senator STEVENS. When you talk about dollar volume, do you know, Mr. Barr, how much you get for the arts and crafts items that you sell in Anchorage and Fairbanks?

Mr. BARR. We sell the bracelet or the co-op sells it—it sells the bracelet to these outlets in Anchorage for about $24—that's an etched bracelet with drawings on it.

Senator STEVENS. How much of that do you get back?

Mr. BARR. The co-op keeps 15 percent of that and the rest goes back to the producer.

Senator STEVENS. The rest of it comes back to the village? Have you any idea of the total amount in money for 1 year for your village?

Mr. BARR. Last year we did something like $20,000 worth of ivory carvings sold—that is mukluks and ivory carvings.

Senator STEVENS. How many people are involved in that in your village?

Mr. BARR. The whole village is a member of the co-op here.

Senator STEVENS. How many people is that?

Mr. BARR. There's about 77, I think so, or around that neighborhood.

Senator STEVENS. That was your supplemental cash income for the village?

Mr. BARR. Yes.

Senator STEVENS. 20,000?

Mr. BARR. But it varies every year you know, and this is not what we get all the time you know. It varies. Now the stores also trade or buy the bracelets and skin sewing products where they trade them off for food or whatever the family needs. And I got some written testimony here from the people of Shishmaref. There's a couple here that I would like to read.

Senator STEVENS. I'm sorry to tell you that my timekeeper over here tells me that yor time is up. Would you like to file those with us and we will print the statements that you have from these people who you've brought in from your village.

Mr. BARR. Yes, I have—

Senator STEVENS. We will take statements that are short statements for printing in the record when they are prepared by people from the village who could not get here.

Mr. BARR.. Yes, I got about 16 over here that are written testimony on how we use sea mammals back home

Senator STEVENS. Very well if you will leave that with us—staff may end up by taking portions of them if they're too voluminous—we do have limitation on the printing on it but we will do our very best. Senator Gravel, do you have any comments?

Senator GRAVEL. We appreciate your coming and appreciate your cooperation with our very efficient and fair timekeeper over here, Frank Degnan. He has raised his hand—that's the same as ringing a bell. Thank you very much.

Senator STEVENS. Is Stebbins Village here? Do you want to leave the papers with the Clerk? Stebbins Village? Teller?

STATEMENT OF THOMAS MENADELOOK

Mr. MENADELOOK. I'm tongue-tied.

Senator STEVENS. Be sure to write your name down there, please, so we can be sure that we have your name the way you want it spelled, and if you'll state your name for the record, we will be happy to hear your statement.

Mr. MENADELOOK. Thank you, Senator Stevens and Senator Gravel. I'm Tom Menadelook; I'm an Eskimo just like the rest of the people over here. My statement here looks like I'll have to read it. OK?

Senator STEVENS. That's fine.

Mr. MENADELOOK. My name is Thomas Menadelook from Teller, Alaska and I would like to make this statement on behalf of the people of Teller, Alaska and the surrounding people who depend on sea mammal for their survival.

Our people have depended on sea mammals for hundreds of years, sea mammals such as walrus, seal and whale. We have been trading, selling and buying from other villages or from one another for food and clothing. Our people have traveled many miles inland or to some remote village by dog team or skin boat to sell, trade or buy items needed at home. Material such as seal skins our woman folks have made into parkas, mukluks, mittens and many other items, walrus skins we have been using for skin boats, the jaw bones for harpoons, baleen we have used for sled runners and for fishing lines, ivory we have used for tools. The meat, blubber and skins we have used for food. Now at this time and age we still utilize all three mammals, the same way our ancestors used them. Now we must have the material to make marketable items to sell to merchants, fellow alaskans whether its Eskimo, Indian, Aleut, white and to tourist, to buy white mans food. This food has been introduced to us very recently and now we must purchase this food since we cannot go without it now. To purchase these items we must obtain cash, to obtain cash we must have materials, this material we must get from sea mammals. Skins from seal which we catch at Teller, baleen from Pt. Hope or Pt. Barrow, Raw ivory from Diomede Island or St. Lawrence Island. As you can see, we depend on the sea mammal a great deal and with the Senate Bill on "Moratorium on sea mammal" this would make our people helpless to help themselves.

I am an ivory carver, like many other people whose main income from arts and crafts is their only income. We are proud with this income we could support our families and not depend on welfare. We have tried to apply for employment and found out we are too old an don't have enough education. We must turn back to our arts and crafts trade, and I am proud to say, we don't have to depend on welfare since we could meet our daily needs with this small income we get. If the U.S. Senate could drop this "Moratorium on sea mammals" in Alaska you would still have a proud Eskimo U.S. citizen.

Our people at Teller, Alaska catch an estimate of 250 to 350 seals a year, from this sea mammal our woman folks make slippers, mukluks, jackets, mittens, hats and many other marketable items. Ivory carving is done there also. Material not available at Teller we must purchase from some other villages. From these items made in Teller we have an annual income of an estimate of $50,000 to $60,000. This will fluctuate depending on the harvest of sea mammal of the other villages.

There are many arts and crafts cooperatives started here in Alaska with the help from different Federal agencys and without the material this will put majority or these coops in bankruptcy, with this cash we get from the cooperatives we are able to purchase the necessary daily items.

I have seen foreign vessels hunt seal in the Bering Straight and have been to what they have left behind, found were the meat of the

seal, taken only was skin and blubber. This us Eskimo's never do, we take to whole seal home for our use.

All game is controlled by the Department of Fish and Game of Alaska whether its seal or walrus. I remember a few years back when there were no limit on the take of walrus this was fine but we found out that the walrus was getting fewer and then the fish and game put a limit of seven female and then a year or two, the limit was five per hunter. I have heard that the walrus herd has increased since they have started to control walrus taken in Alaskan waters. On harvest time there is a fish and game agent where they catch walrus. As to the increase or decrease of sea mammal the Alaska fish and game should give you true figure.

We hope the U.S. Senate will realize what they are doing to their fellow U.S. citizen if they pass the bill.

Senator STEVENS. That is a very good job. Our friend here is raising his hand, and I want to thank you very much for your making your statement. Would you like to leave your total statement with us so it can be printed in the record?

Mr. MENADELOOK. OK.

Senator STEVENS. If you will give it to the young lady here. Senator Gravel? We appreciate your coming and we understand your message. It is loud and clear.

Mr. MENADELOOK. Thank you.

Senator STEVENS. And now we come to our representative of Unalakleet, who can keep time for himself—Frank Degnan, an old friend for many years. We trust you to keep your own time. You didn't bring any trading beads with you, did you, Frank?

STATEMENT OF FRANK DEGNAN

Mr. DEGNAN. Trading beads and blubber. Well, I want to thank you very kindly for coming. You know, I know these two gentlemen here; we've elected them, and they are in Congress. They are very faithful in doing their job. I have been there, and I have seem them in action. We're pretty lucky to have them here today. You know, when you go to Congress, you go there singly. You come back like a man and nobody believes you. But when they come here and they have a band of witnesses here, who will listen to you and what you are saying, you have a witness. And we are lucky——

Senator STEVENS. Thanks a lot, Frank.

Mr. DEGNAN. And we're lucky we have you here, because if it was a land animal, you are 10,000 years too late. We destroyed the mastadon and they had tusks that weighted about 600 pounds each. Now I am going to come to my paper here. I'm not used to reading off a paper. Unalakleet Villege of, make it Village of Unalakleet, Unalakleet Village Council, Unalakleet, Alaska, May 9, 1972.

We, the Eskimo people of Unalakleet, Alaska from the Norton Sound district deem it an honor to appear before you to deliver a message to the President of the United States and Congress. Our people have lived for centuries before the white man came with freedom of land, sea and air, which we claim to be ours from time immemorial.

We have survived to this day with abundance of sea mammals which we preserved for food, clothing, kayaks and skin boats. We have also birds for our diet in abundance. Mukluk soles are used from the skin of an oogruk, as well as rawhide for ropes on sleds, kayaks and skin boats. Entire seal oil and blubber is eaten from a seal, beluga, walrus and the whale. Skins of seals are made into parkas, boots, and jackets.

Walrus tusks are carved by our craftsmen for use as needles, harpoon heads, bow and arrows, and sled sunners. This modern day, we carve ivory for subsistence and our Eskimo people are the best ivory carvers in the world.

The meat, blubber, and oil derived from the sea mammal have been our main diet for survival and it continues. All of this we can eat raw, cooked, dried, preserved in seal oil in inflated seal skin poke with its blubber and oil of the seal, beluga, walrus, and the whale.

Our students on returning from other parts of the world, where this food is not used, ask for it upon arrival.

We are surprised that a law such as the Sea Mammal bill is introduced in the Halls of Congress, not knowing the conditions we, the Eskimos, live under. At no time have we even authorized Congress to take away our way of life and survival.

We speak in defense for our rights.

Senator STEVENS. Thank you. It was a very good job. Tell me, what kind of animals do you take in Unalakleet?

Mr. DEGNAN. We take walrus, oogruk, whale, seal, ribbon seal, and we don't have bull whale. It used to be at one time, but that is past history.

Senator STEVENS. What kind of whales do you have? Belugas?

Mr. DEGNAN. Belugas.

Senator STEVENS. How many do you take a year?

Mr. DEGNAN. Oh, we take as many as we can. We don't kill too many.

Senator STEVENS. How many is that?

Mr. DEGNAN. Oh, I don't know. We are lucky to get around 25 or 30. We have a population of between 500 and 600. When we are out hunting, we are out to get the game. And we get as many as we can because we can use every part of it.

Senator STEVENS. How do you store your beluga meat?

Mr. DEGNAN. Well, we store our beluga meat. We have these seal pokes that we cook it and render, put it in seal pokes or we use it in barrels or containers with oil with it. We also preserve our seal meat and oggruk meat the same way, and our greens as well.

Senator STEVENS. Do you ship any of the meat out?

Mr. DEGNAN. Well, we have orders, many orders, that we are unable to fill. We are not in the market for this. If we were in the market and had an abundance, we have a cold storage back there that could take care of it, but we have never come to a conclusion where we could get enough of it where we could go into the market. But we would like to go into the market because we have orders from Seattle, and probably back in Florida, Detroit.

Senator STEVEN :. From Eskimos who have moved out?

Mr. DEGNAN. From Eskimos that have lived up here and got educated, and they had to go where they could get better living condi-

tions with an income. You see, our people live in a community, like they have for centuries. But today, you have a money change. Capital is what is more important. The person with an education and qualifications will get a pretty good job. You are unable to get it in our community, so they have to move elsewhere. So, it is every day that we live in our community, our village is educated and with qualification have to go where they can get——

Senator STEVENS. Frank, were you saying that you shipped seal oil like to relatives down in Seattle or back in Washington?

Mr. DEGNAN. Yes, we do.

Senator STEVENS. You send them seal oil?

Mr. DEGNAN. Yes, we do; they like it. They like their muktuk, they like their seal oil, and some of them quiver when they are a little stinky, but they are still good.

Senator STEVENS. When Adeline Katongan was on my staff, someone in Unalakleet was sending her items from time to time, I know.

Mr. DEGNAN. Yes——

Senator STEVENS. How much of that really moves out? How much do you send out, and how do you prepare it to send out?

Mr. DEGNAN. Well, we can it like we do, creamed cans, or well-preserved, we can kind of modernize it a little bit.

Senator STEVEN:. Is it pickled?

Mr. DEGNAN. Oh, yes. We do that, too. Now, if you put pickle in, you have to put it in jars. You can't put it in cans. You can pickle muktuk just as you can pickle grout (phonetic). You know what grout is? It is a walrus hide. It is good, too.

Senator STEVENS. How do you spell it?

Mr. DEGNAN. We don't spell it; we eat it.

Senator STEVEN:. He did that the very first time I ever met him. He did that when he told me he thought the money in the Land Claims bill wasn't enough. I offered it to him in trading beads, and he said he'd take it. He told me there was no inflation in trading beads. I'll never beat you, Frank. Well, you have done a very good job and we thank you very much and appreciate also your willingness to be our timekeeper. We elected the toughest man in the room to do that, so. . .

Mr. DEGNAN. Thank you very much.

Senator STEVENS. I keep getting notes from people who indicate that they would like to add to the testimony. We are going to fix a rather arbitrary rule that we will hear one person from each village until we have heard from all, and then we will hear from the representative of Congressman Begich and from the Governor's office, the associations, and then we will start through the individual people who want to add to the comments that were made by representatives of their village. That was arbitrary, but it is the only way we know to be fair. Is the representative from Wainwright here? Good afternnon. We are happy to have you with us. Will you sit down and sign up——

STATEMENT OF WALDO BODFISH

Mr. BODFISH. You have heard about me. I am from Wainwright. I have my testimony here.

Senator STEVENS. Would you sit down, sir, so that we can pick you up in the microphone, please. And you can sign that pad right after my friend from Unalakleet. Can you proceed, sir? You are the representative from Wainwright, right? We're happy to have you here.

Mr. BODFISH. I got another representative whose name is Weir Negovanna here. I have written my testimony in a kind of a letter. I didn't think I was coming.

Dear Hon. Senators: I am happy to bring testimony before you distinguished gentlemen concerning the importance of sea mammals in my life and that of my people. I am a 69-year-old Eskimo man who was born at Teller Mission, Alaska. I have lived along the Arctic coast all my life, and have lived in Wainwright, the village I represent, for the past 54 years. As is true of almost all of 330 people of Wainwright, I, throughout my life, have depended upon hunting for the main part of my subsistence.

Hunting of sea mammals is very important for the people of my village. We must hunt for food because we have little monetary income and the prices of outside meats are extremely high. For

	Cost per pound
Beef tongue	$1. 30
Weiners	1. 30
Hamburger	1. 39
Chicken	1. 00
Pork chops	1. 90

example, Approximately 5 percent of our meat comes from the above, but 95 percent of the meat we consume is acquired from hunting. We do hunt caribou and other land animals, however, our diet is greatly dependent upon sea mammals—whales, seals, oogruk, walrus, beluga, and polar bear. Most every part of the sea mammals we kill are used for food, for either ourselves or our dogs.

Although the main purpose of our hunting sea mammals is that of food, the skins and other byproducts which we cannot eat are used for many purposes. Sealskins have traditionally been used by many people for jackets, pants, slippers, and mukluks. They also are used for gun cases, cartridge pouches, sled bags, rope, and other purposes. Oogruk skins provide soles for our mukluks, lines, and rope, and covers for our canoes. Walrus hide is also used for rope. Ivory from walrus is important too. It is used in many implements—fish hooks, seal hook handles, tool for making fish net, drum handles, et cetera! Baleen from whale is used for lashings and sled runners. The walrus stomach lining and linings of whale organs are used for drum heads. These are a few of the personal use uses we make of the byproducts of sea mammal hunting.

But the most important use of the byproducts of our sea mammal hunting is that for arts and crafts and other commercial purposes. Much of the monetary income of my village comes from the sale of items made from these sea mammals. Sealskins are sold to be used in making various items of clothing. My wife and the other ladies of Wainwright also make and sell jackets, mukluks, slippers, mittens, purses, hats, gun cases, and other items from sealskins. The soles of

the mukluks they sell are of oogruk skin. Craftsmen of Wainwright also make and sell many items from the baleen of the whale and ivory from the walrus. Baleen is made into baskets, boats, wolf scarers, letter openers, bracelets, headbands, and ornamentations on other art objects. I am sure you are familiar with the many beautiful ivory carvings and etchings that are made from walrus teeth and tusks. The hides of the polar bear are mainly sold to outsiders.

As you can see, in order to fulfill the needs of my people any legislation concerning the controlling and restricting of the killing of sea mammals must allow us first to continue subsistence hunting of these animals for food and other personal purposes; and second to use the byproducts of the animals, which we kill for subsistence, for arts and crafts and other commercial uses. Although the Marine Mammal Preservation Act as passed in the House of Representatives does allow for subsistence hunting, it does not allow us to use these byproducts for arts and crafts and other commercial purposes. We appeal to the Senate to pass a bill which will allow both subsistence hunting and the use of the byproducts for arts and crafts and other commercial purposes of my village. If the House bill is passed as is, it would put many more people on the welfare rolls, as it would deprive them of their monetary income from these commercial uses.

We are as concerned or more concerned than many people are of the preservation of sea mammals, for this is a basis of our livelihood. Our killing of these animals is limited by nature as whales, beluga, oogruk, walrus, and polar bear are in our waters only seasonally. When they are present in our waters, we must kill enough to provide us with food throughout the year. Much of our meat is stored in underground cellers to use in other seasons.

As the father of 12 children, all but two who still live off the land and sea, I thank you for the opportunity to voice my concern in this legislation that could greatly affect or alter the way of life of my people. I appreciate having a voice in this important matter.

Senator STEVENS. Thank you very much, Mr. Bodfish. I've been asked whether these things you make from these mammals are so valuable that you feel that you have to sell them. Is that the case?

Mr. BODFISH: Yes.

Senator STEVENS: Do they produce more income by selling them than they are worth to you for yourself? Many people from Wainwright wear items of clothing that are made from mammals themselves?

Mr. BODFISH: Huh?

Senator STEVENS: Let me ask the question again. Do people in Wainwright wear items of clothing that they have made from mammals, or do they sell them?

Mr. BODFISH: Well, the fur seals and the ribbon seals and everything that they make in Wainwright in arts and crafts and everything.

Senator STEVENS: Do they sell them like that in Wainwright, or do they sell them in Nome and Anchorage or Fairbanks?

Mr. BODFISH: Yes, they ship them to Anchorage and to there and different places whenever they have got a shipment to sell.

Senator STEVENS: Thank you very much. Senator Gravel? We appreciate very much your testimony, Waldo.

Mr. BODFISH. I have here two testimonies from major of Wainwright village and also here is the testimony from Weir.

Senator STEVENS: Yes, if you will give them to Miss Rice, we will write them into the record. Thank you very much; we will take a 5-minute recess.

(The statements follow:)

MAY 11, 1972.

PRESIDENT AND CONGRESS UNITED STATES,
HON. TED STEVENS, HON. MIKE GRAVEL AND FELLOW CITIZENS OF ALASKA:

1. Leave Out (Interstate Commerce) (From this Bill)
2. Continue Arts & Crafts on a market.

Like all States throughout the world we find people.

1. Some well to do.
2. Poor and
3. Very Poor

Because of long winter months here in Alaska, our seasonal jobs are limited. Due to weather conditions, most natives have insufficient gear to hunt with. This also narrows down the native hunting to normal conditions. Our schools today find it very useful to teach our students with limited understanding by birth, are trained to carve ivory and skin sewing this handicap person will have no other means to earn living.

All people changes. We urge with all our voices to leave out interstate commerce from the Bill—Our children has prove to us in our schools that Native product has a place for survival to our children who are slow in understanding by birth. Land claim settlement has passed 18 December 1971 with approximately 1 billion dollars in letters, I have not seen a single person up until today with a single red penny from the settlement. We are placing our priorities. Please continue Eskimo Arts & Crafts on a market even with reasonable limitations. We have skin sewers, hide dealers. Weather usually doesn't permit hunters. There is no danger of wasting. We only hunt when we really need the meat, oil, skin, liver, heart, and intestine of the animal.

From the standpoint of fishing industries this industry has been one of highest and dependable industry in Alaska. Fish is one of the main diet for ocean mammal. If the ocean mammal population increase where fish population is practically killed, we all know many Alaskans will be find billions of dollars worth of gear is going to waste. Cannery workers will find themselves without income. In last century we balanced the population for both species, fish and ocean mammals. We are not asking to kill entire Bill we are asking to make some changes.

Sincerely,

FREDERICK KATCHATOQ, SR.,
Mayor, Unalakleet, Alaska.

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES, SUBCOMMITTEE ON OCEANS AND ATMOSPHERE

AFFIDAVIT

State of Alaska,
Second District, ss.

Emerson Paul Moto, being first duly sworn deposes and says:

1. That I am a resident of Deering, Alaska, a native village in the Kotzebue area; that I am 24 years of age and an Eskimo of Alaska;

2. That the people of Deering hunt Beluga whale in the spring; that the average number of Belugas taken in a year is 10 to 15; that the hunt is conducted in shallow water and, therefore, any wounded whales are almost invariably taken;

3. That the Beluga whales taken by the village of Deering are mostly consumed by the villagers themselves but when there is an occasional excess, it is sold or traded to the people of inland Eskimo villages who have a great desire and need for the oil and blubber of the whale; that the cash or goods received in exchange for the by-products are extremely important to economic well being of the people of Deering since there are very few jobs available;

4. That the people of Deering also take an average of four to five Bearded Seal (oogruk) per year per family, that the entire bearded seal is consumed

for food and the skin is used to make clothing some of which is sold; that said sale of the limited amount of clothing made from the bearded seal which is not used by the villagers of Deering is important to the economic well being of the people of Deering due to the extensive unemployment prevalent in Deering;

5. That the people of Deering also take an average of ten spotted seal per year, per family; that the meat and oil are consumed by the people of Deering and the skins are used to make clothing or are sold; that the income produced by the sale of the skins or the finished articles of clothing is important to the people of Deering because of the excessive unemployment prevalent in Deering;

6. That, therefore, any measure enacted into law which would deprive the people of Deering of these limited, yet important, sources of income and, at the same time, deprive the people of the inland villages of a source of sea mammal oil, would seem to work an unjustified hardship on both the people of Deering and the people of the inland villages.

EMERSON PAUL MOTO.

Subscribed and sworn to before me this ——— day of May, 1972, at Nome, Alaska.

Notary Public in and for Alaska.
My commission expires: ———

[Recess.]

Senator STEVENS. We will proceed with White Mountain. Is there a representative of White Mountain here? If there is no representative from White Mountain, we will hear from John Poling, a representative of Congressman Begich here in Nome.

STATEMENT OF JOHN POLING

Mr. POLING. Senator Stevens, Senator Gravel, ladies and gentlemen, I am here today to read the testimony of Congressman Nick Begich of Alaska on the Marine Mammal legislation. Gentlemen, it is my pleasure to submit testimony for these hearings on the Ocean Mammal Protection Act. As you know, the House has already passed a version of this legislation, which is now before this committee. And I was one of only 10 House members to vote against that bill. I voted against the bill because, in spite of some vital improvements which were won on the House floor, it remained largely insensitive to the very real problems and needs of both the State and the people it will affect the most. My vote against the bill was a difficult one, because I believe strongly in the objectives of this legislation, as do all Alaskans. To protect and enhance the vital wildlife resource of ocean mammals. Nonetheless, valid protection and enhancement simply do not require the insensitive and unnecessary sacrafice of social-economic and human values. I believe that a number of specific considerations are essential, as the Senate Considers its own version of this legislation, and I would like to make those factors clear today.

First, I argue in the strongest terms against the inclusion of a moratorium concept in this legislation. This concept, conceived in emotionalism, simply does no credit to the causes. It represents a crude, broad-brush approach to a complex problem which requires finely drawn and strictly enforced management strategies. A moratorium necessarily says that both the problem and the solution for all species of ocean mammals in all geographic areas is the same. This is simply untrue and unworthy of responsible decision making.

The basic failure of a moratorium approach is that it remains inflexible, even in the face of later acquired knowledge which indicates that, in some situations, another approach is better. We can try

to perceive all problems and create exceptions to the moratorium, it is clearly impossible to foresee them all. Far better in my own view is the inclusion of a thorough and sensitive permit procedure as originally proposed in H.R. 10420 before the moratorium was substituted. Such a procedure structured as this committee believes appropriate offers the opportunity for each species, each geographic area, to be treated separately, so as to insure the protection and enhancement plan best in each case. As is, there is only one plan, the moratorium.

Second, this bill must, regardless of whether a moratorium is included, provide for the continuation of the seal harvest under the provisions of the North Pacific Fur Seal Convention. Because I know very well that others will confirm what I say, I simply state that the success of this program as controlled and supervised pursuant to the Convention is a model for future international environmental agreements.

I urge that the Administration of this Convention be excluded from the direct operation of the marine mammal legislation, either by exclusionary language from any elements of a permit system or moratorium, or by the statutory granting of a permit for the harvest program found to be necessary and best each year.

Incidentally, the Administration of this Convention, with its yearly fluctuation, is in permitted seal harvest and resultant recovery of the seal herd is the best argument possible against the blindness of the moratorium approach.

Third and finally, I argue strongly for provisions in the bill which guarantee a continuation of the life style and traditional existence of Alaska's Natives, who will be the true victims of an insensitive bill. Several considerations are essentially. First, is the absolute protection of the subsistence hunting practices in all cases, except those involving endangered species. Second, is the protection of Native use of all byproducts of animals taken primarily for subsistence, even where that use involves commercial sale, as well as other uses. Third, is the protection of the traditional Native arts and crafts industry, which is based on the use of marine animals. Such protection to be fairly limited by considerations of endangered species, traditional patterns of this cottage industry, and sensitivity to existing cultural and personal needs.

Let us all acknowledge that there exists with respect to the marine animals an environmental crisis of some proportion, one requiring our best mutual efforts and inventiveness in providing solutions. But let us admit that the Natives' life-sustaining practices of decades and the arts and crafts industry industry growing from such subsistence practices as the Natives only traditional response to the white man's cash economy, are simply not the cause of the crisis we are confronting.

Let us also admit that the maintaining of a people and a traditional culture is of a high value itself, and must weigh heavily in the balance.

This concludes my list of primary concerns for the legislation you are considering. I have not offered the voluminous information which is available to support each of these points, because I am certain my many friends in the areas where these hearings are held will

do so to an extent which will convince the committee on these matters. I believe that after hearing the testimony of those who must live on a firsthand basis with this legislation, just as they have coexisted with the marine mammals for decades, this committee will feel it a duty to write the sort of sensitive bill that is so very critical to all of us.

Thank you, and thank you, Senator Stevens, on behalf of Congressman Begich.

Senator STEVENS. Thank you very much. We are happy to have you here. Are the representatives of the Governor's Office or the Department of Fish and Game here? Do you have the prepared testimony? We would be happy to hear you at this time. For the information of those in the audience, we have gone completely through the list of the villages. We will call those that were not present, when thse witnesses we passed over the first time have finished their testimony.

Gentlemen, would you state for the record your name, and we would be happy to have your testimony.

STATEMENT OF JOHN BURNS

Mr. BURNS. Mr. Chairman, honorable senators, ladies and gentlemen, my name is John J. Burns. I am employed by the Alaska Department of Fish and Game and have been working specifically on marine mammals of the Bering and Chukchi Seas for the past 10½ years. For over 7 of those years I resided and worked here in Nome. My colleague, Mr. John Vania has also been employed by the Alaska Department of Fish and Game for 12 years. During this time his work has been directed toward research and management of sea otters, sea lions, land breeding harbor seals, and beluga whales. We are presenting testimony on behalf of the State of Alaska.

During previous committee hearings of both the U.S. House of Representatives and the U.S. Senate, the State of Alaska has provided information concerning the present status of marine mammal populations of importance to Alaskans, and a resume of the annual harvests obtained by Alaska based hunters. For the sake of brevity, this information is not included in the following discussion. However, these statistics, including the reported harvests of seals and walruses obtained by the Soviets operating in this area, are available for your use.

Representative Thomas Pelly (Washington) stated that he knew of no one single legislative area in this session of Congress which has drawn more attention from the House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, and from the general public at large, than measures pertaining to the protection and conservation of marine mammals. The debate is basically from two camps; the wildlife managers versus the preservationists. The emergent viewpoints are unfortunately rather polarized and in many instances highly emotional. A review of the Congressional Record concerning the testimony of various individuals on the marine mammals protection legislation reveals that many people are badly misinformed with respect to levels of exploitation, current levels of abundance and the reported danger of extinction of many species. It is indeed fortunate

that the views of those American citizens most directly affected by this legislation will be heard at the hearings presently convened here in Nome.

The following comments pertain to the present impact of hunting by Alaskan coastal residents on the various species of northern marine mammals and, treated from another standpoint, the general importance of marine mammals in view of regional productivity and human welfare.

It appears patently obvious, in view of the socioeconomic conditions which presently prevail in northwest Alaska, that the ultimate destiny of people in this region rests upon sensible utilization and management of both the renewable and nonrenewable resources impinging upon their emerging culture and material well-being. Marine mammals, which constitute one of the major renewable resources of the region, remain as the single most reliable and important source of protein available to a majority of our coastal residents. They also provide a significant source of income. These animals are actively hunted wherever weather conditions and their availability permit. The general status of these animals is as follows:

Harbor porpoise.—Seasonally common in low numbers; not presently hunted; occasionally taken accidently by salmon fishermen; could be utilized if needed.

Beluga whale.—Migratory in northwestern Alaska; seasonally abundant and concentrated; actively hunted when available; harvest potential unknown.

Bowhead whale.—Migratory; seasonally common at specific locations; actively hunted; substantially higher potential for successful harvest if hunting loss can be reduced.

Grey whale.—Migratory; seasonally common at specific locations; usually not hunted; substantially higher potential for harvest if a beneficial use arises.

Pacific walrus.—Migratory; seasonally abundant and available to hunters; actively hunted; total kill should not be increased; improvements in hunting practices along with decreases in hunting loss could allow for increased retrieved harvests and maintainence of increasing populations.

Bearded seal.—Widely distributed; mainly migratory; seasonally abundant and available to hunters; actively hunted; retrieved harvest could be increased especially if hunting loss is reduced.

Ringed seal.—Widely distributed, primarily near shore; mainly migratory; abundant and available to hunters; hunting loss relatively low; retrieved harvest can be increased if local needs warrant.

Ribbon seal.—Mainly in central Bering Sea; seldom occurs near hunting sites; usually unavailable to Alaska based hunters; formerly heavily exploited by Soviets; harvest levels should not be increased.

Ice breeding harbor seals.—Mainly in Central Bering Sea during winter and early spring; moves inshore during ice free periods; seasonally abundant and available to hunters; hunting loss occasionally high; the seal species most capable of supporting increased harvests.

Sea lion.—Rapidly increasing in Bering Sea; increase probably associated with fisheries activities; comes on land to give birth and breed; presently little or no hunting pressure; harvest levels can be greatly increased if local needs warrant.

Hunting loss is a factor influencing the total kill of some species, particularly the Pacific walrus, bearded seal, and bowhead whale. This loss varies widely from village to village but, in general, can be reduced to insure the welfare of the respective species. At the present time, no marine mammal species is declining as the result of hunting by coastal residents. Stated differently, present levels of exploitation by Alaska residents can be maintained and still provide for stable or increasing population of our marine mammal. The total kill of Pacific walrus most closely approaches the point of maximum sustained kill.

Commercial exploitaton, beyond that associated with the annual average kill obtained during the past 10 years, would be undesirable. More complete utilization of present harvests could contribute to the economy of several coastal villages.

You must certainly realize that the accumulated work of almost 22 years cannot be presented in 10 minutes. And I might also add that much of the work that we have accomplished was done specifically with the assistance and contributions of the people residing there along the coast.

At this point, gentlemen, I would like to digress slightly from the prepared statement and concentrate specifically perhaps on the animals that have been stressed as being important by the people that testified before us. I would like to turn this discussion over to Mr. Vania to discuss some of the more important animals that perhaps are not quite so necessary in this particular region, but are extremely important to Alaskans as a whole. After that, we will get back specifically to bullheads, walruses, ringed seals, and other animals which you wish to question us on.

Senator STEVENS. All right. In the interest of time, we will print the whole statement which you have prepared. I'm sure we understand your comment about condensing the work that you people have been engaged in for years in 10 minutes. We will print the whole thing. You can proceed in any way you would like. I'm certain that we would like to have a broader scope of this hearing, as to the total impact of this legislation on ocean mammals, but we do have a specific task here today. I would appreciate your consideration of that. I'm sure that we would be happy to hear Mr. Vania.

STATEMENT OF JOHN S. VANIA

Mr. VANIA. Senator Stevens, Senator Gravel, the animals that I would like to discuss are very common to the area long the Aleutian Islands and southcentral, southeast Alaska. One, the stellar sea lion. This is an extremely common animal along the coast. We have at least 175 rookeries and the hauling grounds that we know of along the coast. We estimate the population to be at least 300,000 animals. Currently, they are being harvested at the rate of approximately 3,800 a year. This is very low harvest. The population is at its maximum. Any moratorium will not help this population. It has reached its carrying capacity.

The animals are hunted primarily by commercial hunters. Some animals are taken for bait for crab fisherman.

Senator STEVENS. What do the commerical hunters use them for?

Mr. VANIA. The pups of the sea lion are harvested. They are sold for garment material. There is no harvest directed at adult animals presently.

Senator STEVENS. Are they palagic?

Mr. VANIA. The sea lions are primarily—reside within State waters. They utilize State lands. There is an exception, we do have sea lions in the Bering Sea that utilize the edge of the ice during the wintertime. This population in the area of 30,000, possibly a little higher, is palagic in the wintertime. They do require the land in order to pup.

Another animal of concern is this bill is the sea otter. Many of you know the otter approached extinction many years ago. In 1911, they were given complete protection under the Fur Seal Treaty. They have increased since then. The population today numbers at least 50,000 animals. We believe—our survey techniques are somewhat in error. It's possible we have as many as 100,000 sea otter in Alaska today. These animals are not anywhere near becoming extinct. The State has had a harvest program on thse animals since 1962. Between 1962 and 1970, we have harvested from areas where the populations have reached the maximum level. We have taken 2,463 sea otter. This does not include the thousand or so that the Atomic Energy Commission killed at Amchitka in their recent test.

Senator GRAVEL. How many did they kill?

Mr. VANIA. We believe, Senator, in the area of 1,000 sea otter.

Senator GRAVEL. And how many do you think the take was last year by citizens of Alaska?

Mr. VANIA. We have not harvested any since 1970.

Senator GRAVEL. You haven't harvested any since 1970 and the atomic energy killed a thousand?

Mr. VANIA. Through the testing; yes, sir. The State, through a transplant program, has moved sea otter to former parts of their range, all the way down to Oregon, Washington, and British Columbia. The purpose of this is not for harvesting, for future harvesting. We recognize that people want to see these animals and that is why they were moved. They are a wonderful animal to observe in the wild. The reason I say this is that we are very often accused of wanting to exploit a resource, and this definitely is proof that the State has other considerations in these animals.

The other animal I wish to cover is the harbor seal, the land breeding harbor seal. This animal also resides primarily within State waters. It utilizes State lands for its life processes. We have an estimated 200,000 harbor seals, land breeding harbor seals, in the southern part of the State, which includes the Aleutian Islands. These animals currently are being harvested at the rate of about 8,000 to 10,000 per year. We estimate that the harvest could be at least 30,000. And this population—it would not affect this population. Most of the areas are not being harvested at all. The Aleutian Islands, most of the islands, are a Federal refuge right now. They are very inaccessible. The harvest, even during the peak of commercial harvesting, was not being conducted along the Aleutian Islands.

I guess that should conclude my remarks for the southern seals.

Mr. BURNS. I would like to briefly conclude. I see we are out of time. And then defer to questions if there are any.

At the present time, based on all the information available to us, no marine mammal species in Alaska is declining as the result of hunting by coastal residents, an extremely important point. Stated differently, present levels of exploitation by Alaska residents can be maintained and still provide for stable or increasing populations of our marine mammal resources. The total killed Pacific walruses most closely approaches the point of maximum sustained yield. An ideal which we strive for in many resources.

Senator GRAVEL. Excuse me. The total kill of sea walruses, what do you mean by "total kill"? What is the other ingredient, other than Alaskan citizens? Is there anything else involved?

Mr. BURNS. Oh, yes. As I mentioned before, if we considered—your question is actually in two parts. Total killed even by Alaskan residents includes the retrieved harvest, plus an estimate of the animals killed but not retrieved. On the other hand, total kill as we know it, consists of the total kill made by both Soviet and American hunters actively utilizing the resource.

Senator GRAVEL. So, what you are saying, is that at the present total kill, we are probably right at optimum utilization or optimum management, the balance of management and utilization, is that the point you are making?

Mr. BURNS. I would say yes, that is generally the point I am making, stressing the fact that our population is still continuing to increase.

Senator GRAVEL. Right. And that of course includes Soviet activity. So this legislation would only govern American activity and would not affect at all the Soviet activity?

Mr. BURNS. That's correct, sir.

Senator GRAVEL. I would like copies of both your studies in addition to what we heard. Do you have extra copies?

Mr. BURNS. Yes, sir.

Senator GRAVEL. I don't want to wait until the record is printed. I would appreciate it greatly. I don't have any further questions.

I think we will include for the record both of their complete statements to be printed at this time in the record. I just wanted a separate copy for myself.

Senator STEVENS. That was the understanding, we would print the complete statements. Gentlemen, I would like to ask you some questions about the problem. I just went down and saw that exhibit that's downstairs in the museum. You state that these mammals sink when they are shot. We have been told here a couple of times today that in portions of the year, they float. What is the situation with regard to that?

Mr. BURNS. Hunting loss varies, both from region to region, and especially with the time of the year. And as in the lower 48, people are constantly promoting greater public safety on the highways, with regard to use of our marine mammal resources, as resource managers, we are constantly trying to promote more effective hunting procedures. Hunting loss is a reality, just like when hunting waterfowl. The Fish and Willife Service figure on something like 20

percent unrecovered hunting loss. This also does occur with marine mammals.

Senator GRAVEL. What percentage is marine mammals, do you figure?

Mr. BURNS. It depends on the species, sir. With ringed seals, for instance, which is the winter staple of residents along our coast, hunting loss is extremely low. With bowhead whales, hunting loss is significant, in that it exceeds in many cases 1 for 1. Based on the procedures employed, the conditions under which a whale is struck, et cetera. It's very difficult to summarize because under different conditions, different situations prevail.

Senator GRAVEL. Can you train people better or get them—can you put out pamphlets and information so that they can increase their skill in this area, based upon experience?

Mr. BURNS. Senator Gravel, I think it's just a matter—the fact of the national interest in these marine mammals being shown by the proposed legislation will go a long way in encouraging people to be very careful and to be more efficient in the manner in which they harvest the resource available to them.

Senator STEVENS. You make a very good point, because there is no question about it: if we get this exemption in the bill, it will still contain a concept of waste. And if there is waste in the use of these mammals, we will destroy our point. Let me ask you about the bowhead whale. Are you finished?

Senator GRAVEL. Yes.

Senator STEVENS. The figures the staff gives me indicate the original population of bowhead whales is roughly 4,000. It's now down to 400 to a thousand, and they indicate that the present population is protected, except for an annual kill of 30 to 40 by Natives. Now, would you disagree with that?

Mr. BURNS. I definitely would disagree, and you are in the same position as anybody in having to check out the credibility of your informants, myself included. Our estimate of the population of bowhead whales—and the State of Alaska, I might point out, is not engaged in investigations of the whales. We are engaged in the investigations of the walrus, the seals, the sea lions, et cetera. The present population of bowhead whales is increasing, as you have heard testimony from many of the people from whale-hunting villages, and in our opinion, can be estimated at no less than two to three thousand animals. The population of gray whales is known to be in the neighborhood of 11,000 animals. We can go back on authority for that.

Senator GRAVEL. Could I interject here? I think something very important—because when you develop your figures, as would anybdy develop figures, you go to the various villages and find out what the harvest is, over a period of time, and ascertain the veracity of the testimony you receive by on site inspection; is that not correct?

Mr. BURNS. That in part is correct.

Senator GRAVEL. What other ways would you determine the——

Mr. BURNS. The reason I mentioned the gray whale is because it is an animal that we have a good census figure on. And the proportion of gray whales to bowhead whales is very indicative of the continued increase in the stocks of bowhead whales. If you had ques-

tioned some of the whale hunters this morning, you would find, I'm sure—they would indicate that bowhead whales are no longer just available to them, but the harvests—the availability of whales, bowhead whales, at the hunting sites that they occur, has been increasing.

Senator GRAVEL. Well, we did develop a question and I think it was universal, both Senator Stevens and myself, and that was that they haven't been experiencing a decline. And that's one of—I think the best evidence you can have as to what's happening to the population is that yearin, yearout, people go hunting. And if it gets tougher and tougher to get whales, then obviously there is a depletion of the resource. But if it's consistently the same, and there's no reason why people should claim it's the same when it's not the same—we are talking about living experiences. And from my knowledge, that's where you get most of your figures and where anybody else would get figures. We have just heard testimony directly from people that there is a consistency. Now, that may not mean that it's on the increase, but we know it's not on a decrease, which is one of the motivating fears of the people who promulgated this legislation.

Mr. BURNS. That's true. And in our opinion, it is on the increase.

Senator STEVENS. I haven't seen your statement. But can you tell us, in that statement, do you designate which of the mammals are subject to State regulation, which have seasons and which have any limitation?

Mr. BURNS. We did not.

Senator STEVENS. Could you do that for us and provide it for us? Do you, for instance, have a limitation through regulation on either walrus or the sea lion?

Mr. BURNS. We have a limitation on sea lions and walruses. On those species which are in—in which the population status is known to be very good, there are neither seasons nor bag limits, concomittant with the utilization that people make of them. To answer your question: Yes; we have a limit especially on female walruses, and we have seasons and bag limits on sea lions.

Senator STEVENS. We were interested in that, because of the testimony on taking a bull as opposed to walrus cows, and I wondered if it was a result of regulation?

Mr. BURNS. It is a result of two things. It is, at some locations, the result specifically of regulation, but at other locations, the result of migratory habits of the animals themselves. For intance, at Savoonga, predominantly males are available to the hunter. In the Bering strait villages, as many males as females are available, but the limit there influences the harvest.

Senator STEVENS. Well, we appreciate—pardon me.

Senator GRAVEL. Oh. I was just about ready to move on. The statement that we read earlier about the Bering Sea massacre, where this indiscriminate shooting and shooting into masses of—do you think that statement is one accurate representative, or represents the extreme, or what is your views about the credibility of that statement?

Mr. BURNS. Sir, statements like that do perhaps refer to situations which occur very seldom. We have heard again this morning from hunters, for instance, from Wainwright, from St. Lawrence

Island, from many areas, that they are very careful about the manner in which they exploit the resources. It's not unusual to expect that on occasion, that a situation like this can arise, just as on occasion a man will get into a car and drive it while he is intoxicated. In neither case can all drivers be condemned, nor can all hunters be condemned.

Senator Gravel. That article also makes a point about some young men who were shooting at mammals for target practice, which kind of shocked me a little bit. Not that I believe it, but what I'm saying is that the argument is not one which is easy to answer. If it does take place, I certainly hope that the people who are going to see this transcript, or hear this testimony, will do their best to stop the person who is abusing the mammal, same as we are trying to stop the people who are drinking and driving, you know. We are still dedicated to stop people who are drinking and driving, so we should be equally dedicated to stopping people who are abusing mammals. This says, for instance—and I'm quoting for the people from Gambel so they won't get disturbed with me, for referring to their statement again—"In Gambel when gray whale approach the coastline, flying in water and spewing in fountains from their blow holes, I saw teenagers using these rare animals for target practice with live ammunition!" Now, that can incense a great many people, just as much as a picture of a guy weaving down the street through a bunch of children.

Mr. Burns. Sir, one last comment. I would guess that the text which you are reading eminated from people that are fighting the extreme in the bill that they hope will come out of Congress. Am I correct?

Senator Gravel. My colleagues are prepared to report a bill which has a 15-year moratorium in it, and the only exception will be the one we're talking about right now, for Alaska Natives, or for scientific purposes. So, it's very important what we are doing for the Alaska Native people, I'll assure you. But, it's also—would you say Mr. Hussey an airtight bill?

Mr. Hussey. That's close. It hasn't passed yet.

Senator Gravel. It hasn't passed yet, but that's the one that's under consideration.

Senator Stevens. Gentlemen, we do appreciate your being here, and I want you to know that as a member of this committee from Alaska, I appreciate all that the Department of Fish and Game has done to try and assist us in this endeavor. I do hope that you will provide, for the record, the statements that you have and that you will provide Senator Gravel with the copies that he has desired. If you have any further information as we go through, I hope that you will stay with us, and we will do our best to put it in the record, also. Thank you very much.

(The material referred to follows:)

STATUS OF MARINE MAMMALS IN ALASKA

STELLER SEA LION

Distribution.—Sea lions are very common coastal resident species found along the entire Pacific Coast of Alaska. They are also found in limited numbers in the Bering Sea along the southern edge of the sea ice. There are more

than 175 known rookeries and hauling grounds in Alaska. The largest rookeries such as those found on Sugarloaf Island, Marmot Island, Ugamak Island and Akutan Island each have 10,000 to 15,000 animals breeding and pupping there annually.

Population estimate.—The population is considered to be at carrying capacity throughout its range in Alaska. Estimated population 300,000.

Harvest level.—Sea lion pups have been harvested in Alaska in modern times since 1964. An average of 3,852 have been taken each year.

Harvest potential.—It is estimated that 18,000 to 25,000 adult sea lions could be harvested each year. Because of the high mortality experienced by pups, it is estimated that from 35% to 45% of the pups produced on any rookery could be harvested.

SEA OTTER

Distribution.—As a result of natural dispersal and transplants, sea otters are now found in all parts of its former range in Alaska. This includes the entire Pacific Coast from Southeast Alaska to the outermost Aleutian Islands, Southwestern Bristol Bay and the Pribilof Islands.

Population estimate.—Sea otter numbers in the central and western Aleutians, Bristol Bay, Alaska Peninsula and Prince William Sound probably equal or exceed the levels found by the Russians in the mid-18th Century. Populations in other areas are expanding. Estimates of the present Alaska population based on aerial and boat surveys, exceed 50,000. However, a recent review of survey and population estimation techniques indicate that the actual number may exceed 100,000.

Harvest level.—A total of 2,463 sea otters were taken during experimental harvests between 1962 and 1970. At the present time only a few animals are taken for scientific purposes each year.

Harvest potential.—Between 2,000 and 4,000 sea otters can be safely harvested in the Rat and western Andreanof Islands of the Aleutian Islands without having any influence on the repopulation of other areas. As other populations to the east reach their potential, the total animal harvest may be increased substantially.

HARBOR SEAL

(LAND BREEDING [1])

Distribution.—Harbor seals are found along the entire coast of Alaska south of Bristol Bay. They live in the shallow water marine environment where fish are abundant and will frequently ascend fresh water rivers during the salmon spawning season. High concentrations of the animals (from 1,000 to 10,000) can be observed in June and July in areas where glaciers reach salt water and in locations such as Tugidak Island, Ugak Island, Port Heiden, Port Moller, and the Copper River flats.

Population estimate.—No good method of accurately censusing harbor seals exist. Any estimate of the total population must be based on field observations and past harvest information. The estimated land breeding harbor seal population in Alaska south of the Arctic is 200,000 seals.

Harvest level.—The yearly harvest of harbor seals south of Bristol Bay has averaged between 10,000 and 15,000 since 1968.

Harvest potential.—The harbor seal population found south of Bristol Bay is being underharvested in many areas of Alaska particularly along the Alaska Peninsula and the Aleutian Island. It is felt that the population could sustain a minimum harvest of 25,000 animals.

HARBOR SEAL (OCEANIC [2])

Distribution.—Ice breeding Harbor Seal are found in the Bering Sea and occupy the edge zone of pack ice. They occur in limited numbers north of the Bering Straits in the Arctic Ocean.

Population estimate.—No good method of accurately censusing ice breeding harbor seals exist. Aerial reconnaissance flights and harvest information, how-

[1] Land breeding harbor seals are those seals which reside almost solely within state waters throughout all of their lives.

[2] Oceanic Harbor seals are those seals which breed on the ice in the Bering Sea outside state territorial waters.

ever, indicate that the population exceeds 200,000 and is at an optimum level.

Harvest level.—The yearly harvest of ice breeding harbor seal by Alaskan residents and Soviet Nationals averages 7,000 per year.

Harvest potential.—Current harvest levels are well below the annual recruitment to the population. Harvest levels could be increased substantially without affecting the population level.

RINGED SEAL

Distribution.—Ringed seals are widely distributed in the Bering and Chukchi Seas. They are found in the seasonal pack ice and also on the Permanent pack ice.

Population estimate.—It is estimated that there are 250,000 ringed seals in the Bering and Chukchi Seas.

Harvested level.—Coastal U.S. resident and Soviet annually harvest an average of 12,000 to 16,000 ringed seals, primarily for subsistence purposes.

Harvested potential.—The present level of harvest is below the recruitment level of the population. The population could support a much greater level of harvest.

BEARDED SEALS

Distribution.—The bearded seal in later winter and early spring are widely distributed throughout the pack ice in the northern Bering and Chukchi Seas. In the summer when the pack ice recedes to the Arctic Ocean, most of the adults move with it. Young seals commonly remain in the ice free areas.

Population estimate.—There are estimated to be 300,000 bearded seals in the Bering Chikchi Sea.

Harvest level.—Bearded seals are being harvested by U.S. and Soviet nationals. The annual harvest is 8,000 to 10,000 annually.

Harvest potential.—The current level of harvest is considered to be below the rate of natural recruitment to the population.

RIBBON SEAL

Distribution.—The ribbon seal is commonly found in the western Bering Sea and during the late winter and early spring months are concentrated near the southern terminus of the seasonal pack ice. Relatively few ribbon seals pass through the Bering Straits when the sea ice recedes to the Arctic Ocean, apparently becoming pelagic during the ice free months.

Population estimate.—Hunted extensively by the Soviets the population was reduced considerably during the 1960's. It is now apparently recovering and is estimated at 100,000 to 150,000.

Harvest level.—Few ribbon seal are harvested by U.S. citizens. The average kill each year by the Soviets prior to 1968 was between 5,000 and 13,000.

Harvest potential.—The Soviets have stopped all commercial harvesting of ribbon seal since 1968 because of reduced number of animals.

POLAR BEAR

Distribution.—Polar bear are circumpolar in their distribution and coincide with the Arctic ice pack. Recent studies indicate that two rather distinct populations exist in the ice fields off Alaska, one located generally north of Point Barrow and the other west of Point Hope.

Population estimate.—At present it is not possible to accurately determine the size of the populations which occur off Alaska. Most estimates of the world population approach or exceed 16,000 animals.

Harvest level.—The harvest level of polar bears by sport hunting is controlled by permits. The average annual reported kill for the years 1961–1971 has been 259.

Harvest potential.—A recent change in the hunting regulations has been made which prohibits the use of aircraft for hunting polar bear. It is estimated the annual kill will be reduced to less than 100 bears a year as a result of this change. This is well below the annual recruitment to the population.

WALRUS

Distribution.—Walrus are widely distributed throughout the seasonal pack ice in the Bering Sea during winter and spring and migrate northward into

the Chukchi Sea and Arctic Ocean during late spring and summer. Walrus do not normally occur in the North Pacific Ocean.

Population estimate.—Aerial surveys and the construction of life tables based on accurate biological information indicates a walrus population of 100,000 to 130,000 animals.

Harvest level.—The population is being harvested by both U.S. citizens and by the Soviets. The average harvest is between 3,000 and 4,500 annually.

Harvest potential.—The walrus populations were reduced to a low level by commercial hunters around the turn of the Century and probably reached their smallest numbers between 1930 and 1950. The herds have since been increasing. The current level of harvest allows for recovery of the population while providing for use by U.S. and Soviet citizens.

WHALES—PORPOISE—DOLPHINS

There are at least 21 species of cetaceans that inhabit the marine environment which borders Alaska. Three of the species; the Blue Whale, Humpback Whale, and Right Whale, have been hunted extensively for commercial purposes in the past and the populations are low. The taking of these species with the exception of limited subsistence use, by U.S. citizens is now prohibited by the federal government.

The *Bowhead and Grey Whales* are both migratory, the grey whale moving as far south as Baja, California. The grey whale population numbers about 11,000 animals and the bowhead is estimated at no less than 2,000 to 3,000 animals. Bowheads are seasonally common at specific locations and are actively hunted. There is a substantially higher potential for successful harvest especially if hunting loss is reduced. The grey whale is also seasonally common at specific locations but is usually not hunted.

The *Beluga Whale* is a very common resident of the Bering Sea and Arctic Ocean and is utilized in limited numbers by coastal dwelling natives for subsistence. Belugas have been harvested for many years with no apparent effect on the population size and indicating that the kill has been below the maximum sustainable level. The population appears to be at about optimum size.

Dall Porpoise and Harbor Porpoise are very abundant along the entire north Pacific Coast. The population size of these cetaceans is not known but must number in the hundreds of thousands. The population is probably at carrying capacity and there is essentially no utilization by U.S. citizens.

Killer Whales frequent Alaskan waters and are often seen by the boating public. There is no utilization of these cetaceans in Alaska and the population appears to be at optimum size in this area.

Fin Whales, Sei Whales and Sperm Whales have been hunted for commercial purposes for many years primarily by other countries, and the populations are below optimum levels. At this time, however, these populations are not considered endangered. The population size of these species in Alaska is not known but the estimated world population for Fin Whales is 100,000, Sei Whales 120,000 and Sperm Whales more than 500,000. There is no utilization of these species by Alaskan residents.

Little is known of the other species of cetaceans which occur in Alaskan waters. None are utilized by Alaskan residents and no reasonable estimate of the population size can be made.

Senator STEVENS. We are now going to do what we said before. We are going to go back through the villages and have the opportunity for those people—now this time those people who did not answer the first time. If they are here we will hear a representative from these villages. We will then go, after this is through, to the representatvies of the groups and the people who have indicated that they have specific information for us, such as Mr. Willard who has come a long way to represent the Alaska Commission of Human Rights. After that, we will go back to the individuals who wish to speak and are from areas which have already had their representatives speak. My list shows that Buckland was not heard from when we first called. Is there a representative of Buckland here now?

REPRESENTATIVE. Yes.

Senator STEVENS. Thank you very much. Will you sign that pad and then state your name for the record? I might add for those people who didn't hear that our plan is to continue on until 5:30 and will reconvene again at 7:30 a.m. if necessary. Hope springs eternal back here, you know. Will you please state your name for us, and then make your statement on behalf of Buckland?

STATEMENT OF SIGWIEN SAVOK

Mr. SAVOK.—Yes, I'm the representative from Buckland, my name is Sigwien Savok. And, here I've got testimonies; not only from myself, but also from individual people that haven't been able to come here. Also, from the council of my village.

(The statements follow:)

BUCKLAND, ALASKA, *May 7, 1971.*

DEAR MR. TED STETENS: I want to say a few words about the mammals how we use them up here in Alaska.

Mammals are lively hood for us Eskemos Peoples, we use them for our food also for our clothing. And we carve Ivery to get for our Bread and Butter, we Put meant and blubber away for winter because you can not go out Hunting when it 40–50 below zero. Also you can't see a head when its snow blowing. I Protest this Legislation.

MRS. ANNIE SAVOK.

BUCKLAND, ALASKA, *May 8, 1972.*

SEA MAMMAL HEARING COMMITTEE,
Nome, Alaska.

SIRS: We the people of Buckland appose the sea mammal bill, because we have our year round subsistance on the white whale and seals. We also trade or sell what leftover we may have up Kobuk villages or Kotzebue and Nome which is the basic income for most of families here in Buckland. This may sound corney to people who sits down and work with steady income but it is our way of life and have been all our lives.

We're all for you to stand for us to appose this bill, we don't have the money to send a man for the hearing but our representative for Nana Board will be over there.

Sincerely,

Pres. SAM HALLEY,
Sec. RAYMOND E. LEE, SR.,

Mr. SAVOK. Also, here I have—I've already stated my name, and the place I reside, and I would like to read my testimony at this time.

That I am a resident of Buckland, Alaska, an Eskimo village in the Kotzebue area; that I am 29 years of age; that I am an Alaskan Eskimo;

That Beluga whale are hunted by the residents of Buckland in the spring; that 10 to 15 Beluga are taken each year; that the entire carcass of the whale is eaten or rendered into oil and muktuk to be eaten later throughout the year;

That it is rare that a Beluga is wounded and not taken due to the fact that the hunt is conducted in shallow lagoon water;

That, generally, only a few more Beluga are taken than are eaten by the villagers of Buckland due to the difficulty of hunting them and the skill needed to take them;

That only a few seal are taken each year by the people of Buckland; that the seal taken are generally entirely eaten by the people of Buckland;

That occasionally a small amount of oil or muktuk from sea mammals taken by Buckland villagers is produced over what is consumed; that in such a situation, the excess is sold or traded to Eskimo people of the inland villages; that there is a great need and desire for sea mammal oil in those villages; that I have traveled to the inland villages and have heard the people talk of how much they need the sea mammal oil; that this limited trade is important to the village of Buckland due to the high rate of unemployment prevalent there;

That any provision of law making it illegal for the villagers of Buckland to trade with the residents of the inland villages would work an unjustified hardship on both the people of Buckland and the people of the inland villages.

Senator STEVENS. Thank you very much. Now, would you give those statements, particularly from the other people that you've read —perhaps you'd give them to Miss Rice, here, so that we can keep them for the record? I think you've made your statement on behalf of the people of Buckland, do you have any comments, or anything —do you have anything additional to add?

Mr. SAVOK. Senator Stevens and Gravel, I'd like to ask a question. For this moritorium—is that for the people that are the natives entirely, or is it that we are the older generation which sustained on this type of food? Are you going to change their diet?

Senator STEVENS. No, I want to tell you that the moritorium that we are talking about, even in the bill that's before the committee now, does not apply to the Alaska Native people in terms of subsistence taking. What we're trying to do is plan that to make certain that it covers the items of arts and crafts that are cash producing. But, there is, in the Senate committee, already, an exception from the moritorium. The question is how broad it ill be. The moritorium will apply to all non-natives for fifteen years, throughout the United States and it's jurisdiction.

Mr. SAVO. Yes, and also on this, sir—I've got another question. you see, I come from a very small village, and this village cannot have a very adequate transportation system, and this is one of the ways where we get our provisions for our daily food. We do not have a meat market in our village, and if the sea mammals in our area were restricted on these basis—how would it be so that we may be able to sustain our meat?

Senator STEVENS. There's no suggestion in the Senate, that you not be able to take sea mammals for food, as you may need them.

Mr. SAVOK. Yes, I want to make the statement.

Senator STEVENS. I want to make sure that you understand that, now. There seems to be some misunderstanding. In the Senate, at, least, no one is talking about restricting Alaska Natives from taking the sea mammals that they need for food. The question is, how much can you take beyond that for the purpose of acquiring seals. For instance, as we have heard here today, another area. Or, for the purpose of selling walrus ivory, or for the purpose of in any way preparing these animals or the products of these animals for commercial use, to be sold out of the villages in which they are taken. That's the problem that we're dealing with primarily in terms of the Senate. Now, I would predict there's no support in the Senate, for a bill that would entirely cut off the right of Alaska Natives to take the sea

mammal for food. That's not the question that we're after. I hope that people will understand that. We're trying to find out what do you do with the portion of the animal, that is not edible, or that your village, itself, does not consume. I think we've had some good testimones, which will help us resolve these questions. Thank you very much. We are now dealing with Deering. Is there a representative of Deering here? Is there a representative of Diomede, now? Kivalina? Mr. Swan? I saw Mr. Swan here, earlier. Will you sign that pad there with your name Mr. Swan, and then we'll be happy to have your statement. Just tell us your name, and we'll be happy to hear from you.

STATEMENT OF DAVIS SWAN

Mr. SWAN. My name is Dave Swan, and I'm from the village of Kivalina, and I just wanted to say that at Kivalina we do a lot of hunting, we catch a lot of seal beluga, and whale beluga, and a lot of this we store for our winter use. What we render, or what we store, we use, and we have to go out and kill these.

Senator STEVENS. How many people are in Kivalina, Mr. Swan?

Mr. SWAN. Approximately 180.

Senator STEVENS. Do you have any idea of the number of these mammals you take? How many beluga do you get a year?

Mr. SWAN. Oh, somewhere in the neighborhood of 30, or 40.

Senator STEVENS. Beluga whale?

Mr. SWAN. That's the white beluga.

Senator STEVENS. The white beluga?

Mr. SWAN. Yes.

Senator STEVENS. And, how many walrus do you get?

Mr. SWAN. About one—one at the most, yearly.

Senator STEVENS. And seal? How many seal do they take?

Mr. SWAN. Let's see—about a hundred and fifty—somewhere in the neighborhood of 150, or 200.

Senator STEVENS. Do you ship any of this meat, or these animals out of Kivilina? To anyplace?

Mr. SWAN. Yeah, we do some trading with the outlying villages, we exchange.

Senator STEVENS. Primarily a trade with the other Eskimo villages, that don't have the meat available?

Mr. SWAN. Right.

Senator STEVENS. What kind of boats do you use to go after these?

Mr. SWAN. We primarily have the skin boats.

Senator STEVENS: Do they have motors?

Mr. SWAN. Right.

Senator STEVENS. What size of boats are they, in terms of men—what is their capacity? How many men go out on a boat?

Mr. SWAN. Are you referring to a whaling boat?

Senator STEVENS. Yes. Your skin boats.

Mr. SWAN. About nine—10, in a skin boat. That's a whaling crew-boat.

Senator STEVENS. How many whaling crewboats do you have in Kivalina?

Mr. SWAN. We have four whaling crewboats, at the present time.

Senator STEVENS. Do you use any of the mammals, for any purpose, other than food? For any carving, any sewing or making of fur clothes, out of the mammal fur?

Mr. SWAN. Yes, we do. Take the belly for instance, out of the whale—they make baskets, boats and anything of this nature out of bellies. There's lots of things you can make out of the belly that you can sell or trade in the store, or elsewhere.

Senator STEVENS. How about polar bear? Does your village take any polar bear?

Mr. SWAN. No, very seldom. We would be lucky if we get one.

Senator STEVENS. We appreciate your taking the time to present your testimony, Mr. Swan, on behalf of Kivilina.

Mr. SWAN. Thank you, Senator.

Senator STEVENS. Let me ask you about one thing that surprises me, and is just coming into the back of my mind. The statement of the number of belugas that you take, per year—is that an annual figure?

Mr. SWAN. Yes, sir.

Senator Stevens. Do you catch that many each year?

Mr. SWAN. Not, no it depends on many things. Different years—1 year you might get a whole bunch. The next year you might get just a half of that.

Senator STEVENS. You've known your village to take as many as 40 in a year?

Mr. SWAN. Yes.

Senator STEVENS. What do you do with all that meat? Trade it?

Mr. SWAN. No, we don't trade all of it. We try to store everything. I mean, I've never—at least from home—I've never seen any beluga, or whale go to waste.

Senator STEVENS. It's all absorbed and consumed by the people?

Mr. SWAN. Right.

Senator STEVENS. Will it keep from 1 year to the next?

Mr. SWAN. Yes, it will. If you store it in a good place.

Senator STEVENS. You store it in seal oil, do you?

Mr. SWAN. Yes, we store it in seal pokes, or in a barrel and we take them out, we have the cache underground. That's where we keep them stored. It will keep them fresh the year around.

Senator STEVENS. And, it will keep into the next season?

Mr. SWAN. Oh, yes, it will last.

Senator STEVENS. How long will it keep, do you think? Have you ever seen any go bad?

Mr. SWAN. No—seal? I don't think I have seen any that has wasted, or spoiled.

Senator STEVENS. Thank you. I appreciate that very much.

Mr. SWAN. You are welcome Senator.

Senator STEVENS. Koyuk? It's just been suggested—Davis, how far did you have to come, to come to this hearing—Mr. Swan—how far did you have to come, to come to this hearing?

Mr. SWAN. How far?

Senator STEVENS. Yes. How far is it to Kivilina?

Mr. SWAN. From here to home?

Senator STEVENS. Yes.

Mr. SWAN. Somewhere in the neighborhood of 250—300 miles.

Senator STEVENS. Thank you very much. We want to make a little record here if we can. Koyuk? Mountain Village? Noatak? Here we go. Just sign that little paper there, Frank. You are Frank Adams, aren't you?

STATEMENT OF FRANK ADAMS

Mr. ADAMS. Yes.

Senator STEVENS. Fine. We'll be happy to have your statement, as a representative of Noatak.

Mr. ADAMS. My name is Frank Adams from the village of Noatak, and I'd like to talk a little about sea mammals, which included beluga—beluga whales and oogurk and seals. Because we live inland, each summer about half of our people of Noatak moved down south to the Northern Sun and hunt the beluga seal and oogurk. The beluga which we hunt is used for food, which is cut up and hung to dry on racks and stored to dry in barrells for use during the winter.

Senator STEVENS. Would you speak a little louder please?

Mr. ADAMS. The seal which is mainly hunted for seal oil, will be eaten, the skin for muckaluks, and also stripped for rope. The oogurk is used for the meat which is cut up, and also dried up in racks. These sea mammals are mainly hunted because they are mostly commonly hunted in that area. These people of our villages move from our village to camps and live for about 1 or 2 months each summer, which is from early June to——

Senator STEVENS. I think the trouble back there is that the people can't hear you, and they're talking between themselves. We can't hear you, either because they are increasingly talking. Can you speak up a little louder? Just kind of shout at me if you will.

Mr. ADAMS. Early June to September, but when 1 to 2 months each summer. Then during spring time, which is about this time, most of the men travel to Kivilina to hunt for beluga for mucklucks and the blubber. Seal is also hunted, but the men mostly hunt with the people of Noatak for the bowhead whale for the muktuk. About 5 to 10 belugas are taken each summer in these camps——

Senator STEVENS. How many people do you have in your village?

Mr. ADAMS. About 260.

Senator STEVENS. And, how far are you from Kivilina?

Mr. ADAMS. Oh, about maybe 50 miles—60.

Senator STEVENS: You say you go to Kivilina to hunt, and go off from there on your whaling trips.

Mr. ADAMS. Yes, sir.

Senator STEVENS. Do you go in your skin boats?

Mr. ADAMS. No; during this time we travel with snow machines.

Senator STEVENS. You take snow machines that far now, huh?

Mr. ADAMS. Yes.

Senator STEVENS. What does it cost you for gasoline for those snow machines?

Mr. ADAMS. Eight dollars for 6 gallons—8 bucks.

Senator STEVENS. Eight dollars for 6 gallons?

Mr. ADAMS. Yes.

Senator STEVENS. And, how far do you get on a gallon of gas on a snow machine?

Mr. ADAMS. About 10 to 15 miles.

Senator STEVENS. Ten to fifteen miles?

Mr. ADAMS. Just about that.

Senator STEVENS. How far can you go on a tank of gas? A hundred miles?

Mr. ADAMS. Oh, I don't know—something like that. No, about—you can get from Noatak to Kivilina just about.

Senator STEVENS. Do you take your meat back from the whale hunt towing it behind snow machines?

Mr. ADAMS. Yes.

Senator STEVENS. How long does that take?

Mr. ADAMS. Oh, about 5 hours to travel.

Senator STEVENS. Do you haul sleds with the meat on them?

Mr. ADAMS. Yes.

Senator STEVENS. How many men go over to Kivilina? Do you take the women of your village with you, too?

Mr. ADAMS. Well, most men take their women, and maybe their children, too.

Senator STEVENS. Did I interupt you? Go ahead and tell some more.

Mr. ADAMS. No; I have nothing else to say.

Senator STEVENS. Well, that's very good. I'm glad you came to tell us. You didn't mention any polar bear either? Do your people ever get polar bear?

Mr. ADAMS. No; we live inland, up river.

Senator STEVENS. And you don't go out after them?

Mr. ADAMS. No.

Senator STEVENS. Thank you very much, I appreciate it a great deal that you've come to make your statement for the record. We're now down to Noorvik. Noorvick is not here. Point Hope? Is there someone here from Point Hope?

Mr. STONE. Yes.

Senator STEVENS. Yes, sir. Would you sign our little pad there, so you can have on the record, your name as you wish to have it? Now, you are from Point Hope, are your sir?

Mr. STONE. Yes, sir, I am.

Senator STEVENS. And, would you state your name, please?

STATEMENT OF DAVID STONE

Mr. STONE. David Stone.

Senator STEVENS. David Stone? Thank you very much for having come.

Mr. STONE. I have a prepared speech here, from the city council of Point Hope.

Senator STEVENS. Please proceed. Thank you.

Mr. STONE. Gentlemen of the Senate Commerce Committee, honored guests and fellow Alaskans. It is difficult, unless you have lived in a coastal native village, to fully understand the importance of the ocean mammal to the Alaskan native.

In Point Hope, my home, our very lives revolve around the migration cycle of the oceanic mammal. There are virtually no jobs

available in Point Hope. According to the 1970, state manpower outlook survey, 64 percent of the population had annual incomes of under $8,000. However, the cost of living in Point Hope is double that of Seattle. When one compares the cost of living to the average income, it is obvious that it is virtually impossible to meet the cost of oil, rent, lights and food without some monetary supplement. Any moneys which can be gained from our limited commercial use of sea mammal products is sorely needed.

Let me point out that the primary purpose for the taking of sea mammals is not commercial but rather for subsistance purposes. Point Hope has no other game animals, in numbers great enough to support the population. Any trading or marketing of ocean mammal goods is the by-product, rather than the product of the hunt.

The actual trade and sale of raw sea mammal products is quite limited. For example, last year the Point Hope native store purchased, 2 tons of muktuk at $2 a pound for resale. This averages out to a total sale of only $23.53 per person less than a barrel of stove oil.

Approximately 300 seal skins were sold to the store last year, less than one per person, at an average purchase price of $5 per hide. The vast majority of all sea mammal products are utilized within Point Hope itself.

There is little or no waste with any sea mammal which is taken. For example the Pacific right whale or baleen whale, on the average of 6 of which are taken each year, is used completely. Only the lungs and skull are not utilized. The meat, blubber, skin, and other internal organs are all used. The baleen is utilized in handicrafts. Even the skin of the liver is used in the construction of our drums for dancing. We have always hunted only for our own needs, we have been wise enough not to overkill.

Is it fair to destroy our cultural heritage and our life style by stopping the utilization of these animals.

The ocean mammal is to us, what the buffalo was to the plain indian—don't take from us our very lifeblood.

Senator STEVENS. Thank you very much, David. That was a very, very good statement. Point Lay? Is there anyone here from Point Lay? St Michael? St. Paul? We would then like to hear from Mr. Willard from the Alaska Commission on Human Right, if he's here. We skipped Stebbens Village. Is Stebbens Village here yet? Bob, we would like very much to hear your testimony, and then we are waiting, or we are going to go to the American Legion after Mr. Willard.

STATEMENT OF ROBERT WILLARD, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR, ALASKA HUMAN RIGHTS COMMISSION, STATE OF ALASKA

Mr. WILLARD. Mr. Chairman, for the purposes of my presentation it is to be read into the record and you should not construe it as any confrontation between you and me.

Honorable chairman, members of the committee, I appreciate the privilege of submitting my commissions feelings as regards legislation that would impose Federal controls on the use and taking of sea mammals in Alaska.

Let me say, first of all, that the views I express are views of my board of commissioners and may not necessarily be that of the State administration.

My commission stands opposed to governmental intervention of the resources presently under management and control by the State of Alaska. Facing reality though, our feeling is that the Congress in all likelihood will enact some form of legislation and this is our prime concern—and that is, what kinds of provisions will that legislation have.

Because we oppose H.R. 10420 as was passed by the House, we appealed to you to conduct hearings in Alaska. We appreciate you accommodating our request.

It was appalling to us that the Congress would place restrictive use and taking of marine mammals as suggested by Congressmen who are obviously succumbing to the pressure of conservation-preservation groups who unknowingly are willing to place a higher value on marine mammals than those citizens most directly affected by sea mammals. By mere enactment of congressional control of the use and taking of sea mammals, as was passed by the House, and now under consideration by the Senate, you are talking about the destruction of the Eskimo, Indian and Aleut culture, heritage, and livelihood that have seen my people through the centuries. Isn't it enough that survival in such harsh climate is as difficult as it is?

Isn't it enough that because of very restrictive rules and regulations (by both Federal and State governments) that my people find it virtually impossible to make a living in the commercial fish harvesting. Isn't it enough that the very hunting and fishing rights have been taken away from us? And now, you would further frustrate and decimate my great people's culture and his use of his available resources. Your action may be bordering on genocide. You have already placed my people on the par with sports hunters and sports fishermen, and now you would impose further restrictions.

Because we realized that we were living in the most shameful state of conditions, we appealed to you as our national leaders. The response we got was the restrictive use of deer, ducks and geese, and other wildlife that is available to us and which we have used for centuries.

And now, you would further limit us in what we can do, what we can use and then tell us how not to use these marine mammals.

The subcommittee, as I understand, is now considering placing limitations on the interstate sale of products while permitting my people to take and use the sea mammals.

I suggest, gentlemen, that will only serve to place further restrictions. While I am in agreement that there should be no large-scale production plants, this provision will unduly restrict present production levels.

Studies have shown that of Alaska's 55,000 Eskimos, Indians, and Aleuts, upwards of 10,000 Natives depend solely on income from arts and crafts; and that over half of the Alaska Native people receive income from artifacts—and a major part of this is from marine mammals.

Because we would like to see Alaskan Natives, and others, who depend upon marine mammal harvesting, continue on the present

level, we support amendment No. 1148 as proposed by the Honorable Mike Gravel. We would like to see our State, and therefore its citizens, go undisturbed in the sea mammal situation. Amendment No. 1148 would accomplish that. We strongly urge you give this serious consideration for recommending passage by your colleagues.

We believe that the record will show that Alaska marine mammals are not endangered.

We hope you will hear testimony from our biologists to this effect. In the event you do not, we will be prepared to have entered into the record reports made available to us—depictive of this conclusion.

The record shows that with regard to the Pribilof Island harvesting, the population has actually increased—while the Aleut people are still able to make a living. By virtue of your action, though, you would curtail production.

Conservation-preservation advocates would have the American public believe that we, in Alaska, are wasteful and not utilizing sound conservation practices, and that we are in need of Federal oversight. I submit to you that this is just not true.

The economy of Alaska will be dealt a devastating blow if you pass upon a measure as was passed by the House. And, if you place restrictions on interstate commerce. Again, if the committee does not hear testimony on the implications of restrictions on interstate commerce, I will enter into the record true and correct copies of reports.

This kind of legislation is dangerous to Alaska and particularly to my Native people. I beg you to approve Senator Gravel's amendment.

The balance of Alaska, the very future of my Native people is obviously in your hands, and it is certainly within your power to take whatever action you elect to take.

It is our hope that in this case, at least, you will rule in our favor.

Thank you, Senators, I will be glad to answer questions.

Senator STEVENS. Thank you very much for a very fine statement. Thank you for supporting the amendment to the bill. And now here is the Nome American Legion. The staff will go over the documents you mentioned, Mr. Willard and will see about entering them all.

STATEMENT OF ROBERT EVANS, WESTERN DISTRICT COMMANDER, AMERICAN LEGION

Mr. EVANS. Robert Evans, Mr. Stevens. I'm the western district commander of the American Legion for the State of Alaska.

Senator STEVENS. Yes, sir, Mr. Evans.

Mr. EVANS. The total population of the Eskimo people in this area is approximately 14,000. The persons hunt the sea animal receive two things: The meat they use for themselves and the ivory they use for carving and sales.

The Eskimo is not to eat the food that they were raised on how do you expect them to eat beef and other substances. They have a proven fact that this meat they eat all their lives does not cause any sickness to them, and also protects them through the cold. It has not been proven that if they eat beef, pork, and so on they do come down with colds and many diseases. Are you going to condemn the other meats also? I think the most important things to come out of

these hearings that we elected our Senators from Alaska and we feel that they should really help us now. The people that sit back in Washington have never come up here and have never hunted up here, have never seen the hardships to get this game. We are not a wasteful people. Thank you.

Senator STEVENS. Thank you very much. We appreciate very much your joining with these people, and making it a matter of record, as far as the American Legion.

Mr. EVANS. Thank you, Senators.

Senator STEVENS. Paul Tuilana? Is he here? State your name for us, please, and we'd like to have your statement.

STATEMENT OF PAUL TUILANA

Mr. TUILANA. First I wish to thank you for coming to Alaska to hear us. My name is Paul Tuilana. I was born and raised at King Island, Alaska. I was taught how to carve ivory and how to hunt in my early age because these two courses will be very important role in my living at King Island. How to be a successful hunter and how to be good carver and if I pass these categories in the eye of my Eskimo instructor I have my equivalent degree to your high school degree and master degree. Because if I am good hunter I bring more meat to eat, more skin to sew or barter and if I am good ivory carver I bring more income to my family just like a successful store manager. Now this House bill is taking away my diploma which I work so hard to get it because in my early years of hunting I use to follow uncle, when he take me hunting. I use to have tears in my eyes, when I get so tired before the day is over because use to have to be physically fit to be good hunter. It is not easy to walk on moving ice all day. I say again this House bill is taking away my diploma and if there is any provisions in the Senate bill I will be out of business and out of work.

I live in Anchorage now for the last 4½ years but last year I hunted at King Island. This year I may not hunt at King Island but my son may hunt. I have hunt a total of 35 years at King Island. When we go out hunting we have to catch all we can to fill skin boat depending upon the weather. I have been hunting walrus long time maybe 35 years. Last year I went walrus hunting too. We do not shoot walrus just for tusk but shoot to get the whole thing. Only time we ever leave meat is when weather becomes a danger. Sometimes storms come up real quick or ice leads close and we have to leave in a hurry and cannot get all of the meat. If you have questions on any of this I will be glad to answer. Again I would like to say this Senate bill is taking away my diploma which I worked so hard to get.

Senator STEVENS. That's a very good way to put it, Paul. Did you sign that statement?

Mr. TUILANA. Yes, I signed it.

Senator STEVENS. I pronounced your name wrong. I apologize to you. Tell me—how many of your people go back to King Island every year?

Mr. TUILANA. There is nobody went back to King Island last 4 years, except in spring of the year to go hunting.

Senator STEVENS. That's what I mean. How many people go out to hunt?

Mr. TUILANA. Last year we—probably about a hundred. We have four boats to go over. For about a week—we stay over at King Island for about a week.

Senator STEVENS. What did you get?

Mr. TUILANA. Oh, we get about—a little over a hundred walrus last year. But the year before they get only one walrus—before that.

Senator STEVENS. Paul, do you take that food back to Anchorage with your family? Do you hunt out in King Island, and bring whatever you get back?

Mr. TUILANA. Yes, I bring some meat back last year and we put it in storage here in Nome. Whenever we need some more walrus meat, we send word—send a letter to send us more meat to Anchorage.

Senator STEVENS. Do many people do this?

Mr. TUILANA. Yes.

Senator STEVENS. Then many natives who have gone to the urban areas to live—do many of them go out to hunt, just for the sake of getting enough food so they can live here in the areas, and still enjoy the native food that they are used to?

Mr. TUILANA. Yes. Because, if we are eating beef every day, we get tired. So, we have to have our own native food to enrich our diet. In fact, I had some walrus meat last week, in Anchorage.

Senator STEVENS. Very good. Thank you for coming up, Paul. Is the Nome Chamber of Commerce representative here?

STATEMENT OF OSCAR CALVILLO, NOME CHAMBER OF COMMERCE

Mr. CALVILLO. My name is Oscar Calvillo, and I'm from the Nome Chamber of Commerce, and I have with me here, a letter to the direction of Senator Stevens, and this will indicate our position with the Nome Chamber of Commerce, and that we support the natives on their views: the Nome Chamber of Commerce is extremely concerned about the sea mammal legislation pending before the Senate. We realize, from reading the arguments of the House, in the Congressional Record that a great deal of pressure is being applied by various conservationist oriented groups in the lower 48. Concerns expressed from Alaskans were passed off quickly, and without a great deal of understanding. Yet, it is the Alaskans who stand to lose most from this issue. We, too, are concerned for the preservation of sea mammals, for whereas they are animals of interest to others, they are the livelihood of many of us. We are distressed by head hunting of walrus, even more by the illegal taking of polar bear. But we feel that the proposed legislation does very little to help the situation, and a great deal to hurt the people who depend on sea animals for their livelihood. First, the 5-year ban on hunting sea mammals robs Eskimo carvers and sewers of the primary source of their incomes before the Native Land Claim will have any real economic effect in the area. At the present time, and for the foreseeable future, there is no realistic economic base for the villages, apart from their arts and crafts skills. Second, let us talk about arts and crafts—we are not interested in the large volume of trinketry already imported from Japan and Seattle. The low cost of plastic

imitations has already made trinket work by Alaskan Natives unprofitable. But, what we are trying to preserve are the legitimate arts and crafts, which are a natural part of the history, and present life of these people. Third, the species of mammals being used for material sources for arts and crafts are not the species in danger. Management of the walrus herd—for example, has resulted in growth, rather than the depletion of the head. Fourth, when mammal herds are left on their own, all of a sudden the birth rates and population controls are left unchecked. The result and harm is often more severe than the hurt being done by human hunting. Cases in point are the formerly great reindeer herds of the Seward Peninsula and the moose population of the Yakatat regions. An artifically maintained balance is still a balance, and removal of game management needs to be as carefully handled. Fifth, it is difficulty to see how an exception to the Sea Mammal bill, providing for the native craftsmen would do harm on the purpose of the bill. Sixth, the system of ivory and polar bear permits, now in affect, could be upgraded to limit their hunting. The problem here is money for law enforcement. Perhaps monies could be placed in the State coffers to provide for enforcement. This would help the situation tremendously, if no other legislation passed. We hope that Senator Ernest Hollings also—will consider the needs of Alaska's craftsmen and the other industries that rely on their skills—tourism and Arctic clothing. Let us provide more funds to enforce the laws we now have, and let us not forget this—additional money for freezing units, and transportation would also mean that all animals killed for commercial interests only, could also be utilized for food, throughout the year by native proples. A copy of this has been sent to Senator Hollings

Senator STEVENS. Thank you very much. You have an excellent letter, and you have some very good suggestions. I appreciate your support of the Alaska Native People, as a chamber of commerce.

Mr. CALVILLO. I might add, personally, that I have lived with the natives for the last 11 years, here in Alaska. I have witnessed their hunting methods, I have hunted with them and I have never observed any spoilage of their game. It's all been utilized.

Senator STEVENS. Thank you very much. Senator Gravel and I appreciate your appearance. Mr. Thornton of The Alaska Furriers? Is Mr. Muller of the Alaska Conservation Society here? I might explain that we went through the villages twice, and I feel that having gone through the villages twice, we should now go through the lists—and we will get back to the villages—when we have completed the lists of the other people who have been waiting all day to be heard.

STATEMENT OF ERNEST MULLER, PRESIDENT, ALASKA CONSERVATION SOCIETY

Mr. MULLER. Mr. Chairman, I am Ernest Muller, president of the Alaska Conservation Society. I am pleased to be here to represent the society at these hearings, and wish to thank you for coming this long distance to secure testimony from many of those most directly concerned with pending legislation to help protect our marine mammal resources. The Alaska Conservation Society

strongly supports marine mammals' protection. It is essential that we take action now to protect these wild creatures from destruction at the hand of man. The concept of stopping senseless killing—the main consideration in legislation now being considered by Congress, helps to solve part of the problem. The most difficult part, the destruction of habitat through intrusion and pollution, will still be with us.

Four points must be made when preparing a legislation controlling the killing of marine mammals. A first consideration would be to design the legislation so that each species of marine mammal can be considered individually, and a protection system designed for the protection—to the extent necessary for that species. The concept, marine mammal is extremely broad. These mammals range from polar bears, seal, and sea otter, who spend most of their lives at sea, yet often use the shores as breeding grounds and staging areas—to whales, dolphins, and porpoises, who spend their entire lives at sea. Obviously, each of these animals has a different habitat requirement, and the impact of man on each will be, and is, different. Certainly, it is essential that wasteful killing of these animals must cease. However, it is equally essential that the restriction of harvesting of marine mammals be made upon a scientific base. Not based upon emotion and pathos. If individual species is not threatened, or it must be harvested, to prevent overpopulation, then hunting and taking of these animals, properly controlled, should be allowed.

A second consideration should be the impact of this legislation upon the culture, and the income upon these people who use these animals, or parts of them for either subsistence income, or food. It is important, of course, that species so harvested, be harvested in such a manner that the species is not seriously threatened with extinction. But, it is also important that we not threaten a culture of the Alaskan Native people with extinction, just to solve a part—a small part of the big problem. Wherever possible we must protect traditional rights of people, using these animals as a source of cultural enrichment, income or for food. These earliest Americans are today recognized as having been some of our country's greatest conservationists. Let us not make them the object of guilt feelings, resulting from our own grief.

A third consideration is that of cooperation and strengthening of our growing State programs. To replace a successful State program with an untested Federal one could very well result in at very worse disaster. The State of Alaska has successfully controlled and brought back the population of Northern Sea otter by management programs involving complete protection. Recently the State of Alaska announced the outlawing, beginning next season, of use of the airplane in hunting polar bear. To replace these responsive, competent, although modestly funded, local programs with a successful Federal program might very well be impossible. There are no U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service protection agents north of the Alaska Range, nor are there likely to be any, even if severely restrictive legislation is passed. Enforcement would then be virtually nonexistent and the hoped-for results negated

A final consideration is that of the international nature of many of these animals, particularly the polar bear, fur seal, and the ceta-

ceans. In order for any protection program to succeed, we must encourage and promote international cooperation. Our experiences in the past have been mixed. The International Whaling Commission has been a complete disaster, yet the North Pacific Fur Seal Commission has been quite successful. I hope we have learned enough from these two efforts to be able to construct a good international ocean mammal protection program. If we haven't, no national protection program can succeed in the long run.

During the course of this legislation, many well-intentioned people have severely criticized the concept of programs of wildlife resource management and a sustained yield harvest. They have claimed that the only effective program must be a total ban on killing ocean mammals. Certainly some of this criticism is justified. It is particularly true of such organizations as the International Whaling Commission. However, like it or not, man is an important, perhaps even critical part, to the habitat and ecosystem of every other organism on this planet. Consciously or unconsciously, man and his works manage, in the broad sense, all the earth's animals and plants. Perhaps this is not the way it should be. It is certainly not the situation of my choice, but it is a fact and we must live with it. This being the case, it is only sensible to structure this management through research, harvest control protection, and other methods, so that our wildlife resources, terrestrial and marine, can be preserved.

I only hope that the final form of the Ocean Mammal Protection legislation strengthens rather than destroys the management program in the United States.

Thank you.

Senator STEVENS. Thank you very much. I take it you would support an exemption for the taking of the mammal by the Alaska Native to continue their current and past patterns of life?

Mr. MUELLER. Yes, sir. In fact, I have wired Senator Hollings and you and Senator Gravel on that.

Senator GRAVEL. I interpret your statement to be even broader than that, and that is that we presently have good State management in this area. And that, as I read your statement, you don't endorse a blanket 5- or 15-year moratorium, which really adds no body of knowledge. I, myself, before this study—

Mr. MULLER. I——

Senator GRAVEL. We are talking about this moratorium, we are talking about freezing everything. Of course, we are not freezing everything. We have taken well care of the tuna people who destroy anywhere from 100,000 to 400,000 dolphin and porpoises. But we are talking about taking care of the big, important interests in the United States, and now we are down to decimating and wiping out the little people. I take your statement, as I read it categorically, that you would not favor—necessarily favor—a moratorium in the nature as it is presently designed?

Mr. MUELLER. That's correct. I feel that if a moratorium is necessary, that it should be established on particular species, rather than the broad group of marine mammals.

Senator GRAVEL. Right. Using an intelligent approach to the problem, which of course we haven't had too much of lately. I would like an extra copy of that, if you have one.

Mr. MUELLER. I just have one with me, but I can mail you one when I get back to Fairbanks.

Senator GRAVEL. OK. Would you mail it as soon as you do get back?

Mr. MUELLER. Yes.

Senator STEVENS. Have you communicated your views to the National Conservation Organization that the Alaska Conservation Society is a member of?

Mr. MUELLER. Yes, sir. We are not a member of any national conservation organization. However, we are affiliated with many of them through friends—Wilderness Society, Friends of the Earth, things like this. And Bob Weiden and myself have written to—they have copies of the letters—to the Sierra Club, the Audubon Society, National Wildlife Federation, the Wilderness Society, saying that—essentially what I said here.

Senator STEVENS. Thank you very much.

Senator GRAVEL. Incidentally, I really do want to commend you for this, because there is so much misunderstanding in this area, and a lot of action outside by very fine, well-meaning environmentalists and preservationists—really do not understand the nature of our problems here. And are taking—because of their lack of understanding, they take a very simple approach, that is, you know, to stop everything. And then when in fact they can't stop it, because of the well-heeled portions of society get to take care of themselves. So the people that are punished are the people that do not have those same powerful resources. And I think your coming forward, one, gives greater credibility to the conservation community, and at the same time, makes a contribution to the more intelligent resolutions to the problems that we face. Thank you.

Senator STEVENS. Friends of the Earth? Do you want to give the statement to the reporter, please, Mr. Mueller? Is Mr. Kowalski here?

Mr. KOWALSKI. Yes, I am here. I would like to wait and speak later, if I could, please.

Senator STEVENS. No objection. It may not be later though, Mr. Kowalski, the way things are going. Lynn Castle, St. Lawrence Island? Well, I see we have two Friends of the Earth listed, so we will hear from the Friends of the Earth from Mr. Davidson, if he is here. Would you sign that?

STATEMENT OF ART DAVIDSON, REPRESENTATIVE, FRIENDS OF THE EARTH

Mr. DAVIDSON. Sure. My name is Art Davidson, and I appreciate the opportunity to speak to you today on behalf of the 26,000 members of Friends of the Earth who are committed to protecting the environmental quality of the world in which we live. Friends of the Earth has a longstanding and vital interest in marine mammals and in the well-being of native people of Alaska and other parts of the world whose ways of life depend upon the natural world, upon the quality of the oceans, rivers, lakes, forests, plains and tundra, and upon the wild birds and mammals that live there.

The very fine statements we have heard from Alaskan Natives today illustrate why the modern world needs to look to native people the world around who, like Alaskan Eskimos, Aleuts, and Athabascans, long ago evolved ways in which to live in harmony and balance with their natural environment. Modern man has much to learn the the wisdom and environmental perspective that has been expressed by Native Alaskans here in Nome today.

I would like to comment on four points of the Senate Commerce Committee working draft No. 2 of the Marine Mammal Protection Act.

First, subsistence: As so many native people have said so well today, subsistence hunting of marine mammals is essential to the way of life of the native people of Alaska. And subsistence utilization of seals, oogruk, walrus, beluga, and Bowhead whales has not endangered these species at any time during the thousands of years native people have been hunting them. It is important that subsistence hunting be allowed to continue and it is important that the term subsistence, as it is used in this bill, include and allow trade of food and clothing from sea mammals. Such trade is not and cannot become a large scale industrial enterprise. It should be allowed to continue in keeping with ancient patterns of trade among native individuals and groups. If a native person is living in a God-forsaken place like Fairbanks or Anchorage, as I do, he should be able to buy some seal oil or muktuk from a native individual or organization on the coast where this food is available.

A second point to which I wish to speak is arts and craft use of marine mammals. When the House of Representatives acted on this marine mammal legislation, Friends of the Earth fought with Congressman Begich to allow commercial arts and craft use of marine mammals. A statement from Friends of the Earth which Congressman Begich used in his debate expresses our position today:

"Friends of the Earth would favor an amendment to permit the taking of marine mammals for use in traditional arts and crafts of Alaskan Natives, as long as the amendment prevents any expansion of this usage into large scale commercial operations.

"Such a provision would complement the provisions already in the bill, insuring that native subsistence use will continue, which we have supported from the outset.

"Together, these provisions will reemphasize the principle that Alaskan Native cultures be protected and fostered. This is a principle that Friends of the Earth strongly supports, as our book Earth and the Great Weather, the Brooks Range intended to show."—George Alderson, legislative director, Friends of the Earth.

It is important that there not be a prohibition against interstate commerce sales of arts and crafts items. Such a provision would be disastrous to native people and is unnecessary to protect marine mammals.

Such a provision would likely restrict trade within Alaska as well as in other States. But even if it only restricted sales in other States it would eliminate sales in fine art galleries and thus native artists and craftsmen would be locked into a tourist trinket type of market instead of having access to the fine arts market which realizes a

greater return for their effort and which is essential for native fine art work with materials like ivory and whale bone.

And an interstate commerce prohibition would not be a useful game management tool to make certain that a species such as walrus is not overhunted. The demand for raw ivory and thus walrus hunting could continue unaffected by such a provision.

Presumably, such a provision is designed to limit the demand for ivory. But it could, in fact, encourage a greater demand for ivory as artists and craftsmen locked into making low priced curio and gift type items, would have to have more ivory to sell many items to make the same amount of money that a few ivory fine art sales could have realized in a fine art gallery outside Alaska.

It is important to man, and especially Eskimos, that a great animal like the walrus not be brought to extermination by overhunting or any other cause. From my experiences with walrus hunting St. Lawrence Island Eskimos, I believe there are natural limitations on walrus hunting such as the limited number of hunters, the short period of time the walrus are available and adverse weather and ice conditions. And the Marine Mammal Act already includes an opportunity in section 107(b) for the Secretary of Interior to develop a management program with limitations if a species appears to be depleted. Hopefully such a management program would be developed with the help of Native Alaskans who have a tremendous first hand knowledge of marine mammals and with the help of the Alaska Department of Fish and Game which has undertaken extensive studies of nearly all the marine mammal species.

A third consideration I wish to discuss is Eskimo hunting of Bowhead whales. Friends of the Earth recognizes the extreme importance of Bowhead whales to Eskimo people. The whale hunt, feasts and celebrations are deeply significant cultural traditions and whale oil, meat and muktuk play a vital nutritional role in the diet of Eskimo people, as Dr. Christine Heller, a professional dietician with more than 10 years of experience in whaling communities and elsewhere in rural Alaska has emphasized.

Friends of the Earth also recognizes the deep concern of many Americans that the Bowhead whale, one of the great creatures of the earth, should be protected from commercial and wasteful harvest which could make this species extinct, as indeed the Atlantic Bowhead populations appear to be today. Preservation of this species is extremely important.

After extensive discussions with both Eskimo whaling people and those scientists recognized as being knowledgeable about Bowhead whales, we believe a policy can be developed that will protect Bowhead whales and also continue the tradition of Eskimo whaling.

The most fundamental consideration about Bowhead whales is that very little is known about their population distribution and dynamics. A useful approach to this problem would be for Eskimo whalers and professional marine mammalogists to work together to learn more about these great creatures. Research efforts should also be directed toward determining the effects that biocide pollution of the Pacific Ocean, and developing oil drilling and tankshipping in the Arctic islands where Bowheads summer, might have on this whale population.

Each year there is an undetermined number of Bowhead whales that are struck, only to die unrecovered. This rate of loss might amount to five whales killed for each one retrieved. Some Eskimo whalers, as well as conservationists have said this waste should be eliminated so far as possible. To be effective, efforts to reduce this rate of loss must be made with the cooperation and help of Eskimo whalers.

Since Bowhead populations appear to have stabilized or perhaps be increasing slightly under Eskimo hunting during the past 50 years (since large scale commercial whaling of Bowheads essentially ended), a cautious program that would allow an annual Eskimo harvest of perhaps as many whales as were taken on an annual average during the 1960's would be a meaningful approach to preserving both Bowhead whales and the tradition of Eskimo Bowhead whaling. To be successful such a program would need the cooperation of Eskimo whalers, immediate bowhead population research and the development of more effective methods of taking these whales. It would also need tighter control of international commercial whaling fleets which may still be taking Bowheads.

A fourth and final consideration I would like to touch upon is the international program of this legislation. International agreements are necessary to protect seal, walrus and whale populations from commercial exploitation. Such policies should consider not only protecting populations from wasteful and commercial harvesting but also from pollution of the seas and loss of habitat and food of marine mammals. No efforts should be spared in formulating and enforcing these policies immediately.

I would like to express my appreciation to the Senate Commerce Committee for holding these hearings in Nome and Bethel. Ideally, hearings should have been held in all the native communities which are greatly affected by this legislation and the hearings should have been held in the language of the local people. But these hearings have been an important step toward involving local people in the environmental decisions and lawmaking that affect their lives. People are part of the environment, just as environmental quality is a part, an essential part, of every person's life.

Senator STEVENS. I thank you very much. It's my understanding that Tom Garrett, the national wildlife director, has expressed points of view that are contrary to that. Is this a policy position you have worked out in the Friends of the Earth that you reflect today, or is it an Alaska position or——

Mr. DAVIDSON. Pertaining to what point?

Senator STEVENS. Pertaining to the interstate commerce activity, pertaining to the Bowhead whales and pertaining to the native arts and crafts.

Mr. DAVIDSON. Well, I would refer again to the letter which we worked out with Congressman Begich, and which he used in his debate in the House, which expressed our position at the time, when we fought with him in his gallant but futile effort to have the arts and craft use included in the House bill. And it was our intention at the time that those sales not be restricted to Alaska by an interstate commerce commission.

Senator STEVENS. Is this a Friends of the Earth position——

Mr. DAVIDSON. So that was the position at that time, and it is today too.

Senator STEVENS. National?

Mr. DAVIDSON. Nationally. That was from—that letter was from George Alderson, the legislative director of Friends of the Earth in Washington, D.C.

Senator STEVENS. The staff tells me that Mr. Garrett refused to support this amendment before the Senate, and that's why we are asking.

Mr. DAVIDSON. I don't have that reference, but I do know that this specific wording of the working draft No. 2, I have gone over with Mr. Garrett, other people in Friends of the Earth, very closely, and this is the policy that I have stated today. I might also add that I have contacted other conservation groups, encouraged and urged them to support the continued arts and craft use of marine mammals and without an interstate commerce prohibition.

Senator STEVENS. I'm encouraged by your continued reference to management concepts, which is the largest spike that is involved in the bill that has not really been expressed here. It's really not directly involved in the exemption for the Alaska Native people to continue their way of life. But it is involved in the total concept of this bill, as to whether we should talk in terms of management concepts or whether we should talk in terms of a moratorium.

Mr. DAVIDSON. I would like to comment briefly on that. I think that the health of a population such as whales, beluga, walrus, is really in the interest of native people and all people, especially the people that depend on them the most. I think that if we are going to protect them and use a management philosophy and approach, that philosophy and that approach and the policies and regulations which might come out really need the input of the local people, and they need to be directly related to the population of the animal, the distribution, the dynamics, the animals themselves, and also the people that are there utilizing them. And as we know, these animals can be utilized in different ways. Some of them for sports hunting, some of them for subsistence, some of them for large commercial operations, such as the international whaling fleets. And I think that it's very important in considering these marine mammals, it's very important to consider the people, the native people who have been using them for centuries and need to use them in the future. I think that's of primary importance, above the large commercial operations and sport hunting.

Senator STEVENS. Well, does the Friends of the Earth continue to support the continued operation of the fur seal treaty and its application to the Prebiloff Islands?

Mr. DAVIDSON. Yes. I think that that treaty and that operation as a management program is effective. It's been described to me as very effective by people who are much more knowledgeable about it than I am. And I think that one provision in this bill which would allow that treaty to continue and that harvest to continue with a close examination to determine if that's at the optimum level of harvest keep the populations healthy, I think that's wise.

Senator STEVENS. Do you also represent Ruralcap here today, or just the Friends of the Earth?

Mr. DAVIDSON. I'm testifying for Friends of the Earth.

Senator STEVENS. Thank you. Do you have any questions, Mr. Gravel?

Senator GRAVEL. No. I'm just very happy that you came forth and gave testimony. Art, because I think it adds credibility to your organization here in Alaska, and, of course, will help us in trying to arrive at more proper legislation, less extreme and more accommodating.

Senator STEVENS. It sounds like we are almost in agreement, and I just wondered whether I ought to go back and come in the room again, Art. Maybe you should pinch me. Now that we have the pipeline out of the way——

Mr. DAVIDSON. Don't be so sure about that.

Senator STEVENS. We didn't want to mention that subject. But I'm very pleased to hear the management concepts coming out of Friends of the Earth. I want you to know I have sat through these hearings in Washington, as John knows. I do not have the impression that your national people are—pardon me for saying so, as liberal as you have appeared to be today, in terms of your approach to the marine mammals.

Mr. DAVIDSON. Well, if I could comment just realy quickly. I think that a term like conservation and conservation groups is a large, general type of label, which includes many different people with different feelings, views, philosophies, different groups of different philosophies. And I think that many groups—I know Friends of the Earth is really vitally concerned about native cultures, not only in Alaska, but in other parts of the world. To protect the environment that they need to live in. And that's—the people are part of the environment too, and we are concerned about the whole living environment, the whole earth, and people. I think that as issues such as the marine mammal issue come up, I think it's very important that everybody communicate with everyone else. And I think that two things are involved in an issue like this. One is people's feelings. Many people feel—and these are people in more extreme, humane society type groups—that they don't want to see the killing of an animal, because they don't like to see their suffering, their dying. Another consideration which should be considered separately is the management. What really is the state of the animal population, how healthy is it, what harvest can be taken. And I think those things have to be looked at very clearly. The facts have to be known, the values—especially if they are competing values—have to be weighed together. That's all.

Senator STEVENS. Thank you. I appreciate your reference to Dr. Christine Eller. We have gone over that statement and we will use it effectively, I'm sure. I appreciate your concern and assistance. Is the Juneau Conservation Society representative here today? If not, and I say this advisedly. I want to make certain that we understand one another. We would like to know if there are any persons here who are authorized by the board of directors—again, I want to make sure we understand that—authorized by the board of directors to speak for the Federation of Natives, the ANB, the AVCP—are you here for the ANB? Fine. We will be glad to hear you. Come up to the table, please. Let me read through this

list. The AVCP, the Arctic Slope Native Association—but we want to make sure that the people that appear and testify are appearing on behalf of the board, and not as a member, because we are—thank you very much—seeking to hear from the association as a whole in this category of witnesses.

STATEMENT OF IRVING IGTANLOC

Mr. IGTANLOC. Senator Stevens, Senator Gravel, honored guests, ladies and gentlemen, my name is Irving Igtanloc. I am the Grand Vice President of the Alaska Native Brotherhood.

First, we feel that any legislation regarding marine mammals should follow an international agreement for the protection and management of marine mammals with other nations.

Without an adequate international agreement, any legislation regarding marine mammals would restrict such taking to the citizens of this State and this Nation and never really guarantze those foreign nations taking sea mammals would agree to any international agreement.

We would like to remind you of the problems we as a State and as a Nation are having with those foreign nations fishing in our waters.

Second, concerning Senate bill 3161, which we felt at the time was the one that would be heard at this hearing, section 107(a)(1)——

Senator STEVENS. Let me interrupt you there. That was introduced by request. I introduced it at the request of the National Wildlife Federation and others who wanted to get some concepts before the committee. The bill that is before us is the marked up committee print II that we are considering, and I'm sorry for that misunderstanding. Similar terms appear in those bills, though, so your comments will be appreciated.

Mr. IGTANLOC. Regarding section 107(a)(1), what is the definition of traditional customs, as applied in this bill or any bill? Does it mean that snow machines instead of dog teams? Outboard motors on the back of skin boats instead of the paddles? Should guns instead of plain harpoons? We look at it in the light of, who is going to interpret traditional customs?

In S. 3161, the Secretary of Interior or his designated State representatives? The definition of traditional customs is not in the bill. We know not what we are faced with under the term "traditional customs". To us, it is like taking environmental health. The term "environmental health" can cover a realm of things. We are concerned with what is the definition of traditional customs as applied to this bill or any bill.

Second, section 107(a)(3), what are the ramifications of the enforcement of this section? Does it mean that when our people shoot a walrus, they cannot sell the head or the ivory? Second, what happens, say, if someone receives the ivory as a gift and then sells it? Is the hunter guilty of indirect sale of such products?

Under section 107(b), in its present form, it places the burden on the people to challenge a decision already made. In other words, we will know about it after the fact, instead of before the fact.

If I may interject here also at this point, talking to an elder from our community in Barrow, Mr. Al Hobson, Sr., he felt that another point that we should look at is what happens to our people. There is nothing in the bill that replaces, either under a moratorium, we are not covered or protected for the taking of such animals for our subsistence use, what happens to our people? There are no provisions, as we see it. Are we to go on welfare and end up like the Appalachian area and the ghetto areas, where we see five generations of welfare? We do not want this for our people, we do not want this for ourselves, we do not want this for our children, we do not want it for our grandchildren or our great-grandchildren or the others following us. We have seen what welfare has done. We are feeling at this point in time also what welfare is doing to us. We don't want welfare. We don't need welfare. Also, another point that was discussed was that our people cannot change from the natural subsistence diet that the sea mammals bring forth, to a meat and potato diet, so to speak, of the white man's culture. A good example of this is what has happened in Canada when they moved the Canadian Eskimo from their natural diet to the diet of those people they worked for. What happened to the Canadian Eskimo was that they broke out with sores such as impetigo and cold sores. They couldn't trace the source of it, until they went back and studied their natural diet. And what happened was that they took away from the Canadian Eskimo his seal oil, his natural diets, and what happened was it dried his skin out. He was susceptible to cold sores and impetigo, which means that this is the case through moratorium and complete, say, cutoff or termination of the subsistence rights of our people in the villages. Then we are going to have to also look forward to increased health and welfare programs to overcome what we feel is there, and that will be cold sores, impetigo, or whatever it brings.

What happens to our people if a moratorium is put on, and we lose the rights of the furbearing sea mammal for clothing? Are we to go to street shoes that aren't applicable in our regions in the dead of winter? To parkas that are not really adequate for our regions? Let alone if they are, they are so expensive that we cannot afford them? What happens to our people that are using what little they do make off the sale of the hides and the ivory and so forth, what happens to what they receive in monetary determinations from their sales to their being eligible or financially capable, rather, of buying the staples, such as salt, flour, sugar, milk, tea, coffee, and so forth? These are some of the things that we have discussed, we have looked at.

Another section was 107(b)—rather, excuse me, I have already brought 107(b) before you.

In closing, we would like to reiterate our position. We oppose any legislation that would or could penalize our people, the Alaska Native, without limiting or restricting those commercial entities, both foreign and domestic, in the taking of marine mammals.

Thank you.

Senator STEVENS. Thank you very much. Do you have any questions, Senator Gravel?

Senator GRAVEL. No.

Senator STEVENS. Thank you. We appreciate your appearance. Is the Arctic Native Brotherhood representative here today? We are

seeking people who have been authorized to speak for associations. We will hear from individuals at a later time. I understand that quite a few people who will appear are also members of associations, but we are seeeking to find out if associations themselves have directed statements to be made. Without going through the list, may I ask this? Is there any representative of any Native association that is here at the direction of your Board of Directors to make a statement on behalf of the association? If not, we will proceed on—pardon me. Yes, sir.

STATEMENT OF WILLY GOODWIN, JR.

Mr. GOODWIN. My name is Willy Goodwin, Jr. I work for the Northwest Alaska Native Association in Kotzebue. And I would like to make a statement concerning my people from my region.

The seal oil that is used by many of our regions is used in many ways. One of the ways is using it when we cook, which is one of the main dishes of our people. It is the frozen meat or fish. If that is taken away, it will be like taking the salad dressing away from your salad. Because the only way the people from the seven villages within our regions in the Notak and Kobuk Rivers get seal oil is by the intervillage trading that has been going on for centuries. It dates back to I don't know what year, but my grandfather has told me people come to Kotzebue to trade in the thousands. To trade their hides for our seal oil. There is no other way for those villages in the Kobuk and Notak Rivers to get their seal oil, except when they buy it or trade for it. And it will so go on, whether this bill is in effect or not. There, I presume you will have to build bigger jails to take care of the lawbreakers or change this bill.

I have yet to see one of the seals that we take from our region being used in a zoo as a seal bouncing a ball. We use it for food, for seal oil, to make mukluks. We trade our seal skins to the villages in the rivers. The Oogruk skins for the soles of their mukluks, for their beaver skins. We still do it today. The villages in our region have no access to the sea mammal, but through us, whether it's in Kotzebue or in Kivalina.

I don't see no increase of killing of these sea mammals in the future as before, because then we had the dogs. Now, we have the snow machines. But this intervillage trading is still going on. Many of our people still go with a sled load and drag it with their snow machine into a village and sell the seal oil or trade it. Many times in Kotzebue there is—in fact right now—many of the people go to the villages and trade that seal oil for caribou meat, because there is no close caribou meat—caribou meat close by to Kotzebue. And the same effect, there is no seal oil in the villages of Norvik, or Kiana, Amber, Shilaneff, or Kobuk.

Senator STEVENS. How many villages are in that trading group?

Mr. GOODWIN. In our region, there is 11 villages, and seven of them are within the rivers.

Senator STEVENS. And four of them are coastal?

Mr. GOODWIN. Yes.

Senator STEVENS. And the four coastal ones supply the seal oil and the ocean mammals, and the others supply the upland game; is that what you are telling us?

Mr. GOODWIN. Yes. One of the reasons we have no welfare in our—not much welfare in our region is our people are too proud. We would rather hunt the seal, sell it, use it to buy gas for our snow machines and such, rather than go on welfare. And we would like to continue living as such.

Senator STEVENS. Very good. We thank you very much. Senator Gravel?

Senator GRAVEL. I have no questions.

Senator STEVENS. Thank you very much. You are a representative of the Northwest Association, as such; is that right?

Mr. GOODWIN. Yes.

Senator STEVENS. I am told that Margaret Seeganna is here to speak for the Arctic Native Brotherhood. Is that correct? Now, again, are there any other associations that have been—people are here representing associations at the request of the board of directors of the associations? Thank you very much. Mrs. Seeganna, would you just sign that page?

STATEMENT OF MARGARET SEEGANNA

Mrs. SEEGANNA. I have no written statement.

Senator STEVENS. We are happy to have you here. Would you tell us what you think the Arctic Native Brotherhood would like the Congress to understand about the problem of continued utilization of mammals by the Alaska native people?

Mrs. SEEGANNA. From my own experience, my husband has a skin boat that takes four walrus hides to cover. And our oldest son has a smaller skin boat that takes at least five, four or five large oogruk skins to cover, or two large oogruk skins and a walrus hide. The large boat they use to go to King Island in the spring. They go up the coast about some 40 miles, then go across another 30 miles across the Bering Straits, and then they do their walrus hunting over there. And the walrus hunting season is very short for King Islanders. It will last only 2 weeks, and it takes day and night, day and night, for the people to try and get as much of the meat and hides and the ivory, everything they can get, for subsistence. Seal skins are gotten from here in Nome when available. Last year, I know we had a light amount of seal skins taken in the winter. And this year, we had just a few. Seal skins are used to make hunting pants, hunting mukluks, and mittens. And they use oogruk hide for soles. I don't think that you ever have a substitute for hunting like native seal skin boots for the going on the sea. We cut up the seal and put the blubber away, and in the spring we women cook that blubber and use it during the summer to store our greens. Our greens will last as long as they aren't eaten. They can last and last in seal oil. We don't have cold storage to preserve anything, so that's what we learn from our forefathers. And with the walrus hide, they use the skins for the boats. The walrus stomach is used for container, or else they make those into drums for their Eskimo dances. And the intestine used to be used for the raincoats and it's also used as food. If there is waste of food, who can blame us? There is no—we have no storage to store large amounts of foods. Whatever we can save, we try to save. And the seal skins are used for slippers and mukluks for

trade or to sell. A pair of slippers, I know, would mean a meal for our family. Welfare checks, some welfare checks don't go very far, so we women have to make slippers and at least one pair of slippers would mean getting some supper for their kids. And if this bill passes and women can't make slippers any more, who is going to feed their children? We would like to find that out too. They have been asking us questions and questions about what we do with this and that, and take what we have, what we have gotten through the centuries from our forefathers, take that away. And we ask you, who is going to feed our children, what will they give us in return?

Senator STEVENS. You make a very good case for what we are trying to do, Mrs. Seeganna. We appreciate your appearance. Thank you very much. Donald Perkins is the Governor's representative. Is he here? Mr. Perkins? Rural Development Agency?

STATEMENT OF DONALD PERKINS

Mr. PERKINS. Senators Ted and Mike, committee members, guests, fellow Nome residents, I am not here to give such qualified statements as most of our native friends have given here today. I will not be dealing on the village level, although my job is dealing primarily with Alaska's rural communities. And I was told that I should be speaking on interstate commerce, so I will confine my remarks to that.

I would like to state that Evan Hobson, special representative for the Governor, was due in here this morning, and because he did not reconfirm his reservation within 24 hours, he didn't make today's flight and couldn't catch the Wien flight. So Evan will be available to go to Bethel tomorrow, if you wish, if there is room for him. And he can arrive here in the morning on Alaska. So I have hopes that Mr. Hobson——

Senator STEVENS. It was my understanding that Mr. Hobson was going to meet us in Bethel tomorrow. He is on his way to Bethel now. I hope that's the case, because our plane is full. There is no plane from here to Bethel, and the plane the committe has chartered for us is already full, and we are leaving off three of our people who came in with us.

Mr. PERKINS. OK.

Senator STEVENS. Maybe you could double-check and make sure he is going to Bethel.

Mr. PERKINS. He does have a prepared statement——

Senator STEVENS. We will be happy to take care of that. I'm sorry about the misunderstanding. We are taking Senator Gravel and his assistants and the committee and my staff and the young lady to Bethel, and the rest of them are going back to Anchorage.

Mr. PERKINS. There are many small home industries, as you are well aware, here in Alaska, especially in our native villages. And I'm speaking primarily of the hunter, once he catches a walrus or a seal and takes the byproducts other than the meat, and tries to craft this into a marketable item or sells the skin, which ultimately will reach the fur market.

I would briefly like to try to trace down that simple sealskin. It seems like a simple item to a lot of people, but eventually it winds

up becoming a part of a $400 to $1,000 beautiful, luxurious, fur jacket or fur parka. But we have a lot of people involved, Senator, in this proposed legislation. It isn't really proposed, it's gone through the House, of course, and it's now in the Senate. And it's a very serious thing, I think, because it involves the economy of thousands of Alaskans. Not just native hunters, not just small curio shop owners throughout the State, but there is a very large segment in some of our larger communities that have hundreds of thousands of dollars invested. And I'm not lobbying for them, incidentally, but I have made contact with numerous of them. And the impact of this could very well ruin several major businesses in the State of Alaska. I'm speaking primarily of Anchorage and Fairbanks, the fur shop operators.

This sealskin, which one of our village representatives this morning stated, sells for approximately $15. It is usually sold to a buyer. This buyer may be someone traveling through the community, paying what appears to be a fair price to the hunter in the village, or in many cases the buyer is a village-owned cooperative store. And once they acquire this skin, it can ultimately reach another buyer, then reaches the tanner, and winds up in the hands of a garment maker. And there are numerous large ones within the State who will fashion this into a very luxurious type of product. And it is a highly marketable item, and I might say it has a tremendous amount of feel, not only to the Alaskan, but to the touring visitors who come into the State. And I checked with statistics for six various operators and find that there is a very considerable amount of interstate commerce on this. I talked with four fur owners, four fur shop owners in Anchorage, and they gave me the following figures. One of them has from 45 to 55 percent of their business from the tourists alone, and that amounts to hundreds of thousands of dollars. Approximately 20 percent is mail order business, or is ordered by that tourist, once they come up, they have seen the item, they go back home and then write for it. And they pass this along to friends who also order. One other operator just gave us the figures of 30 to 50 percent of their business was through the Alaska tourist. And less than 10 percent was mail order. One other—one of the more well-known operators in Anchorage, who also has a substantial amount of craftwork for sale and also has a small animal-type museum, does approximately 80 percent of their business with the tourists. And they have approximately 10 to 20 percent of their business is mail order. One other operator, also a fur manufacturer, said about 80 percent of his business was the tourist and about 30 percent was out-of-State shipment by mail order.

Now, the tour industry is Alaska's fourth largest industry. It's a multimillion dollar industry which affects thousands of Alaskans, and I might say, affects 1,000 or 2,000, or maybe even more natives, small shop owners, fur buyers, people working in the two or three small canneries in the State, and ultimately, the larger manufacturer of a product, usually for wholesale and retail both. Say in the Anchorage area predominantly. And there is a phenomenal amount of potential yet to come. This is still almost an infant industry for the State of Alaska.

The one business that I will not quote by name, although you have documents from him which he said he was presenting to you, from Anchorage, stated that for 3 years, he had worked with Disneyland to try to promote the sale of Alaskan crafts. He has finally just about completed it. That would mean the shipment out of State of very likely hundreds of thousands of dollars of Alaskan craftwork. This act would, of course, eliminate that possibility, and not only that, if in its entirety, if it were not amended, permits, say, the sale of craftwork within the State would probably put many, many dozens of businesses completely out of commission.

In Nome, I checked with our two largest gift shop owners, Senator, and one of them has 90 percent of his business from the visiting tourists. One has approximately 60 percent. One of them stated that 20 to 25 percent of his business is mail order business out of the State, and the other was 10 percent. Now, I have only taken six businesses, and I have taken some of the very larger ones and a couple of the smaller ones, but it's a sample in a 600-mile span between here and Anchorage of what the impact is in selling out of State. And as I say, it's still an industry that's basically in its infancy. The potential is yet to come. The cooperative movement, although it has been tried in Alaska, has not been so terribly successful in the past. It is beginning to succeed now. We are going to see a lot more cooperative industry within the State, larger cooperatives working with craftwork, and, of course, with the fur workers. And the market potential out of State is tremendous. This will kill it before it barely gets started.

And I think in all fairness to many people who probably owe at least $1 million, $2 million or $3 million in loan money, some of this, incidentally, through the Federal Government through the Small Business Administration, will probably be put almost totally out of business. And I think that certainly our Congress and our Senate would not intentionally wish to damage people economically in this fashion. They certainly wouldn't want to damage the person on the village level, who still lives almost on a subsistence type economy. I think that if this testimony in this group here today is weighed and listened to accurately by most people back there, if you committee members can get this point across, I think you will be doing the Alaskan one of the greatest services that could possibly be done.

I think that concludes my statement.

Senator STEVENS. Thank you very much. Don. We are happy to hear you. We are informed that William Takak of Shaktulik must catch a plane and would like to testify at this point.

STATEMENT OF WILLIAM TAKAK

Mr. TAKAK. I didn't want to leave without representing the people of Shaktoolik and the city council.

Senator STEVENS. Just sign your name to that slip there, so we are sure we will have it the right way. We are happy to hear you. We would like to ask you if you can add to what they said. I'm sure that you realize that we really will not have time to have each village's comments gone over for the second time. So, we would like to ask you and all the witnesses that come after you to add to what was said by the other representatives of your village. Now, I know that's a tough

set of facts and I'm not going to be too rigid, but please try to tell us additional facts for the record that will assist us in representing you in Congress.

Mr. TAKAK. Yes, sir. Senator Stevens, before I start, I got a short testimony here. Can I ask a question? Are the testimonies here making a difference on how this sea mammals bill will turn out?

Senator STEVENS. In regard to the provision that will apply to the Alaska Native people, the bill in its present form specifically says that it will not be finally written until the results of these hearings are delivered to the Senate Commerce Committee. That's what these two gentlemen are here for, they are members of the staff of the Senate Commerce Committee, to assist the other members of the committee to know what went on here and they will also have this record—assuming my good friend and former assistant gets it done as quickly as I know she can get it done.

Mr. TAKAK. Thank you. Can I read through what I have here? It will take only about 2 or 3 minutes.

Senator STEVENS. Yes, sir.

Mr. TAKAK. The people of Shaktoolik are very concerned about this bill, because we and our forefathers have depended on seal and other sea mammals since they came to Alaska. When a person gets a seal or oogruk, all the animal is used. The skin is sold for use for mukluks and the blubber is used for seal oil, which is very important to the diet of the Eskimo people. The meat is used for food, either cooked or dried. If and when the bill is passed, it will take away our food and clothing. The white whale or beluga when caught is used for food. The muktuk is cooked and stored away for use in the winter. The meat is dried and also stored away for use in the winter. Even the sinews on the whale is used for thread for making mukluks. When we can't use part or a whole whale or seal, it's given away to someone that needs it. After taking away most of our land under the Land Claims Bill, now they want to take away our main source of food. In any case, I hope they let us keep our sea mammals. Over the years, the Eskimo has tried to a large extent to adjust to the white man's way of life. While they neglect to understand their way of life and customs. And as a result, there has been a lack of communication between the white man and the Eskimo.

In conclusion, I would like to say, throughout the Lower 48, people have lived in welfare, subsidized by Federal, State, and local governments. We, the Alaskan Eskimo, do not wish to exist in this manner. We are capable of existing as we have throughout history on our own natural resources. Leave us our inheritance and leave charity to those who need it.

Thank you.

Senator STEVENS. Thank you very much. You make quite a point, and we thank you. I hope that you will take the word back to your village that this bill does not prohibit subsistence hunting of mammals. The question is, what goes on in terms of interstate commerce, in terms of the arts and crafts, in terms of what I call full definition of subsistence by the Alaska Natives. But I hope we have brought that message, at least, that the bill does not prohibit all taking of mammals, and there is no intention to do that.

Mr. TAKAK. Thank you.

Senator STEVENS. Thank you very much. And I hope you catch your plane. I have conferred with Senator Gravel, and we are hopeful that perhaps we might have a change of procedure and we might be able to continue through and get finished In just a few moments we will take a few minutes off and confer with the young lady here to see if she can agree to it. But again taking into account the fact that we have come clear from Washington, and it's now 11 p.m. Washington time, and we wonder if it's possible that we might continue here until we finish, and then adjourn for dinner, so we can go to bed after dinner, and go on to Bethel tomorrow morning and continue our hearings there. That's sort of a pleading statement.

Senator GRAVEL. I think we can appreciate also that some of the testimony we are getting is repetitious. And I don't think it's that advantageous to the case. So we are down to probably around five or six people to be heard.

Senator STEVENS. Let me tell you, Senator, what we have left. We have the representative of Deering—and I'm not calling you up right now, but I understand the representative of Deering is here and Stebin Village is here. We have still to hear from the Alaska Council on Economic Development, the Alaska Legal Services, Anak, and the upgrade village art program. We have heard the other individual witnesses, except for the Northwest Skin Sewers. Does Frances Johnson still desire to testify? I don't know, but as I understand it, that would mean we have one, two—six, seven witnesses, plus those people who have come from villages already testified. So, why don't we give it a try, anyway. We were going to adjourn now until after dinnertime, but if we could take a 5 minute recess—and that's what it will be, 5 minutes. Max Gruenberg will come out here to the table, and anyone who I have not named who would like to testify and give us additional facts to those we have heard, we would very much like to hear you. But we would like to have you sign up with Max before we reconvene at 7 minutes after 5.

[Recess.]

Senator STEVENS. Fairbanks Native Association, another representative of Golovin, Edith Sagoonick of Nome, Jim Kowalski for the Fairbanks Environmental Center, Martha Akin of Barrow, and Merlin Anuka of Gambell, Jerome Trigg is the official representative of the Bering Strait Association, Al Nakak and Betty Jean Hoogendorn from Nome, and then Myrtle Johnson and Tommy Johnson, and our final witness will be Charles Hurd of the Alaska Fish and Game. Now, as I count it, that is 17 people to hear before we close this evening, and I would again urge you to try to be succinct and assist us in making a record that explains thoroughly the need for not only the right to take mammals but the right to use mammals completely, in terms of continuing the Eskimo and Native way of life in Alaska. It looks from the things that surround me here tonight that we are going to have some interesting discussion.

The first representative we would like to hear is the representative of Deering. Is he here? Is the representative of Deering here now? Emerson Moto ? Well, I hope you will let me know when he comes in. Is the Stebbins Village representative here? Yes, would you come up, please? Just sign your name on that yellow pad and tell us your

name for the record. And we are happy to have with us another radio station tonight, to bring this over to the Fairbanks area. I might say that Senator Gravel and I were very pleased with the reception. I understand Myrtle Johnson will tell us when she appears who that was that prepared those signs and the reception for the committee as they arrived here in Nome. I would appreciate it if you would, Myrtle, give credit where it is due. That was very thoughtful.

Now, the representative from Deering. Would you tell us your name and please make your statement.

Unidentified voice. From Stebbins.

Senator STEVENS. From Stebbins, excuse me. We skipped Deering.

STATEMENT OF JOHN HENRY

Mr. HENRY. The guy that was to represent us, he is not here, so I represent Stebbins. I don't have no written statements. I asked that man to give me those written statements so I could make our statement to Senator Gravel and Senator Stevens. So, I'm going to make my own—what people thinks. As people thinks, I'm Eskimo, just like Indian or Aleut, all same. We are from Norton Sound on the coast area, where we could hunt on the sea and on the ground. We have two ways to hunt. To feed ourself from the sea and from the ground. Even we don't have no money. Sometimes we have hard times. We can't purchase from the ground, we can't purchase from the sea. Because we are Eskimo, we can't write a check to purchase something that we could buy. Just sit down and write a check to purchase something for our children. We always have hard time. In Washington, D.C., we could write a check—we could purchase what we want. We are not in Washington, D.C. We are in Alaska having hard time. We try, we don't get it. Two days sometimes, next day we get it. Trying to get for our children to eat. It's a hard life for Alaskan people. On the sea mammal, representatives from Washington, D.C., they don't even be in Alaska for even 1 day yet. The one that trying to pass that law for sea mammal. They never been in Alaska even half a minute. They don't know about Alaska. Why not send Alaska representative to Alaska first before they could pass that law as representatives?

Senator STEVENS. That's what we are doing here now.

Mr. HENRY. It should be done before—if they think about sea mammals. Why not send somebody to Alaska first and representatives could talk to Alaska people. If that was done after the talk on representatives from Washington, D.C., they wouldn't talk about sea mammals after they find out. So I have one question—I have no written statements. It's only example, I'm going to talk about example. Farmers. We got a written examples from—not examples but—from Stebbings, but he didn't appear. Farmers. I'm going to give you one example to Senators that try to close that sea mammals for Alaskans. So, farmers. If you pass that, if representatives pass that farmers to grow one potato, so white man would think that farmer will hurt his feelings, just the same as we are hurt. Now, cattles, if cattlemen was passed by representatives from the United States to butcher one cattle, then cattlemens will be hurt too, just the same as

we hurt. And that example to us, we are hurt, we don't want Senators to pass that law. We will be hurt just the same as these guys, white mans. We will be hurt.

Senator STEVENS. I think we understand.

Mr. HENRY. If you misunderstand, I don't know what I'm talking, but I know what I'm saying. That's my example, only example. That's between white man and Eskimos. We are hurt to close this, because we won't sell no arts and crafts. So if these guys—representatives close this business, we will be hurt just the same as we do, no different. And next are sea mammals. It's our living and I born on sea mammals. I born, we didn't have much money. My did didn't have much money. He hunt and hunt, just the same as like other peoples in the other villages. He try to support us from the hunting, that's all. He never worked. He just liked hunting. No other resource we have, just from his hunting. Just like other villages does. And ancestor, from our ancestor I think we born like them. I will be like that, because my ancestors I know. I was born without money. I will be ancestor for my own folks without money. The land claims settlement is past. It was long time to try to settle that land claims settlement, long-time, I understand. Now, on the sea mammal could be 50 years from now could be passed. By the time our young generation will be all right from cash, Alaska sale monies, almost like State policemen, I guess. Why not—don't pass it right now, because we need—that's our resource, just like your gardens, your cattlemen in the States. We need it. Why not representatives come, if they going to say something to Alaska that Alaskan people don't like. Their living, mostly for their living. Why not come and talk to peoples first and go to Congress and try to make a law out of it. Before the—we find out before we know it that representatives pass it. Now, Senators, I hope you don't pass it. It's our livelihood. No matter how much we got money, no matter how much we don't have no money, still we go for our arts and crafts, we sell it. We could sell it and we have plan in Stebbins to have a arts and crafts, I hope. I hope the Senators from Washington, D.C., don't pass it.

Senator STEVENS. Fine. Well, we thank you very much for appearing for Stebbins, and I'm glad that you have given us your views on behalf of your village. Do you have any questions, Senator Gravel?

Senator GRAVEL. I have no questions.

Senator STEVENS. Thank you very much. We appreciate it. Did either Diomede or Deering people show up this evening? I knew they were trying to get in. We also passed over St. Michael today. Did St. Michael's people get in? Deering here? All right. And we passed over other villages. Is there anyone from a village that we have not called on today? Yes, sir. Will you sign that yellow pad and we will be happy to listen to your statement. I'm asking for anyone in the audience. Are there others that we have failed to get on the list here, because of the shift between this afternoon's and this evening's session? I failed to mention that included in the number I listed were the other four witnesses that we had. I had read the Alaska Council on Economic Development, Alaska Legal Services, Anak, and the Upgrade Village Art program. They are also on my list plus these other 13. Will you state your name, please?

STATEMENT OF EMERSON MOTO

Mr. MOTO. My name is Emerson Moto, and I am from Deering.

Senator STEVENS. Fine. We would be happy to have your statement.

Mr. MOTO. OK. What I've got to say from the people of Deering is that we oppose the bill because of the fact that we use sea mammals as a source of income. What I mean by that is that we sell or trade our excess seal meat, oogruk, or beluga to people that want to buy them. We also sell the sealskins; some women make mukluks, seal skin jackets, and sell them. The people of Deering get about 15 oogruks, 30 seals, and about 10 belugas each hunting season. Once again, like you say, that the Deering people oppose the bill.

Senator STEVENS. Well, thank you very much for taking the time. How many of the mammals do you take in Deering, and what type? Do you take seals? Walrus?

Mr. MOTO. Yes. We get about 30 seals a year.

Senator STEVENS. And how many walrus?

Mr. MOTO. We don't get any walrus; just beluga and oogruks.

Senator STEVENS. How many whales?

Mr. MOTO. We get about, each family gets about two whales.

Senator STEVENS. And how many families are there?

Mr. MOTO. Right now, there are about seven families.

Senator STEVENS. Seven families?

Mr. MOTO. Yes.

Senator STEVENS. Fine. Well, we thank you very much. Do you have any questions, Senator Gravel? Thank you very much for your having come to this area and for giving us your views. The next gentleman is the major of Unalakleet. Will you sign the yellow slip, Fred, and——

STATEMENT OF FRED KATCHATAG, MAYOR OF UNALAKLEET

Mr. KATCHATAG. My name is Fred Katchatag, mayor of Unalakleet. Hon. Senator Ted Stevens, Hon. Senator Mike Gravel, we have heard many testimonies today concerning the ocean mammal bill and the diet of our people, the great Eskimo's. I would like to draw your memory back to 1942 or 1943, the time when Muktuk Marston was down here with dog teams organizing the native people to Alaska territorial guides. Now, during this time, this people, the native groups, were known as the eyes and the ears of the U.S. Army, and I think this is a really great name for the people that are protesting against this bill, giving their testimonies to the honorable Senators from the great State of Alaska. I have heard the testimonies all day, and this I have not heard yet, until now. Last fall, or last year, I was elected to the school board from Unalakleet community. When I came down here to Nome for school board meetings, I learned that our schools were teaching this arts and crafts that is so very important to some of our people in schools. Regardless of where you go throughout the world, you will find some students as dropouts from the school, perhaps not on their own fault; we do not know on whose fault, to be honest with you. However, these dropouts from our schools come in very handy with arts and crafts. They learn to

deal with the native stores, known as Alaska Native Inc. Association. This was one of the first organizations that was delegated to the native people here in Alaska, and these people have learned to help their homes up here, and you know how it is up here. We have long winters up here, our days during the winter months are very short, and this is when we need the stove oil and what is necessarily in the home to help our younger generation for their future. They go on to school. When they are in grammar school, they fix themselves so that they can stay in the high school. In high school, they learn to do things that my grandfather didn't know anything about. And this change is coming to life. With a last-minute settlement, I have been involved with the Bering Straits Native Association, with a rule cap, with Norton Sound Health Corp., and I have learned that the education is very important for the native people. This is the only goal we have left today. With arts and crafts being in the market to help our children in this respect as they grow stronger and better in their knowledge with a lot of hardships going through because of the kind of weather we have up here. Even the hunter has a hard time nowadays. This is what our former leader from Unalkleet this morning did not mention. Another thing that he did not mention is that one of the biggest industries we have up here in Alaska is fisheries, especially down here at the lower Yukon on down to Distrovich. We have people down there that have spent so many thousands of dollars a year, and don't you know that the ocean mammal, the biggest and best food they have, is this fish? The biggest industry of Alaska. If the ocean mammal population grows, this fish will start to decrease and this is what we know in nature. When our Creator Created this Alaska. We're located on the top of the globe. When He created us, he created an ocean mammal, He created fish, He created everything that we have up here, and this is why we are here today, to protect ourselves, so that we could be protected here in this part of Alaska. United, and working together, because this land claim settlement is changing our livelihood. What we are here for is to urge these people to delay this bill so that we could better face this bill sometime in the future. Now, could I ask one question?

Senator STEVENS. Yes, Fred.

Mr. KATCHATAG. I would like to ask what will happen if interstate commerce be left out of the bill? Or, is it possible to be left out of the bill?

Senator STEVENS. There are several drafts of the bill. One of the drafts of the bill in the Senate would prohibit the transportation of products made from marine mammals in interstate commerce. That is one of the reasons we are here—to find out how we might take care of this problem.

Mr. KATCHATAG. Is it possible that this bill, I mean, this interstate commerce could be left out of this bill, or wouldn't they compromise in this respect?

Senator STEVENS. We are going to see about that, Fred. At the present time, as I understand the House bill, it would prohibit the transportation of products in interstate commerce, so we have to try to change that bill.

Mr. KATCHATAG. Now, I have also heard one old lady mention seal oil and greens. This struck me very hard as I listened to her testimony. You know, this is very true. Green comes in only once a year, in the early part of the spring. A green is only available to the native for about 5 days, and seal oil is the only way to preserve this green for the winter. If this green is in the seal oil, it will preserve, and you know, if you take that green and eat it, it will last you a longer time than anything else you can eat in your stomach because of the seal oil.

Senator STEVENS. Yes; I thought that was a very good testimony this morning, Fred. That was very interesting. Both Senator Gravel and I did not know that greens were preserved in seal oil. This is a very important think. Regarding your interstate commerce question, we are doing our best, and we feel we will eliminate that. The question is to what extent should this bill leave it possible for large, commercial enterprise. I think they were more directed toward the concept of building up large, commercial enterprise which would increase the demands for taking mammals without regard to food. And, as I understand the testimony here today, no one here is suggesting that the people here today have suggested that mammals should be taken for food, and if they are taken for food, the products should be fully utilizable in any way they want to use them. That's your——

Mr. KATCHATAG. No; my question is just to leave it out. I am not hoping for large industry, industrial, in this respect. Just the best possible way of dealing—I'm not saying that they will be important to other countries but in case there is a very small package that go in that, I mean, you know, I'm not talking any line of a big bundle of—a——

Senator STEVENS. We've got to take a 5-minute break for Jeannie, here.

[Recess.]

Senator STEVENS. Go ahead, Waldo.

STATEMENT OF WALDO BODFISH

Mr. BODFISH. I have only one more question, and this is, "Can we continue arts and crafts on the market?"

Senator STEVENS. Yes; that is our goal, and we will do our best to assure that the right of the Alaska Native to use mammal products in arts and crafts is continued?

Senator GRAVEL. In fact, one of the things important, of course, is this hearing has given us a lot of information today that we did not know about that Ted will be able to use in the committee and the staff has noted and the staff works in the drafting of this legislation. So I think that the fact that the staff was here and our presence here just adds to the likelihood that the bill will be corrected so that it won't do harm to Alaska.

Mr. BODFISH. Now, there might be some likelihood that this bill might be good for some species; we don't know beyond ourselves, you know. There might be some species who are losing the population in some other areas of the world; we don't know, but we have up here the ones I don't think will be in danger from our killing off

all the animals. And another thing that I really didn't go for this morning was to read that book you had up there or whatever you call it, that deal, because I know that about 20 years ago there was a man who came into Unalakleet and he was a bookwriter, and he took a boat, few dogs, a kayak, and old man, and went out to the mouth of the river and kept that boat, the motor, the dogs, and the old man down there for about 4 hours, and I didn't think nothing of it. And after maybe several months, I read this book, and in his book he said he was way out of the reach of the people. And this is not true; it must be that thing you referred to this morning might be from the same research. Thank you.

Senator GRAVEL. You mean to say that we get some phony writers to come up to Alaska?

Senator STEVENS. Thank you very much. The next witness is Irene Itta, who is representing the Fairbanks——

Senator GRAVEL. Come sit up here; you can be the timekeeper. There is a watch for you, right there.

Senator STEVENS. Yes; let me appoint you the official timekeeper. Frank, we just appointed a new timekeeper.

Senator GRAVEL. Only people from Unalakleet can tell time.

Mr. DEGNAN. Thank you for the promotion.

Senator STEVENS. We are happy to have you with us as representative of the Fairbansk Native Association, Miss Itta, particularly at a time when this is being broadcasted into Fairbanks. Yes ma'am. Won't you proceed, please.

STATEMENT OF IRENE ITTA

Miss ITTA. My name is Irene Itta. Thank you, Senator Stevens and Mike Gravel. I wrote a little note here, and I am going to read it.

Although the life of the interior Eskimo have changed towards civilization, we still have not forgotten the taste of the food we were raised on. Many of us married into another race and many of us moved here because of employment. Our husbands got jobs here so we women moved our families here.

I raised my children on the meats and the oils of the sea mammal. I was also raised on the same and so were my parents and their parents and as far back as I can recall. My children are grown up and married and now live in Barrow. I have brothers and sisters in Barrow. They have furnished me with seal oil and meat and other sea mammal meat since I've moved to Fairbanks. My way of life have not changed in Fairbanks as far as my taste for dried meats of the oogruk or the taste for frozen or cooked whale meat. At my home its a daily diet to put seal oil on the table. The women or men who married other from our race come to my home to see if I got something good to eat; they do not mean nonnative food. I have one girl who comes to my house when she gets where nothing looks good to her. Her appetitie has gone. After she has her fill of seal oil and frozen meat or muctuck she tells me now that she has satisfied her craving she will be able to eat nonnative food and not be so picky.

I am representing the interior Eskimos in their support for their fellow Eskimos. Friends and relatives alike. Because if the bill is enacted it will also hurt the Eskimos of the interior.

Although the Eskimos of the interior are removed from the coastal areas we still utilize the hides of the sea mammal for articles of clothing. Some of us still sew and sell our art to local gift shops.

If the bill is enacted it will remove forever part of the Eskimo culture and way of life that can never be replaced.

Senator STEVENS. Thank you very much, Miss Itta. Now isn't your daughter Brenda?

Miss ITTA. No, that is my niece.

Senator STEVENS. Niece?

Miss ITTA. Yes, my husband's brother's daughter.

Senator GRAVEL. Thank you very much.

Senator STEVENS. Thank you very much.

Our next witness is Edwin Punguk, of Golovin.

STATEMENT OF EDWIN PUNGUK

Mr. PUNGUK. It is just about all I can do to write my name. I have had no schooling in my life.

Senator STEVENS. We just want to make sure it is spelled the way you want to spell it. If we spell it the way you put it there in that piece of paper, then we won't be in trouble, you see; that's all. We are happy to have you with us from Golovin.

Mr. PUNGUK. I didn't get you; I am kind of hard of hearing, too, sometimes.

Senator STEVENS. Tell us where you are from.

Mr. PUNGUK. From Golovin. I come from Golovin.

Senator STEVENS. What do you think about this mammal bill?

Mr. PUNGUK. What did I learn?

Senator STEVENS. Tell us what you think about this bill.

Mr. PUNGUK. Well, it is my opinion this Congress is the kind I don't know too well about, but I do understand what is meant. And I heard that over the radio before this, and because I am deeply concerned about it when it talks about the seal business. I am just wondering. You know, in my life, I'll be 80 this fall.

Senator STEVENS. Eighty?

Mr. PUNGUK. Eighty years old. All you people here, before you were born and learn Eskimo—not the Russians, the white man—and everything I have learned in my head. I am not like those other people, and don't have a paper to take along and read to tell the others. I got it in my head and most of it I learned myself. And I learned from my forefather all the hunting to be done and I learned from my forefather than seal hunting is one of the biggest problems in the State of Alaska and especially in this area. Now I know that much; the white man is not a fool. He's got a big head. He sees ahead. I'm just wondering. People out in the States, somebody, wanted to cut this seal hunting business off. I just wondered why. They must have seen something; something I haven't. What? My mother and my son, I oppose that. My own opinion is that I want the seal hunting to be continued for the Eskimo people. Whether somebody like it or not, I am going to say it that way. Because I only got a little more to go, I am going to speak for my people, right here in this part of Alaska. I can understand all the way from Saint Michael to Kivalina. I am not far from life. In fact, I learned

first language, Kivalinan language when I was 2 years old, although I belonged to a fishing tribe, like most of the folks inland. When I came back 5 years later, I picked up my own language. And then from my own, struggled along, and I had no chance for school. My parents passed away before I returned from a school. There you are. Then in my young days, there was no social security or welfare. Somebody seen my mukluks, saw old, loose skin; they seen that hay, straw come out of the bottom of my feet. "Hey, young fella, I got a pair of old boots over there; you take them; yours are too, too, yours are no good. That was welfare for me. And I heard quite a few people testify about the meeting today, and I am just wondering. I wonder all them people understand about the hard labor and work. Maybe half of them didn't know yet. I'd like to see some of those people stay up here summer and winter. What the seal hunting looks like. Seal hunting, seal business is one of the biggest problems for Eskimo people in Alaska. I am going to stick it out, even if I lose! you can't take it some other way, it goes like made, well, I'll stick with it. Of course, I will not make a new law in the time left in my life. I will do what Governor and Senator Bring up, I'll understand, and stay right there with them. I know most of our people working for Alaska, Senators especially, work hard on the problems. A lot of time, they come to failure because they haven't got all the problems. I know they work hard. Look. Sometimes, some reason, you fall off bound from what it was, and you can't help it. Today, I wish I could talk and read so I could go ahead and explain anything to you the right way. But I'm not going to speak all afternoon and all evening because a lot of people have come along to testify, some to look, and I am always pleased to thank you for giving me a chance to say a few words anyway. Thank you.

Senator STEVENS. Thank you very much. And thank you, too, Martin, for convincing our friend to come in. He was wonderful. Edith Sagoonik. Is she here? Hello, Edith. How are you? Good evening.

STATEMENT OF EDITH SAGOONIK

Mrs. SAGOONIK. Good evening. I thank you coming here to hear the story from Eskimo. I live in Nome, Alaska, and I came here in 1960 from the village of Koyuk. I am knowing to; I got a seal oil from my brother, David Ookin, and I also get seal oil from the store, and I get seal, walrus, oogruk, muktuk from the store. I also use seal oil just like medicine. I was raised with seal, and I eat them all the time when I was young. Year-round, we had seal oil in seal poke. We eat seal in any old way. We eat them in different ways. We dry them first and then put them in seal oil. I buy seal skins for sewing and I also sell them from the things I sew. I make slippers, I take orders and sell to just my friends from here and from Anchorage. Most of my friends buy seal meat, oogruk, muktuk, and meat from all the sea mammals from the store. These meats are sold mostly in native stores. My father long ago hunted and my brother hunts now. My brother hunts seal, and whale, in Norton Bay. I also get seal and seal oil every year. My seal oil lasts practically the whole winter. The seal oil and grease from whales are the best foods

for us Eskimo. When God created the whole world, He made the seal for Eskimo's. All the other sea mammals and fish, too. If I could not buy it anyways, other meat like muktuk and oogruk, it would be really tough as we are not used to white man's food and get tired of it real quick. That's all I have to say.

Senator STEVENS. Thank you very much, Edith. Where do you sell these things you make?

Mrs. SAGOONIK. I don't really sell them for some time now. Just once in a while when I have a little order from here, Nome, and from Anchorage.

Senator STEVENS. Very fine.

Mrs. SAGOONIK. Uh-huh.

Senator STEVENS. Thank you very much for taking the time to share your thoughts with us and for the trip back and forth. Mr. Kowalsky, will you give it to the young lady? Edith, thank you very much. You are speaking for the Fairbanks Environmental Center, Mr. Kowalsky?

STATEMENT OF JAMES KOWALSKY

Mr. KOWALSKY. Yes, that's right, Senator Stevens. I was mistakingly registered for Friends of the Earth, and I will explain that very quickly.

My name is James Kowalsky. Although I am employed by Friends of the Earth as its Arctic regional conservation representative, I also serve as executive director of the Fairbanks Environmental Center, located in downtown Fairbanks at 529 Fifth Avenue.

The Environmental Center is a community supported, informational clearinghouse with a membership from the Fairbanks area and from interior Alaska. Its board of directors has asked that I travel here today to both learn some more about the views of the natives of this region who use ocean mammals for subsistance and for commercial uses in their arts and crafts work, and to make a statement to the committee for the center on the subject of legislation and other aspects of the protection of sea mammals.

The Fairbanks Environmental Center supports the protection of ocean mammals under a careful management program and it fully recognizes and supports the continued use by Alaskan Natives of these mammals for subsistence and commercial arts and crafts in their cottage industry.

We certainly realize that the continued use of ocean mammals by natives is generally consistent with such management. We believe that blanket legislation for all mammals, such as that proposed in the Senate, does not treat each species according to the specific problems and needs of that particular mammal.

This is our main point, Senator Gravel and Senator Stevens. Whether it be management by the State or the Federal Government, each species must be treated separately. It may well be that new regulations and/or moratoria might be necessary in the case of one or another ocean mammal. And, again, we of the Environmental Center—area citizens of the interior, some of whom are oldtimers, support continued use by Alaskan Natives of these mammals as I outlined before.

I do not believe that the current legislation is adequate. Another reason is that this legislation does not address a very real threat to the mammals, those who depend upon them and other Alaskans. I speak of the erosion of the quality of mammal and human habitat in Alaska caused by pollution and other abuse and misuse of the air, land and waters of Alaska brought about by carelessness, poor—or no—land planning, and poor laws or no laws which do or should deal with these matters.

As an example of the extreme abuse which constitutes the erosion of habitat and threatens the quality of human life in Alaska, permit me to cite an example of misuse of the Alaska land.

I speak of the underground nuclear test explosion of Amchitka Island, part of a wildlife refuge which was set up to protect the habitat forland animals, sea mammals, fish, and birds. The test, conducted by our Federal Government, threatened nearby native lives, it destroyed some habitat and possibly killed more than 1,000 sea otters. And, with a sealed glass chamber now below that island in the Aleutian chain of islands, dangerous radioactive wastes now reside and will continue to do so for perhaps thousands of years.

The danger is still there. These are the kinds of misuses and abuses which we want each of you to address yourselves to, because the kinds of destruction which such tests invite are those kinds of things building up and repeating themselves in our State over a period of time, which will ultimately destroy animal species and perhaps, native and non-native people.

I want to thank Senator Stevens for his opposition to that particular Amchitka explosion which he announced last fall, I believe and Senator Gravel for his very hard work and staff cooperation in attempting to stop this particular abuse of Alaskan land.

But, gentlemen, the marine mammals legislation doesn't address itself to the poisoning and polluting of habitat. With good management practices, our mammals will likely survive and we urge the Senate and the full Congress through the Conference Committee, to give us legislation which reflects this.

I also call your attention to the need to support the Alaska Department of Fish and Game in their capable efforts to give us such solid management programs. Those could combine with Federal management programs. We need to support and encourage the Alaska Department of Fish and Game to give us that management for marine mammals. It might be true that, such as the case of another valuable fur bearer, the gray wolf—that the Department needs encouragement to give us good management.

In any case, I ask that you work for a revised bill and that you fully devote yourselves to helping us protect the land, air, and waters of Alaska, because these are the things which will protect native life styles, marine mammals, wildlife, and our fisheries.

I thank you very much for coming and also for allowing me to speak to you both and to the natives of this community.

Senator GRAVEL. Thank you and your rights and your suppositions which we will use in testimony as a wedge in Washington to try to convince the people there that we have broad support. Thank you very much.

Senator STEVENS. Thank you very much. I, too, think it is very fine that someone from Fairbanks has taken the time to come over and help us on this. Our next witness is Martha Aiken.

STATEMENT OF MARTHA AIKEN

Mrs. AIKEN. Senator Stevens, Senator Gravel, ladies, brothers, and sisters, ladies and gentlemen. my name is Martha Aiken a full-blooded Eskimo, born and raised at Barrow, a housewife and a mother, recently started teaching our Eskimo dialect to the seventh, eighth, and ninth graders to read, write, and speak it. We realize the importance of our Eskimo culture our dialect and striving to help the young generation to get it back! Right now more and more of our young people are gradually speaking it in their work, play, and even in school. And, we hope not only to recapture the dialect but work on Eskimo books to be edited and published. We have such high hopes for the future and will need the support of our mother country, the U.S.A., and its Congress. Surely like a mother she is to Alaska and Alaska just a few years a State. God give her wisdom to rule her children well, with love and understanding heart! And the child longing and looking up to her with expectant hopes to receive of what she asks of! You see other countries, as other children, gobble more of the candy when your child had only one and your child is blamed who had only one candy—blamed that she had finished the candy! Will you help her or will you take her only one candy as well? Alaska had lived and survived all the hardship of life way before it was sold to the United States and so has the hunter hunts with sheer courage and skills. What about the hunter's wife? A woman has her skills all her own—she's the one who sews all the warm clothes for the hunter—raised her children, cooks the meals, stores and dries all the meat, drying every skin of animals that her husband had killed—she's the one that cuts up the ringed seal—stores the meat, cuts up the blubber for seal oil, scrapes and stretches the skin to dry!

There are several different uses for ringed seal. If she needs a real poke to put away the blubber in—she picks out a smaller seal, cuts it through the head, turns it inside out, take out the meat, scrapes it and blow it like a balloon to dry, and make sure no air comes out and rubs it with its blood and hang it to dry. Should she need a white bleached skin, she works on that in certain part of the year and in a different way! She's the one who dries, scrapes, and sews the caribou skin to all sizes of clothing for the family. Every bit of caribou meat is tasty. The head is the best part for an eskimo. Sinews are made from the legs and also from the back. Its legs killed in wintertime are best for warm winter boots. Ugruk skins for boot soles. Walrus meat is delicious fresh or fermented.

And, the important and much sought after with much courage and skill is the priceless bowhead whale. The largest and the tastiest! Every part of the whale can be eaten. Many a man goes without sleep just to be blessed with a whale. A man with or without a job. When whale is caught there is much happiness and a means of our livelihood. All meat is taken ashore, no matter how rough the road to shore may be. And, once taken, to the village, it is stored away in

large hard dugged cellars. (So it is never spoiled or wasted all year round. To this day, 11 whales are killed at Barrow, but by the end of the year, not one piece of muktuk will be left. No wonder some call us the "blubber eaters." But we're not ashamed to be called as such because we can't live without oil, as more jobs are available more modern methods are used for hunting, but still meat and oil is our main diet. Though everybody thinks we're living modern these days, from a strangers point of view. They never get closely acquainted with an eskimo family enough to see what our main diet consist of.

There are white in our villages, but they don't go to our homes to eat with us and therefore they don't know what we eat and live on.

And, it isn't chicken and steaks daily, although we do have those occasionally. In fact, we can't afford the store bought meat for very long! We depend more on the animals on sea and on land for our main diet. Think for a minute. Let the eskimo cut all eskimo diet and seal oil for a year! You know what would become of us? They'd either lose weight so much our skilled hunters would become as frail women. Or gain so much weight trying to satisfy their gnawing stomachs for eskimo food. Could you imagine the pangs or their thirst for oil and meat? Now, if our whites were commanded to quit raising chicken and cattle, and start eating only vegetables and fruit, well, that's how miserable it would be for an oil and meat eating eskimo. If our livelihood and our diet of centuries are taken away from us—what's the use of being called an eskimo? Whats the use of trying to recapture our eskimo culture which is fast dying anyway! If this bill is passed and accepted what we are trying to recapture now will be completely destroyed. And once destroyed and lost who will recapture it after us?

I'm proud to be an eskimo and to say I can speak, read and write the dialect. Once I heard a teenager from Kotzebue personally say to me "It's awful to be an eskimo and don't understand or speak the language." Are we to be eskimos in name only though we look like eskimos? Or will you help us recapture our culture, customs, traditons, and our dialect? Right now, eskimos are on the edge of nowhere balancing to keep their culture.

Will you be the one to balance the scale? Or will you be the ones to push us down. I pray to God that this is not so!!

Senator STEVENS. We join you in that, Mrs. Aiken. I want to thank you and all the people of Barrow for the kindness you showed to my wife and Mrs. Dalton; they were up there last week, and they had a very good time. I enjoyed your whale feast, and I understand that it was a very good party. You were all very kind to us. Thank you very much. Mike, do you have any questions?

Senator GRAVEL. Thanks very much, and I join you in that last prayer.

Senator STEVENS. The next witness is Jerome Trigg. Mr. Trigg appears before us as the official representative of the Bering Straits Native Association. I am happy to have you with us tonight, and you may proceed with your statement in anyway you wish.

STATEMENT OF JEROME TRIGG, PRESIDENT OF BERING STRAITS NATIVE ASSOCIATION AND ARCTIC NATIVE, NOME, ALASKA, BROTHERHOOD

Mr. TRIGG. Thank you. Mr. Chairman, the committee, I am Jerome Trigg, president of the Bering Straits Native Association, and president of Arctic Native Brotherhood. I welcome this group in behalf of our eskimo people, who have taken valuable time to hear the people who are largely dependent on the product of the sea for subsistance.

From time immemorial, the native of Bering Straits region was organized and had hunting boundaries. A boundary that existed as if a wall or fence was there, with hunting seasons to preserve the game. Much like the modern day law.

Although we had boundaries, hunting and fishing rules and water rights for generations, at this time and age we have no voice in fish and game boards.

We are alarmed and disturbed by the mammal bill being proposed in Congress. Many of our people's sole subsistence come from the product of the mammal of our sea. There is very little employment in our Bering Straits villages. The ones that are capable of working have moved to larger towns in search of work. Those at home are largely dependent on sea mammals for food and byproducts such as skins, ivory, bones, to make clothes, mukluks and other items to be sold, to buy items such as snow machines, outboard motors, coffee, flour, sugar, milk, tea, and other food they have come accustomed to since the coming of other races.

Walrus tusks are used to make tools and jewelry, much of which is sold to tourists who contribute tourist dollars to help the economy of the State.

Without this form of subsistance undue hardship would be handed to the Eskimo people of our area. The culture of our people is greatly threatened by this act. Hunting and fishing is our way of life. From the day that we were able to walk, we are taught the fine points of hunting, to preserve the game. Good hunters were the idols of the young and many were and are leaders of the villages. Our boys and girls look up to good hunters, such as the other races look up to good ballpayers or other great atheletes. Many celebrations mark the end or the beginning of each hunting season. Having very little growing season we are primarily meat eaters. We want to be able to eat the meat we are raised up on. Since the Fish and Game Department says the sea mammals are steadily increasing, we feel that these northern waters are in no jeopardy. We also would like some commercial use for our product, so our people whose way of life is hunting and fishing, not for sport, but for every day living may be able to utilize some of the more modern facilities that are available.

I am not going to give figure of dollars and cents. I know that some of the testimony will bring this out. This is like telling farmers, "You cannot farm anymore, only eat, you cannot sell your products," and coal miners, "You can only dig enough to heat your house, don't sell any." Many older natives have come to me to look for help, help to preserve their way of life. "What could I tell

them?" Only thing I could tell them was, their Congressmen are human. Pray for them. I know that these natives have been praying that the people in the legislative hall be given guidance, guidance that they not forget the little people of the North. Though they do not even know how to write, they are honest and contribute in their little way in carving, sewing, and tourist entertaining. They are good people by standard law and word of God, they are honest and look to the great white father for help. Their hopes are in you gentlemen who are here today. They have never run from the call of duty. These men have been in the arms when our shores were threatened by the enemy, young and old alike. They didn't object, desert, they didn't burn draft cards. You didn't even need draft cards, they were ready. Today their sons are serving in many parts of the world. I am sorry I went off the track a little, I wanted to let you know what kind of people this law would affect.

Even today some of our people are out in the sea looking for game to bring home. When one crew gets game we will eat. First few loads are usually given away to others who are less fortunate and didn't have luck. The children's first game is given to widows or elders.

Just to be able to eat the blubber and meat would not be enough, we must be able to sell mammal products to get other commodities to pay taxes and utilities. We must keep the hands and minds busy. In the evening and days when we cannot hunt.

I know you have said what parts of animal is used. Wish I could tell you its a long and true story. Let me tell you what is left behind. The contents of the intestine, approximately 2 feet of the lower tract and the bile.

Whether its food, clothes, tools, hunting gear, or boats, you name it. It's the way of life in a harsh and desolete country, where at times there is no landmark, not a willow or grass to go by, short days and snowstorms.

Let us give these people full consideration. Let us think how we can help them. Only one village has cold storage to preserve meat and fish. If all village had cold storage facilities much spoilage would be avoided. More trading could be done. As different kind of sea mammal are more abundant in diffrent areas, and fish and other products in other areas these could be traded or sold to each other. This has been a harsh winter for our native due to weather and ice condition very little game has been taken.

During my lifetime animal have been given more right than native both on land and sea. We have a feeling that we have our back against the wall. Even my family eats at least two meal a week of native food, 4 days a week meat from animals of western Alaska, 1 day a week food from lower 48.

Killer whales kill many animal, even large whales, yet there seem like nothing is done to keep their population down. May I thank you gentlemen for listening to us. Thank you.

Senator STEVENS. Thank you very much, Jerome. A very good statement. A nice point about the killer whale, too. Al Naka. Al. Betty Jean Hoogendorn, of Nome.

Mrs. HOOGENDORN. Senators Gravel and Stevens, ladies and gentlemen, my name is Betty Jean Hoogendorn.

STATEMENT OF BETTY JEAN HOOGENDORN

I am 23 years old, a graduate of Mount Edgecumbe, married and the mother of two children. I was raised in Golovin and White Mountain. Nome is now my home. My family uses seal meat and oil that we buy at the store and get from my family at Golovin.

My statement concerns the importance of sea mammals in the patterns and processes of the modern society and economy of the Eskimo people. The sea mammals associated with this statement are primarily seal and walrus, with only a short comment about whales. The statement pertains to northern life today, and is not to be interpreted as a plea to maintain the poverty aspects of the present, or to move backward for sentimental or romantic reasons. Rather, I am starting from now and look forward to what can be reasonably forecast for the next 20 or 30 years. This is the period when we will see the results of the great changes that are coming to us now through the Native Settlement Act. For this reason, comments on the use of sea mammals are restricted to how people use them, now. The practice of using this meat for dog food has nearly ceased, since few dog teams remain and there will probably be fewer and fewer in the coming years.

The sea mammal harvest for the Eskimos of village Alaska involves both the society and the economy. It thus becomes a part of the total socioeconomic balance of all people who live in coastal Alaska from Kuskokwin Bay to Barter Island. Cash that is paid in Point Hope to a 76-year-old Eskimo lady for the mukluk soles she made from oogruk skin caught near Kotzebue by a relative, may end up in the till of a caucasian owned store at Point Barrow, Nome, or Fairbanks. The seal meat sold to a village store provides cash for the hunter to buy coffee, tea, sugar, or other foods in a direct cash transaction and that money flows through local banks until it reaches Seattle.

In the past, as now, the basic staple foods are fish, sea mammal meats and oils, caribou (or reindeer), and wild greens. The seal oil is both a food and a preservative, being used for storing greens, fish, and meat. These are supplemented with any and all of the foods that any other Americans use, but in the villages processed foods are extremely costly. Those foods that are not really needed, are in short supply. Fresh meat is seldom seen as the cost of shipping in meat or fish of any kind would literally remove such foods from most family tables.

For some villages seal is the main meat, for others it is walrus. Whale, except for Beluga, is a main meat source only when there is a plentiful supply. Walrus, also a seasonal harvest, is stored for yearround use. Otherwise, seal, the sea mammal that is dependable throughout the year provides the meat and fats counted upon to feed the family.

The by-products of sea mammals are equally as important as the meat. Skins, pelts, and membranes are used for clothing, some household articles, and special cultural items like dance drums. The bones, teeth (or tusk), hides, and pelts form the only raw materials for a widespread cottage industry. This has a much greater dollar value then is generally recognized. The inventory value of these items

exchanged through Eskimo ANICA facility probably represents less than 50 percent of this type of income that is derived by Eskimos in the villages. Many families are dependent upon the goods or cash brought into their homes through an established pattern of trade particularly related to the seal harvest. The pattern of places like St. Lawrence Island that emphasize walrus harvest more than seal is similar except the exchange of ivory adds greater income.

Some regulation and control of sea mammal harvest for the benefit of all men may be indicated at this time; but it must be a fair regulation that recognizes the overwhelming importance of sea mammals to the Eskimo way of life.

The records of more than 50 years of scientific investigation relating to the evolution of the Eskimo culture are extensive. Books by people like Wendell Oswalt, Dorothy J. Ray, and George Hans-Bondi will back up my concluding statements:

1. Eskimo culture took form and reached its peak efficiency along the northern Alaskan coast—particularly on and around the Seward Peninsula—some 1,800 years ago, and functioned in balance with the environment until that environment was disrupted by a heavy influx of others.

2. In order for a life-style to be classified as "Eskimo culture" the harvest of sea mammals must be woven into the very framework of the fabric of daily life. Once sea mammal harvest ceases to play a basic part in the village socioeconomic scheme, the residents will shortly become people of Eskimo descent since much of the essence of being "Eskimo" will be lost.

3. Thus, at this time, to deny the Eskimo people the right to harvest sea mammals as a primary source of livelihood at the village level is to break the bonds of the social and economic lifeline that presently provides ethnic identification, community and individual pride.

Senator STEVENS. Thank you very much. It was a very good statement.

Mrs. HOOGENDORN. And, I'd thank you for coming up to Nome to hear our people.

Senator STEVENS. We're happy to be here. Myrtle Johnson? Good evening.

STATEMENT OF MYRTLE JOHNSON

Mrs. JOHNSON. Good evening. Thank you, Senators Stevens and Gravel.

Senator STEVENS. Tell us about the signs, before you give us your statement.

Mrs. JOHNSON. Well, I wrote quite a lengthly page, here, if you would like me to read off all who helped in meeting you at the airplane, et cetera?

Senator STEVENS. That would be very nice.

Mrs. JOHNSON. Mr. Carl Melten of FAA, Mr. Bob Davis of the B.I.A., Mr. Stan Harhut, the Galleghers, Tommy Johnson provided transportation and a host of many good friends were out to meet you, this morning. The welcome sign that we had waiting for you, at the field, which read, Welcome for the Mammal Bill Hearings, U.S. Senator Ted Stevens and U.S. Senator Mike Gravel, was done

up by the teen center members under the direction of Joe and Sumner Putnum. The Chamber of Commerce planned the no-host dinner under the direction of Oscar Covillo, the president of our local chamber, which is the Northwest Chamber. And, we wish to thank all those who helped in every way, the radio station, KICY and KNOM who did a great job. For many weeks, helping along this line with the Mammal bill. All the State and Federal agencies and all the Sisterhoods and Brotherhoods A.N.B. of Alaska and all the villages who participated, a big thank you to all of you.

Senator STEVEN:. Thank you very much. Now we would like to have your statement.

Mrs. JOHNSON. Okay. U.S. Senators Mike Gravel and Ted Stevens, thank you for coming so far to hear our testimony concerning the Mammal bill.

I am a resident of Nome, and was born and raised in the village of Golovin. I have listened to the testimony today. I believe it might be helpful to the Congressmen to understand better our need for sea mammal harvest if I give an example. I will draw from people I know personally to paint an imaginary picture based upon the truth.

John and Mary are in their mid-50's. John works part-time seasonally in casual labor, and they care for four foster children plus one grandchild. John is a successful seal hunter. He also catches Beluga. If he had a chance, he would join a crew and hunt black whale as well. This would bring him a share of meat and muktuk—something his family otherwise must buy at $3 per pound or receive as a gift that will obligate him to return in some other form.

John's family depends heavily upon sea mammal meat and oil all year long. The spring greens are stored in fresh seal oil, some of this being sent to family and friends living in the cities. The meat is dried, frozen, or in other ways preserved for the time when it is not so plentiful.

Mary skins the small seals at home. John skins the large ones near the kill site so the meat can be cut up and carried home. The skins will end up as mukluks, parkas, parka-pants, and vests for the family, as well as surplus skins or garments to be sold or traded to others. Both raw and stretched, skins are a source of income and add to the internal welfare system of their village.

John's wife will sell some articles she makes directly to others, and some at the village store. Some things she will give to the church or school to raise funds. If John carves, he will earn some cash from the tusks he has taken, or those he has gotten from other hunters.

Not all men in a village hunt seal. Some are working or cannot hunt for other reasons. In every village a certain amount of sea-mammal meat, oil, and skins are purchased by nonhunters. This stretches their food dollars. A portion of the village sea-mammal harvest is always provided for the poor or the aged in a fashion that is in keeping with village traditions.

The sea-mammal harvest is directly tied to cash-flow from the village levels through the State banking system. Guns, ammunition, gasoline, oil, boats, snow machines, clothing, and equipment are purchased for the hunt through local stores. The trade of meat and byproducts eventually becomes a cash transaction, so this contributes

to cash flow as well. At small village level the contribution to the local cash economy is not particularly obvious, but it is there. An example can be found regarding the exchange of seal oil. Solid vegetable fat costs from $1.75 to $2.50 per 3 pounds. Vegetable oil costs from $1.30 to $2 per quart. Some families simply cannot afford such prices. They can trade seal oil with a nonhunter family for vegetable fats or other processed foods that necessarily must be bought at the store.

Beef and pork, seldom carried at a village store, must be priced 25 percent to 50 percent higher than at the outlets with jet flight service. Thus, the importance of a local meat harvest cannot be underestimated. Without the meats and oils, many families would be without this basic food in their diet.

The price of commercially made boots and clothes for hunting or the fabrics to construct them is still too high for most ordinary village families even if they preferred to use them. Many hunters feel traditional clothing is more practical and efficient than store clothes when it comes to protection from the harsh climate and stormy waters. The use of all types of seal skins for making clothes plays more than economic role in the family. It is often viewed as a part of the necessities for survival when hunting, fishing, guiding or working as casual hire on local jobs.

At many villages the rhythm of life is rooted in the sea mammal hunting seasons. Most nonnative people are familiar with the organization and festivities associated with whaling (and to some extent with walrus hunting). This is seasonal, since it depends upon natural migration of the animals. People are not as familiar with the overall effect that continuing seal harvest has on every coastal village.

Caucasians speak of bread as the staff of life. For coastal Eskimos the seal represents the single basic food staple with all the meanings others may associate with bread. What would happen if urban America suddenly faced the possibility that all the bakeries might be closed on short notice? The emotional and economic upset resulting from such action would be similar to what people in the North feel they face through the far reaching effects of closure or partial closure of sea mammal hunting for them.

To take away our Eskimo bread is to deny the men and women of the villages the right to work to meet their needs as they see them and can mean the final end of our way of life before we are fully adapted to the modern world.

I would like to add, with my experience with the reindeer business, when our men of say, 10 to 15 in 1 day will slaughter 60 to 70 reindeer, if they have their Eskimo food, greens or if they have their seal oil to eat with the reindeer meat that we cook for them, they can last a lot longer in the seal oil and they are happier.

Senator STEVENS. Thank you very much, Myrtle. Do you have any questions, Senator Gravel?

Senator GRAVEL. No; thank you, that was a very good statement.

Senator STEVENS. We appreciate your coming and we also appreciate your giving credit to those people who helped organize the welcome and the facilities for the use of the committee.

Mrs. JOHNSON. Thank you.

Senator STEVENS. We will now hear from Charles Hurd. Charles Hurd. Mr. Hurd is the representative of the Alaska Fish and Game.

STATEMENT OF CHARLES HURD

Mr. HURD. Senator Stevens, Senator Gravel, ladies and gentlemen, and guests of Nome. I am Charles Hurd, a fisheries biologist for the State of Alaska. In summary, I'm going to discuss, briefly three basic questions concerning this legislation. This first is philosophical with some flag waving, but, why not, it's a good flag. The second, who should manage these sea mammal resources and the third concerns certain fishery resources which are the basic food supply of many marine mammals. Historically, our country has been noted for its individualism. The United States of America, the place where the people have the opportunity and the freedom to go from rags to riches or, if they so desire, from riches to rags. As most of us here are aware, Alaska probably has the greatest number of individualists per capita of any State in the Union. By that I mean people who don't fit a standard pattern, nonconformists. This is a healthy condition. These are people that care. Individualists in some ways are primitive. The most primitive people that I have met are the happiest. The sea mammal as passed by the House seems to disregard this individuality. One effect of this bill would be to try to cram some of our Alaskan individualists through the knothole of conformity. This would be a crime against the basic tenets on which our country was founded. How do we conformists obtain and enhance our manhood? We bring money home. The more the better. We obtain positions of power or jobs that we enjoy. We climb the highest mountain, we break the Olympic record or we jump 20 cars on a motor cycle or we kill the biggest moose. How does a man in a small Alaskan village without a job fulfill himself? The answer, in many cases is by hunting and providing for himself and others. Do we have the right to arbitrarily destroy even a portion of any man, by law? Not if he is observing the rights of others, we definitely do not. The second, who should manage these sea mammal resources. The generality of this legislation puzzles me. We've heard several analogies about chickens and cattle, good analogies, so, I will use it one more time. Does a farmer manage his flock of Rhode Island chickens the same as he does his Herford cattle? Of course not, yet this bill proposes to manage all sea mammals, with some interesting exceptions the same way, by referendum. It is my firm belief that the sea mammals should be managed on an individual species basis. This is a point that has been stressed at this hearing. And, that the management programs should be established and run by people trained to do the work, biologists. Certainly, there should be checks and balances. The game biologists are answerable to the legislature and to the people for the work they do. A few dedicated biologists in Alaska cover a lot of territory. Maybe appropriations to hire more men and fund more programs should be increased instead of being curtailed or maintained at a basic minimum level. Like the old sign in the store says I don't loan and the bank doesn't sell potatoes. Let the trained personnel concerned do the job. The third and

final comment concerns the basic life history of some of our sea mammals. The diet of many sea mammals, such as beluga whales and various seals is fish. The diet of others, such as the killer whale, consists of other sea mammals, the belugas and the seals, a chain effect. The chain of life in the sea which starts with habitat protection has been mentioned. Without the proper habitat, you have nothing. I have heard no mention of this basic diet of the sea mammals. Referring to the publication preceding the 18th annual meeting of the Internation Pacific Fisheries Commission, a meeting held in Anchorage, Alaska on November 1st through the 5th, 1971, portions of this publication, and it's a thick one, refer to foreign fisheries, fisheries in competition for Bering Sea stock. This is wide open exploitation. A lot of this fishing effort is around the Pribilof Islands where one of exempt large sea harvests is made. We'll go briefly over some of the summaries of these catches. To give an idea of what the North American effort there is, in 1963, there were 104 Canadian and American vessels fishing in the Bering Sea for halibut. In 1971, there were 15, as of July 31; 19, in 1970, the year before; that was total. In 1971, the Soviet fisheries around the Pribilof Islands took over 100,000 metric tons of herring. I'll read fishery totals for the Japan Bering Sea Fishery. In 1968, they took 863,666 metric tons. In 1969, 1,077,915 metric tons. In 1970, 1,426,661 metric tons.

Senator STEVENS. We've made that record of the hearing in the record in Washington, I hope if you have any other details we can have it, but——

Mr. HURD. Yes.

Senator STEVENS. We've tried to point out that the increased Japanese and Russian and Korean fisheries are depleting the fish stock of the very mammals that we are now going to stop harvesting. Because of this, some of them are going to starve and probably will be the mammals that die if they continue fishing at that rate. Of course, we would like to stop them fishing at that rate. But, we can't get hoisted with our own petard, with the mammals bill. We can't use the Russian and Japanese and Korean fishing as an excuse for something that's going to go on forever because we're trying to stop it. I hope you understand our problem in that regard.

Mr HURD. Yes. The herring stock seems to be the most highly exploited. They are a very rich fish. They have just recently tried to start the commercial utilization of herring in Norton Sound and, possibly this year we'll get something going up by Kotzebue. These herring are the ones that winter near Pribilof where this foreign fishing effort is taking place. Every effort should be made to a treaty to properly manage these fisheries and the basic food supply for many marine mammals. On behalf of the people here, we wish you a good journey and success.

Senator STEVENS. Thank you very much, Mr. Hurd.

Senator GRAVEL. Thank you.

Senator STEVENS. And, now we will hear from Tommy Johnson of Nome.

STATEMENT OF TOMMY JOHNSON

Mr. JOHNSON. Senator Stevens, Senator Gravel, members of the committee. I have a statement. I am Thomas Johnson of Nome, I am

a commercial fisherman from time to time, from Bristol Bay to the Norton Sound. My family owns and operates Northwest Reindeer Processing Co., Inc. Reindeer is meat also. I have heard all day long of the sea mammal bill. You have heard much today of the importance of the sea mammal harvest to the Eskimo. There are about 30,000 Eskimos in Alaska. Most of these people live in northern villages. Those that live in the northern villages, those that live in the cities, still need the food that we are used to. I have some figures to relate to Nome. Only just a few Eskimos here can hunt seal for the table. Their relations in the villages can supply enough muktuk meat to meet the needs so we can have the seal mammal meat for the sale in the local stores. In 1971, in the Nome stores, approximately 35,000 pounds of meat were sold. This included coke, half-dried, walrus, seal oil, and oogruk meat. We do not know the dollar value of this, but it sells for about 75¢ a pound. This meat is sold to people who cannot hunt but who are luckier than the other city dwellers because they can buy the food they need. There are about 2,400 people in Nome; some 2,000 are Eskimos. This figures out to the average of nearly 18 pounds per Eskimo man, woman, and child sold over the counter. This does not account for thousands of pounds that are sent from the villages as gifts, barter, or direct sale. Some of these sea mammal meats sold in the villages, stores in places like Barrow and Kotzebue, but the value is nothing, as much as Nome. Meat and oil are supplied for the stores to provide the sick, the aged, the foster homes, and the women who head households associated with hunters. There is no way to estimate the amount of meat sent to friends at the native hospital in Anchorage and Kotzebue. Our old folks and our sick must have the native food if they are to be happy and become healthy. All of us who live in the North require the sea mammal's meats and fats to stay healthy. Over centuries, our fathers have adapted to the oily fish, and fat meats. We harvest, and we have learned that we must have this type of food to stay healthy and active. Our daily life calls for the heavy physical labor and great exertion. We do not believe that the beef and pork can supply our body needs any more than other vegetable fats can. I believe the medical research in AMS Hospital will back us up. Reindeer and caribou cannot, anymore than the caribou do from further. They all had to have the sea mammals fat, even the people of Anatuvik Pass who hold to different ways of life. They will trade caribou skins to the Barrow people for fats. Reindeer and caribou fats cannot be rendered out to be used in so many ways like the sea mammal's oil. Approximately two-thirds of the coastline of the United States flag surrounds Alaska. Only a small portion of the coastline supports the Eskimo population. They Eskimos are economically sound day, and within every means of the term "culture" upon the sea mammal harvest. Some groups of people feel that the sea mammals are being extinct. I feel this is just the other way around. The extincts of rights to harvest as a basic supply means the extinction of the people, the Eskimo. Thank you.

Senator Stevens. Thank you, Tommy. We appreciate your making a statement. Would you give the statement to Miss Rice, so we can make sure we have got it completely?

Mr. Johnson. You want it? I already gave her a copy.

Senator STEVENS. Very good. We appreciate it very much. Thank you. I have been told again that the Diomede people are here. Did the Diomede people get here? I have not seen them. Thank you very much. We'll put it in the record. We have missed from time to time, and we get a note saying someone's here, and the next time we call them, they are not here. It is my understanding that we have heard from every village that wanted to have a representative testify, and each association. And now we have to finish up the Alaska Council on Economic Development. Are they here? Are they all awake?

STATEMENT OF LYNN CHAMBERS

LYNN CHAMBERS. I'm Lynn Chambers, and rather than take time and duplicate what Gabriel Gely from Shishmaref is going to talk about, I will submit my written statement and present you Gabriel Gely.

Although interstate commerce is important to today's arts and crafts, it is going to become even more important in the future as fine arts are developed in the villages of Alaska using as raw materials primarily whalebone. Community Enterprise Development Corporation of Anchorage, an OEO funded development agency, has employed Gabriel Gely, a well-noted French artist who spent 17 years in the Canadian Arctic assisting in the development of the fine art work that is now coming out of Northern Canada. He is now residing in Shishmaref working with the people and developing fine art work such as you see here. To sell these in the Alaskan market alone would be quite tragic. The people in Shishmaref and in future similar village projects would not receive the dollar value for these products that could be generated in the fine arts markets in both the "lower 48" and internationally.

The project in Shishmaref, if it proves successful after market testing planned for November on the east coast will be expanded to include as many other villages as we can find artists and funds to support. In developing fine arts, we must, at the same time, locate fine arts markets which are willing to pay the much higher prices that these kinds of pieces will demand.

The Alaskan market for fine arts is quite small. Alaska is a very small State when you consider size by population, and there are very few people here who will appreciate the esthetic value of these prices as well as be willing and able to pay the higher fine arts prices. We have had these prices evaluated by Alaskans and they have appraised them at 40 to 60 percent less than we anticipate receiving at the first showing in November.

I believe that the Alaskan market can be cultivated, but only after the value has been placed on these items in a fine arts market such as you find in San Francisco, New York, Georgetown, London, Paris, and so forth. It would be exceedingly difficult to start and stay in Alaska.

And in Gab Gely's words, "the only exportable commodity of many Alaskan villages is the creativity of the people within them." Let's not squelch the beginning of something with as much potential as this promises by closing off the market before we even get there."

Senator STEVENS. Thank you very much, Lynn.

STATEMENT OF GABRIEL GELY

Mr. GELY. I'm Gabriel Gely, from Paris, France. I was raised in Paris and came in Canada in 1952. I spent 17 years in the Canadian arctic working as a CLOC Development Officer, and I have been in Alaska since July 1971. I will only express my personal opinion. I think the point has been well taken and well, and the position has been well articulated by the various parties that have been speaking here today. I will refer to the statement of Lynn Chambers, to begin with. Aside from the subsistence resources that is gotten from the sea mammals, with the often cut, we deal mainly with the byproducts; in other words, I take it from you gentlemen that there will be no restriction about game. Am I correct? That there will be no restrictions for subsistence by the native to harvest——

Senator STEVENS. For personal use; for personal consumption.

Mr. GELY. But there will be some restriction, would they?

Senator STEVENS. Not for subsistence, or personal consumption.

Mr. GELY. Not for personal consumption. Fine. Then, this brings me to the point of how could we possibly feel a restriction on the byproducts then? That this could possibly meet with no sense of logic, when, in one hand, we are teaching not to waste the flesh of the animal and, at the same time, advocate the waste of the byproduct. I don't think anyone could possibly endorse such an opposition. Because, it appears to me that one of the responsibilities of the Congress is to legislate. Another responsibility to be discharged by this same government is to offer a substitute to the people for loss or losses that could be incurred. This brings me to the arts and crafts that are made from the byproducts of sea mammals. I have brought a few samples to point out to your attention that a lot of this material has been laying on the beach and that indiscriminatory legislation banning the blanket tide that you have mentioned, in passing, a few times would discriminate against products made from the materials that have been laying on the beaches for the last few thousand years. Therefore, they should be, as I do, endorsing the amendments that have been suggested, that the natives be left alone as to the use of the byproducts. It is their very right to do with the flesh and skin what they want and with the byproducts just as well. I think they have put this across very well to you, and I want to only give more strength to their view because the arts and crafts are more than a few dollars that have been too often suggested. It seems that a little thing that we have never been able to tamper with; it is only people like yourself buying eskimo crafts from the eskimo people from and within the villages can understand the value of the crafts beyond the $1, 2, and $5. And it is something that we cannot tamper with; I think our group has already tampered with the work of the sea and this tampering has proved a rather costly experience, and now we cannot possibly penalize the natives for using the byproducts of the game that they are entitled to get from the sea. I would like to point out, too, that talking from experience, after a few months in Shishmaref, I can tell you those few dollars represent the only cash income for a great majority of the eskimo craftsman. I think they haven't underlined this particular point; because of the lack of economic opportunities, $5 or $10 represents a lot for the

individual for when he sells his crafts outside the State or within the State of Alaska. Some of the crafts also receive recognition in other regions but Alaska because of the small population of this State, which is something like 300,000. The best work, if I may raise now and point out to you some of the art and classify as more or less works of arts, cannot be marketed properly to receive the fair price for this kind of production. We have absolutely no choice but to have this item go to the southern States and overseas markets, such as Europe and the Orient. Presently, we have a 10-year show which is traveling around the world 404 carvings, going to Philadelphia and in other, say 10 or 20 large cities around the world, and this is the type of effort we are trying to put through on behalf of the Alaskan craftsman. Unless we are able to move the finished articles between States, we don't stand a chance and we cannot compromise, we cannot possibly encourage the production of crafts for the next few months without having the assurance that once the effort has been performed we are being unable, because of legislation, to cash in on our work. This would lead me to a question, if I may. Is there a time element? Do we have so few months or so few years to worry about the outcome of this legislation?

Senator STEVENS. Something will happen probably before this year is out, probably in the next 3 or 4 months.

Mr. GELY. Thank you.

Senator STEVENS. I would say it might be sooner than that. This bill will be before the full committee of the Commerce Committee on the 22d of this month. In all probability will be recorded for the Senate on the 29th of this month. At that time, we will await its turn, and Senator Gravel is correct; we have a conference with the House, and that will take some time. It will probably come after the political conventions this year.

Mr. GELY. I realize it's awfully late now. Let me ask you one more question, please. Are the Canadian people, I mean our neighbor, going through the exercise of legislating?

Senator STEVENS. Not that I know of.

Mr. GELY. Then this will make us even more vulnerable because we are going to prove the source of the supplies?

Senator STEVENS. If the bill specifically prohibits importation of any product that could not be taken in the United States, even though they might have been taken in illegally where they were taken and if this bill applied to polar bear, you could not go to Canada and get a polar bear and bring it into the United States. So it has some real stringent sanctions. Not that I agree with them, necessarily, but there are very stringent sanctions in this bill prohibiting importation of any product that has been denied the right to be moved from State to State within the United States.

Senator GRAVEL. But a person could still, we would still, our natives would suffer because natives of, say, Canadian use, could have foreign markets that we wouldn't have at all. They could benefit from it indirectly. Of course, an American tourist could go to Can-

Mr. GELY. But there will be some restriction, would they?

Mr GELY. So that the demand could be met by southern imitation of the northern culture, too, just as well, with substitute material,

isn't it? So, in other words, the natives would be very victimized and it would be a tragedy for them, wouldn't it?

Senator STEVENS. In a diabolical way, yes. You make the point, though, that these items—many of them—have been carved from bone or from fossil ivory that has been on the beaches for years? But it is still within the specific terms of this bill as it is drawn now as being a byproduct of marine mammals and therefore could not be moved in interstate commerce.

Mr. GELY. But I don't see this could be enforced because a museum collection would belong to the same classification then. We wouldn't be able to move any artifacts from country to country then.

Senator STEVENS. There is an interesting provision in the bill, which says that it will apply to any marine mammal taken after the date of the act. In other words, this is a nice question to raise but it would obviously not apply to any of these items, particularly fossilized ivory. I think you could well prove that was not taken after the date of the act. But you have raised a nice question. We will look into it.

Mr. GELY. I think it is unenforceable. I wish you would carry my feeling. It is unenforceable. If I am around, I will make sure it is unenforceable because we are making a talk. Thank you. [Laughter.]

Senator STEVENS. Now, is the representative from ANAC here?

Mr. TIFFANY. Yes, sir.

Senator STEVENS. May we hear from you, please? If you want to leave those around, we will be glad to pack them up with all the rest of the paraphernalia and mail them back to Washington. Thank you, ladies and gentlemen; we appreciate your contribution.

STATEMENT OF HENRY TIFFANY

Mr. TIFFANY. My name is Henry Tiffany. I am general manager of the Alaska Natives Arts and Crafts Co-op. The co-op is wholly owned by natives of Alaska and controlled by them, and I have been specifically asked by a resolution of my board of directors to represent the co-op in this hearings. Amos Lane, our president from Point Hope, could not make it in, so I will take his place. The co-op represents approximately, at this point, 50 villages statewide, and an excess of 1,000 craftsmen. And, as many people have covered all the other areas, I would like to pick up Gabe's point as to what this cash crop can do to the village and the significance of how. In particular, as it relates to exporting outside the State of Alaska, the crafts that are presently being made are not all of the quality that Gabe is hoping for. The only way that we are going to be able to achieve a higher economic return to our craftsmen is through a quality campaign. This effort is directly related to achieving recognition for our craftsmen in other markets beside Alaskan. Most Alaskans, Native or non-Native, enjoy all our products. Our discretionary dollars, that go towards this product are limited, but not in quality, just in the population that we have. The co-op, since I was apointed manager in January, has been setting forth plans to cooperate with efforts like Gabe's and other co-ops in the State to market quality products and set up quality control so that the net returns to

our craftsmen will be significantly improved. The dollar that goes to Daniel Iokak in Gambell, and other gentlemen like that is critical. A $15 minimum light bill a month is tough to pay with food stamps. The stores, the co-op stores, take carving in trade only, in credit initially and then have a rebate system. But none of this is cash immediately. Skidoo's require payment; gas requires payment. The present craftsmen's income is from both ANAC co-op, traders, the local stores, and tourists who come in and direct-mail sales from stores in Anchorage and Fairbanks and citizens in the lower 48. It is the plan of the co-op to expand our direct-mail sales to the lower 48 and to the New York and the Washington-type markets, which are significant from the quality standpoint. I am not thinking of the trinket and the souvenir aspect. That is being inundated by Seattle products and Hong Kong products. The Alaskan Natives doing handwork is better to achieve his economic return if he devotes himself to quality. And this can be achieved in a dollar sense if only we can converse with the other countries and the other States of the lower 48. I do not mean to imply that this lower 48 supply means high production, many-factory set-up all over the place. I am just speaking of a cottage industry aspect. And I think it is critical to the success of our efforts to help all our crafts people, including those who do not market through the co-op, that we be allowed to market in other sectors other than just our Anchorage-Fairbanks-Juneau markets. And I would hope that you could convey to Senator Hollings and the other members of the committee and the Senate that to stop us with our own villages or within our own communities would create a hardship, it will prevent any national or international recognition of what the Dr. Helularsen, of the Danish National Museum, stated as being the finest creative work in the polar rim that he is aware of, and he has studied the entire polar circle. He feels that our Alaskan craftsmen are significantly, are more creative than any other group and yet, we are way behind the Canadian effort, as Gabe has testified and as many of you know. I think it is only fair that this talent be given a chance to express itself, other than just in our local community.

Senator STEVENS. But if my colleagues from the Commerce Committee were here, I could hear one at least of them saying that that is a very fine statement, Mr. Tiffany, and it was. But are you going to reach the day when demand for your art work is such that if there is an extension from the provisions of this act for the Alaskan Natives, the motivation to take mammals will be to get material for the art as opposed to the motivation that presently exists to get the animals for food? Are you going to change this around so that the cash economy puts the motivation on taking the animals to get the tusks, the hides, and the bones? Whereas today, this sincere motivation is to get the animals for food?

Mr. TIFFANY. I would suggest that their sincere motives, of the villages I have visited so far, is combined. The white people has introduced a cash economy. They have led a trail into requiring certain supplies, basic necessities now for these communities. So, when a walrus is taken, it is taken with the full knowledge that the hide can possibly be sold to West Germany as a buffing item. The tusks

can be to the lower 48. I don't think the balance will be reversed significantly because the cultural environment of the people I work for live in commands a certain high degree of respect for nonwastefulness.

Senator STEVENS. We were all shocked this last week to get the report, and I am sure that all members of the Alaska delegation got it, that there were carcasses found on the ice floes that had just had the walrus heads removed and the meat was left on them. We are having this investigated, because the report was done by foreign hunters. But should that day arrive, I am certain that we would no longer have a justification for subsistence exemption for the Alaska Natives. We agree on that?

Mr. TIFFANY. I can see that eventuality. But I think our own State monitoring of the game is very good, and I think abuses will be brought to light. If we are legislating today for something that may become an eventuality, I don't think that is a fair premise.

Senator STEVENS. I'm still just being the Devil's advocate in this process by spelling out what I think to be some of the arguments on the other side from people who want to make certain that the exemption that we seek is limiting, and who foresee the fear of the extension of the demands for the commercial side of the product being the primary motivation for the taking of the mammal. That is all I am saying.

Mr. TIFFANY. Are the other senators aware of the demand for these products already far exceeds the supply, and so that there is already an inflationary factor on the price, which presumably would motivate higher craft production towards just craft and not subsistence. And yet, that does not seem to be the case today. They do not just go solely for the crafts side of the ocean mammal.

Senator STEVENS. Yes, the impression I have gathered from this hearing is that the primary motivation is for food and for the byproducts that are associated with the Eskimo way of life. And what you are dealing with is an incidental byproduct.

Mr. TIFFANY. Well, I don't think some of the people in Gambell think electricity is an incidental byproduct.

Senator STEVENS. Yes, but the things they are making are an incidental byproduct of the seal or the walrus or the whatever mammal it is that has been taken.

Mr. TIFFANY. But there is no substitute for their cash requirements if you eliminate that incidental item.

Senator STEVENS. I was entirely in accord, and believe that subsistence is, in the Alaska sense, a much broader thing than the man who is on the desert who wants a drink of water; it is a different concept. It is a much broader definition, and we spelled this out in the hearings in Washington with the aid of the people who came down there. We would like to make certain that everyone understands what the opposition is and what motivates their opposition.

Senator GRAVEL. I would just like to inject in the record here so that we do get one other thought across, and that is that it wouldn't disturb me at all if food became a byproduct and that the commercial aspects that you speak of became the prime necessity. Because that is really no different than what happens in the South 48 with farmers and other people who husband this type of resource. So I

think that those who make the argument, I think it is a specious argument when you come down to the basic needs of human beings. And if these are satisfied first through the translation of satisfying their food, and then you have an extra amount of food, then we will be canning walrus and trying to market that as a byproduct of the other skins and other things that may be more valuable at each point in time. I think that there will be a cyclical effect that will development depending on the market situations and depending on how successful you people are in (1) motivating the crafts, (2) developing the crafts, and (3) motivating and developing the market. So though I agree with Senator Stevens, that this is an argument that is made by some Senators, but I think it is a specious argument and I think that we can counter it with (1) the good testimony we have, and (2) this is exactly what we do in cattle ranches in the West.

Senator STEVENS. I would call your attention to the fact that we have made substantial changes in the bill in the last 2 or 3 days before we came back here. One of the changes is that we are talking about sustained productivity of stocks and species. And I would concur in what Senator Gravel says that to the extent that what we are talking about is immaterial. The motivation is for the taking if there is a sustained harvest that can be taken without damaging the basic stock or species for continued reproductivity. Then I think we have got the optimum production of the species and the stocks, and you can use them for food or for whatever type of product as long as there is no waste on either the commercial side or the food side. And that is what we are headed for now. I hope that you would have an opportunity to study the changes in these terms. As a matter of fact, one of them that I inserted regards the optimum carrying capacity of the habitat to support the healthy species without diminishing the ability of the habitat to reproduce. This is the concept where we are going, I think. And I think that it makes sense in the Alaska scene.

Mr. TIFFANY. Well, I think it has been that way for the last 10,000 years, so any hampering presumably is an external force, and makes sitting in judgment on the indigenous people, and I am not so sure that that is appropriate.

Senator STEVENS. We've got some hampering going on out here with foreign fishermen.

Mr. TIFFANY. Agreed. But they are not indigenous.

Senator STEVENS. I agree.

Mr. TIFFANY. Thank you very much.

Senator STEVENS. And, now we have Joe Senungetuk.

STATEMENT OF JOE SENUNGETUK

Mr. SENUNGETUK. Senators and fellow Alaskans, my name is Joseph Senungetuk and I represent the village art, upgrade program, Division of Statewide Services, University of Alaska. Under this program, I am one of two instructors who cover the State of Alaska on matters concerning native arts and crafts. I began working in this capacity on February 1, 1972.

The goals of this program are to look into the villages and meet with the producers of native arts and crafts and to seek out those

willing to participate in training programs either on the local level or through the Public Service division of the University. At the present time we are limited to the age groups generally applicable for adult vocational training programs because of funding sources. And because of funding limitations, this program has yet to grow from its original plans to encompass all of the villages that have asked for our services on upgrading village art.

I am here now because of the close relationships the village art upgrade program has to the village artists and craftsmen insofar as raw materials, production techniques, and marketing practices are concerned.

During the early periods of native and nonnative contacts in Northwest Alaska, there began a movement of arts and crafts out of Alaska to places as far away as Europe. In turn, the whalers, traders, missionaries, and schoolteachers imported such commodities as beads, money, whiskey, coffee, sugar, rifles, and ideas contrary to the ideas of the nonwasteful native. Today, the Eskimo has little to account for his tradings away of his cultural works of art. Some of the early works done by native masters are in the hands of museums and collectors thousands of miles away. Their going prices often reach the price of one snowmobile.

Today the raw materials are much the same as they were then, a period of some 200 years ago. Art forms do not remain static; life styles, if given a chance, do change and art in any culture reflects many facets of how these changes affect the general trends and relationships with other cultures. So the changes in art forms, even if legislated for or against by various means, are still very much a part of man no matter who he is, where he is, what he is up against, or when it was that he encountered this drive to create.

If this bill had been passed during the times of the rifle's introduction, the Alaskan Native would have had a chance to realize what he was up against. But right now the emotions are so intermixed with so many other do's and don'ts that it will be a while before the authors of this bill will realize what they have added to the chapters of ignorant handling of native affairs in the United States.

We are all quite aware of the present educational, health and occupational shortcomings of the Native American. In Northwest Alaska, it is hard to imagine the hardships endured by those reliant on a hunting and fishing subsistence. For some people, it is just plain impossible to comprehend "primitive" situations in this day and age. Still the textbooks of too many schools conjure an image of the smiling, happy, and carefree Eskimo. Or else we suddenly are confronted with a picture of all Alaskan Natives instantly benefiting from the recently passed Land Claims Bill. The reality is that the cost of living is not decreasing in Northwest Alaska. There is no immediate answer to the terrifying statistics of unemployment, suicide and dropout rates from schools. In spite of broken homes, broken promises, and poverty, the native hunter is still here and he has children to be concerned about. His expenses are many: The cost of hunting equipment, his boat, motors, fuel, rifle, campsites, and their cost of maintenance.

From the United States east coast to California the wave of conservationism has engulfed the public's feelings. First there was the publicity on seal pups of Eastern Canada. Then the polar bear kills entered the scene through filmstrips showing light plane usage. Then the Pribilof fur seal appeared in television screens with hardly any kind words for the native whose livelihood centered in this annual harvest. The wolf question never really got answered, although much was said by the hunter and the conservationist. All of this publicity has made many instant experts on wildlife and wilderness. They used the ever-ready audiovisual material, often with no qualms about using research films spliced together to fit other situations.

The rest of the Native Americans will find it hard to identify with the areas affected by this bill. The Indian reservations have had their problems all along. But this is an age where quiescence is no longer the only recourse for many tribes who are finding it more and more viable to keep abreast of the events concerning their affairs in light of stronger recognition of their rights as people.

Today we see American Indians fighting for their land and water rights with the earnestness of a life and death matter. Because it has come to just that—life and death. Indians in Arizona, Nevada, New Mexico, and California are gathering up their strengths in their own lawyers and leaders who are saying the same things their ancestors said. But with legal attachments to the voices.

The rights of Alaskan Natives in the near future will be respected only if we are kept informed and respect shown to people who have fought for their existence long and hard without the shrill voice of extremism nor with cries of unfairness without basis in facts. Let us hope that the arts contingent on matters in this bill will not have to reflect these stages in the future.

Thank you very much.

STATEMENT OF CHARLES W. LAFFERTY, DIRECTOR, UNIVERSITY OF ALASKA

The experience of instructors and administrators from the Division of Statewide Services of the University of Alaska, through our work with several programs concerned with Native arts and crafts, leads us to believe that experience for Natives in producing traditional arts and crafts objects serves as an entry-level occupation experience. The work habits, use of tools, and the selling of articles produced helps prepare the craftsmen to participate in the broader, or total, society. He is better able, from our observation, to accept employment and work successfully as a carpenter, mechanic, sales clerk, or in other occupations than is a Native who has not trained as an art craftsman.

We feel that it is extremely important for the Natives whose traditional economy and culture depend heavily on the taking of sea mammals that they continue for at least the next decade to harvest these animals.

Senator STEVENS. Thank you, Joe. We are well aware of your work throughout the State. We're very pleased to have your testimony for the record. We have remaining the testimony of Alaska Legal Services and the representatives of Kotzebue who have not been able to testify yet. Are there any other people who have indicated that they want to testify besides those people? We'll be glad to hear the Kotzebue people. I assume, as lawyers, you understand why I am keeping lawyers to the last. I am one myself and, so, I feel we will understand each other as we get down to the point of the last of the evening. Can we have the representatives from

Kotzebue? Are they still here, the ones who did not testify earlier? I understood that you are Mr. Goodwin and Mr. Uhl.

STATEMENT OF WILLIAM R. UHL

Mr. UHL. Senator Stevens and Senator Gravel. I don't know that I have anything that hasn't been said already, here, tonight. I might have one small other problem to add to what you folks do have to work on.

Senator STEVENS. Do you have a prepared statement?

Mr. UHL. Yes.

Senator STEVENS. I'll tell you what we'll do. We'll just print it in the record as though you read it and you tell us what's on your mind, all right?

Mr. UHL. Well, it's short and it won't take long.

Senator STEVENS. All right, whatever you wish.

Mr. UHL. Twenty——

Senator STEVENS. Would you state your name for the record, please?

Mr. UHL. I believe we sneaked a copy in before we went out to eat, a while ago. There is a copy of what I have here.

Senator STEVENS. All right.

Mr. UHL. Twenty-four years ago, I married an Eskimo girl in Kotzebue and she and I have been living off of sea mammals in the last 24 years. Now, that's part of my qualification for being here. The Rural Cap group in Kotzebue has paid my fare down to testify.

I am a resident of Sesolik, Alaska, 9 miles north of Kotzebue; that I have lived in Sesolik for 24 years; that because of my long residence I am quite familiar with the people and wildlife of the northwest Alaska area.

That it has been my experience that seal oil is a basic staple of the Eskimo diet, much the same as olive oil, rice, or beans are the staples of the diets of other cultures; that the taking of sea mammals is the only source of seal oil; that the eating of seal oil is so deeply engrained in the culture of these people and that it would be a hardship to do without.

That the number of seals taken in the last decade has drastically declined due to the fact that seal meat is no longer needed for dog food because of the increased use of snow machines and because many of the people of the area have migrated to larger towns where hospitals and schools are available and sometimes jobs.

That in the 24 years I have lived in northwest Alaska I have hunted seals; and that I have witnessed no depletion of the species that I hunt, to wit: Arctic ring seal, spotted harbor seal and bearded seal.

That other residents of northwest Alaska and I have had experience with State of Alaska Fish and Game Dept. and would submit to their regulation should they determine that, for any reason, the populations of the above-mentioned seals should be in danger.

That it is my opinion that the populations of the above-mentioned seals can be successfully managed so as to provide for the needs of the people, and at the same time, insure the continued health of the populations of seals.

That Eskimo residents of villages not on the coast and older people who can no longer hunt for themselves need to be able to buy or trade for sea mammal oil; that to prohibit any commercial utilization of sea mammal products would make it impossible for the above people to obtain the sea mammal oil so important in their heritage.

That for the above reasons, no bill should be passed which would prohibit the utilization of sea mammal byproducts for sale or trade, at least to the extent such byproducts have been utilized historically by the residents of Northwest Alaska.

In our specific area in the Kobuk, Selawik area—you asked a question of one of our representatives that was down here, how important it was, the trade was, between villages in the light of their ability to get oil. There has long been a trade between the towns of inland villages with the coastal villages that has been brought out here. And, our co-op, native co-op in Kotzebue is attempting to organize this so that the monetary exchange can best serve—work out, in practice where the hunter need ammunition to make his 2 month seal hunting trip so he can supply oil for the people up river. The seal oil business is not just a day or two affair, it's a 2 month proposition.

Senator STEVENS. Thank you very much. We appreciate very much your testimony and, now, we call on our last witnesses for the day. The representatives of the Alaska Legal Services. Oh, I'm sorry. Did you wish to testify? Well, please come forward.

STATEMENT OF WILLIE GOODWIN

Mr. GOODWIN. Mr. Chairman, could I talk my own language? Could you understand me?

Senator STEVENS. I'll tell you what. You give me that statement and you tell it to your own people in your own language. It's alright with me. Where's the copy of it. Someone must have some copies of it.

Mr. FLAVIN. I have a copy of it.

Senator STEVENS. I thought you would have. Do you want to let me have it? You go ahead. That would be a good idea and that would be a good way to wind up the hearing.

Mr. GOODWIN. I probably can talk a little good in English and figure what I know.

Senator STEVENS. Well, I think it would be very interesting for the people who are listening on the radio if you would express your viewpoint in your own tongue.

Mr. GOODWIN. I am from Kotzebue. And, I was born on that area and ever since I was a little kid and when I was old enough to eat what we'd been eating was seal oil until now. And, my grandpa used to say that seal oil had been coming for many years. From long time. And my grandfather used to have a better equipment to make it sail from inland down to coast. Down—sometimes go down to Kotzebue from Selawik, sometimes go down Kivalina and Point Hope to buy the seal oil and trade it with fur. And we would like to have in Kotzebue a little trader so we can sell our oil to place to—so the inland people will come down and buy it from one place. Nowadays and lately in Kotzebue, when the traders don't buy any more

seal oil, the people come—from inland, down to Kotzebue and try to buy some seal oil and certain times they don't have it and in the mean time they don't have the right people. And, now, if they know where they can to find the seal oil to buy it it would be better. And, 'cuse me, when I was young, the first seal oil was really expensive. When my grandfather was messing about it it was really expensive. And, when I grewed up and was middle age, the oil come down. The price of it. And, nowadays, back in Kotzebue, it's coming up. The price is coming up, on the seal oil. And the fur what we use from this whales and the fur on the seals is more important to use lately now especially our kids start learning how to sewing from the school and people, old timers, and all that things. Now, I wish all these Eskimo would understand what I would say. I buy—I hunt the seal and take it home and when I get many extra and next neighbor come in the house and buy some seal oil and the fish and game come around to get me I will go right to the jail. I will not gonna give them a single cent to get out from the jail. I'll be right and go right to the jail. And, the way I look at it, now, the white people must gonna take turns. If the white people think that what I mentioned about he not going to jail because I know it. They take a lawyer and they never go to jail. If he got money, he never go to jail, if he do like I do. And, this is the point what the natives should do. Don't be afraid to give any oil for yourself or sell it. Or arts and crafts or whatever it is. Don't be afraid. Uncle Sam is not gonna take your money away from you. He not gonna starve you. Only way is just face to him and go right to jail. Don't pay no one cent out. The way I ask my point. Thank you.

(The statement follows:)

STATEMENT OF WILLIE GOODWIN, SR.

I, WILLIE GOODWIN, SR, being first duly sworn, depose and say:

1. That I am 57 years old and that I have lived in Northwest Alaska all of my life; that I am an Eskimo;

2. That I have eaten seal oil all my life; that I consider it to be the most important staple in my diet; that the majority of people in the Northwest Alaska also consider seal oil to be an important part of their diets and prefer it over most other types of food, just as I do;

3. That the people of the villages which are not located on the coast, but are populated by Eskimos also have need for seal oil; that the only way these people can get seal oil is to trade for it with the people of the coastal villages; that trade of that nature has been going on for centuries;

4. That many old people who can no longer hunt for themselves need to be able to buy or trade for sea mammal oil;

5. That at this time the Kotzebue Area Fisheries Co-op is setting up an organization whereby this trade will be made easier and waste would be eliminated as much as possible; that any law prohibiting commercial use of sea mammals would eliminate the Co-op service;

6. That a bill flatly prohibiting commercial use of sea mammals would only encourage illegal taking of sea mammals and much wast would result;

7. That for the above reasons, no bill should be enacted that would prohibit the residents of Northwest Alaska from buying, selling or trading for the oil of sea mammals.

Senator STEVENS. Thank you very much. Now, gentlemen, we'll have the last witness. Gentlemen, would you give us your names for the record and for the people who are listening on the radio.

STATEMENT OF ROBERT BUNDY

Mr. BUNDY. Senator Stevens and Senator Gravel, my name is Robert Bundy and I'm an attorney with the Alaska Legal Services Corp. I live here in Nome and practice here in Nome. With me is Frank Flavin is with our Anchorage office and has been working statewide on this bill and he has consented to come here to Nome and help us out with our local problems, here. And, before I say my brief remarks, and they will be brief, I'll let Frank go ahead with his.

STATEMENT OF FRANK FLAVIN

Mr. FLAVIN. First of all, I think we should thank you for your consideration and endurance in this thing and wish——

Senator STEVENS. As a lawyer, I've been faintly suspicious that some of those statements had a lawyers hand behind them so that you would know that I knew what I was doing.

Mr. FLAVIN. Well, now that you mentioned it, I would have one request that you would keep the record open for several days because we intend to submit some fairly extensive briefing the interstate commerce aspects of this. We learned about this rather late and, necessarily, most of our time recently has been spent interpreting and explaining the bill to various villages, because that was our top priority. However, we have done some research and I would like to get into the interstate commerce aspects first.

Senator GRAVEL. If I could caution you on one thing in that regard, though, it's not to be redundant in that regard. A point made once is probably the best made.

Senator STEVENS. Yes, and besides that, we have authorization to print the statements of 2 pages by Alaska Natives. If you want to submit the legal statements, submit them to the subcommittee in Washington and they will determine whether or not to print it. I am sure they would welcome your assistance. But, this record is a record of a limited authorization.

Mr. FLAVIN. Yes, sir. I think quite briefly, the problem with this bill is that any bill that contemplates regulating or legislating conservation of a biological resource in addition to the ecological or biological considerations we must also be sensitive to both the interests of the people utilizing these resources and those people who must manage the resource. And, this bill, the major obstacles in this bill is the fact that it hasn't fully analysed the complexities of the interrelationships between Alaska's Native citizens with both their environment and the technological societies which they are not fully a part of, yet. Part of the problems here with the interstate commerce aspects of the bill which will not allow the sale of native arts and crafts products in interstate commerce. Lest there be any doubt that the interstate commerce laws conclude this, since 1936, the interstate commerce laws have been broadened to the extent that now, it embraces any type of commerce between states including communications, negotiations and sales and purchases and also includes any sort of transportation on an interstate type of vehicle. The most—the largest percent of the arts and crafts products of the Alaska Na-

tive people are sold in interstate commerce. They are sold to the tourists in the villages or they are sold to individuals of cooperatives who sell them to tourists. The end product almost always being interstate commerce. If the interstate commerce aspects are left in, it's going to be a severe blow to the cooperative movement as Mr. Tiffany has already explained. I would also like to briefly, answer the question that you brought up before, the hypothetical question as to the increasing demand for certain arts and crafts products. If the Senators are concerned with this increased demand and the ability of marine mammal population to stand up to this demand, they have only to look to their own bill provisions and 107(b) which says that if the species is lessened at all from optimum sustainable population, that the Secretary can place restrictions on the taking. Now, if we take the philosophy that if there is an increased demand that, consequently, the species is going to become endangered, we're already considering that the provisions of the bill will not be effective and if the Senators feel that 107(b) is not going to be effective, then, perhaps we should let the management of the species stay with the State who has brought the population of the whale from 70,000 at statehood to over a 100,000 now. We obviously have our fingers on the resource. These people have also spent a lot of time earning the trust of the native people in this area. They have spent a lot of time working with the native people and that's probably why they are successful, that is, because the people utilizing the resource know quite a bit more about the resource than, perhaps, some of the fish and wildlife people might have realized before. One further point I would like to make, under the Committee of Scientific Advisors, I think it would be very wise if we could include—have included as a mandatory provision that any population that is found primarily in one State, would have an expert of that population from that State included on the Committee of Scientific Advisors. This would mean that people like John Burns and John Vania who have spent 15 or 20 years, collectively, working on these marine mammal species it would mean that their combined knowledge would be available to the committee. And, I think that this is absolutely necessary for sound management. And, one further thing is looking at the permit sections. I think toward the future, we should have an absolute priority if we are going to be issuing permits for marine mammals, this is over and above section, under 107 that the first priority should be the development of—the economic development of underdeveloped areas. And, this would also include areas like the Aleutians and Bristol Bay. I have many clients in these areas and the areas are extremely economically depressed. And, as these populations reach the maximum carrying capacity, I think the harvestable resource should go first to the economic development in these areas for these people. In case the committee would wonder why we don't have very many Aleut people here, the committee hearing, as great as it is to have it here, it's sort of like having a hearing for migrant workers in Chicago when the migrant workers are located in Los Angeles.

Senator STEVENS. That's not quite fair. The B.C.F. brought the Pribilof people in and they testified twice and they have been very well represented by lawyers in San Francisco and have been very active with us. We have been working with them very closely. We're

here because we're in the area where there are people who are unable to get back to Washington and that is why we picked these two places. We have authority only for a short term. The whole hearings will last just 2 days. This, we have tried to get the people who have so far, been unable to get to Washington. I might say that the other people from the North Slope have been very adequately represented in Washington. Charlie Edwards, Leo Climpson (phonetic) and other people from Barrow have been back there this past year and we're happy to have the Barrow people here. Basically, we have not been able to get representatives of these smaller villages, Kivalina and Deering and these villages here into Washington, and that's why we came out.

Mr. FLAVIN. That wasn't meant as a derogatory comment about the committee, it just meant that we could not have the full representation possible from some of these small areas like King Cove and Unalaska and the smaller village areas in the Aleutians, that we would like to have.

Senator STEVENS. Well, I'd like to go out there, too, if we could.

Mr. FLAVIN. Thank you and now I'll turn it to Robert Bundy.

Mr. BUNDY. Well, I would like to address my remarks mostly to Section 107(A)(1), which is the subsistence section allowing the taking of the sea mammals for subsistence purposes in accordance with traditional customs. I think that it is absolutely crucial, as you pointed out before, Senator Stevens, that this subsistence, this definition of subsistence be expanded to include trade of sea mammal food products and byproducts among the various natives in the State of Alaska. It's ridiculous to suppose that a hunter can exist now or ever has existed by himself. The only existence is in his own culture. And, the culture of these people was such that the people in the inland villages, the people on the rivers traded with the people of the coastal villages. People on the coastal villages supplied the sea mammal products needed and desired by the people on the inland villages. People from the inland villages supplied things such as fur and dried fish and fish in the winter time to the people on the coast. It has been amply pointed out in much of the testimony that we have heard today, that the nutritional value of the sea mammal is crucial in a lot of these villages because of the lack of cash and because of the lack of other resources. There is a need for cash and in these villages it's gotten by the trade of these things for things like ammunition, gasoline, and other things like vegetables and fruits for their diets. You heard the testimony by Dick Curtis of the Kotzebue Area Fish Co-op and how the Kotzebue Area Fish Co-op is attempting to facilitate the efficient trade between the inland villages and the coastal villages so as to eliminate as much waste as possible. This effort by the Fish Co-op would be sabotaged by this bill. And, also, there's just the simple problem of the various villages on the coast. A lot of times, some villages, in some years, just don't manage to get as many of the sea mammals as they need be cause of weather conditions of ice conditions. Therefore, I think it is vital that it be made clear that the term subsistence is to encompass trade among the natives and sea mammal byproducts and sea mammal foods made from sea mammals. That should be accomplished, ideally, by specific language in the bill, but, if that cannot be done, then there should be good legislative history containing clear lan-

guage that the intent of Congress is to broadly define subsistence, so that in the case of any future litigation, this would be absolutely clear. As it stands now, it is possible for some court in the future to reach a result that is obviously undesirable. That's about all I have.

Senato STEVENS. That's very good, gentlemen. I think that we will make note of the last comment and take care of that. I'm sure that it has been a long day for you. It has been for us.

Mr. BUNDY. One more thing, I'm sorry. I've got some statements that I would like to introduce into the record. The statements are of May Williams, Robert Nulin, Dina Evon, Irene Oten, Agnes Markuk, and Anges Hawkinson. That's all I have.

Senator STEVENS. Alright, fine. We have reached the bewitching hour of 10:20 and we would like to thank you all for your patience and your helpfulness; and particularly our young lady who has been so patient all day. I thank you all very much and the hearing will be adjourned.

(Whereupon at 10:20 p.m. the hearing was adjourned.)

OCEAN MAMMAL PROTECTION

FRIDAY, MAY 12, 1972

U.S. SENATE
SUBCOMMITTEE ON OCEANS AND ATMOSPHERE
OF THE COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE,
Bethel, Alaska.

The subcommittee met pursuant to call, in Nome, Alaska, Hon. Ted Stevens, presiding.

Present: Senators Stevens and Gravel.

OPENING STATEMENT BY SENATOR STEVENS

Senator STEVENS. We can start. I am very happy to be here with Senator Gravel. We are here to conduct hearings for the Commerce Committee of the U.S. Senate through the authorization of Senator Magnuson, our chairman, from the State of Washington. This is also possible, due to the cooperation of Senator Hollings, of South Carolina, who is chairman of our subcommittee. I want to, of course, introduce to you some of the people who are traveling with us. I hope you've had the opportunity to meet Dick Keating from my staff, who is sitting here at the table. There is also right next to me John Hussey, who is the counsel and represents the subcommittee chairman, Senator Hollings, and next to him is Dave -Clanton, who is minority staff member and represents Senator Cotton in the minority of the Senate Commerce Committee. Before we start, I would like to express my appreciation to Maj. John Guinn for his allowing us to use Bethel and the facilities of Bethel for a location of these hearings. We also want to thank Bill Zaradnichek, who has helped coordinate the arrangements for the hearings with my Washington and Anchorage offices. We all owe a debt of gratitude to two fine people: Margaret Cook and Bill Hendrickson, who have worked hard in coordinating the lists of people who will testify. I understand they have been on the radio these past few days explaining the meaning of the hearings and the importance of them. We appreciate the help of Mary Gregory, Bill Hendrickson, and Margaret Cook, who will be our interpreters. If you wish your own interpreter, you may select him. We appreciate the assistance of those people who have helped from BIA and also Bruce Crow in expediting the arrangements here. We're grateful, of course, to the military—to Colonel Shanson, to Lieutenant Owens, who helped us in the physical arrangements of setting up the gym as our hearing room, and to Don Dillinger, Director of Public Safety, who has also assisted us. We are here, basically, to make certain that we can

have a strong enough record to make the case to the Senate of the United States so that we may be able to assure that the taking of ocean mammals by Eskimos, Aleuts, and Indians in Alaska will be continued. We are trying to work together in this matter as Alaskans to help Alaska. We ask that you help us by agreeing to some guidelines. We understand that there are some 70 people who want to testify before this committee. In order that we may be able to hear that many people, we will have to go by the guidelines that have been laid down, and that is that we will hear one witness from each village and not hear another witness from that village until all villages have been heard who want to be heard. If people appear before us to represent associations, we will listen only to those people who have been authorized by the association to speak for the association. We want to ask you to limit your testimony to 10 minutes. It may seem short to some of you, but I assure you it will be a long time by the time we all sit here and listen to 72 witnesses, particularly when Senator Gravel and I will want to ask some questions to some people to make certain that the record is understood. The staff will undoubtedly have some comments and they also would like us to ask questions. The hearing will be quite a long one. I am certain. But before we start off, I want to make certain everyone understands our problem. Our problem is that the House of Representatives passed a bill, which does permit the continued taking of ocean mammals by Alaska Native people for subsistence, but does not contain the authorization that we think should be there—to continue to use the mammals for the purpose of native arts and crafts and for what we could call the byproducts of the ocean mammals under the current way of living of the Alaska Native people. We are talking about the mukluks and ivory carvings, and various thinks that are made from the mammal. We would like for you to tell us as much as you can about the type of mammals that your village takes, what you use them for, what would happen to your way of life if you were not able to use the products of the mammal for the purpose of native arts and crafts. But, again, I want to make sure that we all understand that there is nothing before the Congress at this time that would prohibit the taking of mammals by Alaska Natives. That is not the question. The question is to what extent can the products of mammals be used in interstate commerce, in selling products from ocean mammals to other people. I am very grateful to Senator Gravel, who has come along on these hearings. He is not a member of the committee, but he is taking his time to come up here and join us to make certain that we have a full, bipartisan approach to the problem that is before us, and we will be working together in the Senate on this matter, as we do on all Alaskan matters. I would hope he would have a comment to make at the beginning of the hearing.

OPENING STATEMENT BY SENATOR GRAVEL

Senator GRAVEL. As Senator Stevens said, I'm not on the Commerce Committee, but it is testimony to the fact that he is very well liked on the Commerce Committee. Now, the information that we get here will be used by the committee. They have already stated in

the bill they will not write the final details of the bill until they go over the testimony we're collecting here in Alaska. He will be working on that in committee. And also, I felt that it was very important to come up here to listen to this testimony, because I and Senator Stevens will be able to also use this in argumentation on the floor of the Senate when the bill is taken up. That should be when I'll be able to add my contribution to the legislation. And we're both optimistic that this legislation will not be harmful to the native people and their culture in Alaska. There are some problems, but we feel these problems can be overcome. Unfortunately, I have to be in Washington tomorrow evening, and in order to make that, I have to catch a plane at 4 o'clock in the morning out of Fairbanks, so I will leave here around 6 o'clock; so I won't be able to be here this evening for your testimony. But I will read the record and consult with Senator Stevens, and you can be assured that whatever views are mentioned here tonight I'll have copies of them to use in Washington. We had a choice of having 2 days of hearings, and it was talked of having a hearing in Barrow and in Nome. And both Senator Stevens and I felt that it was very important because of the degree of the involvement of your life in ocean mammals that we have the hearing here in Bethel to hear your views from the coastal communities. I want you to understand the legislation is not completed as yet, and that it does not appear, and chances are very good, that it will not affect you adversely. But we need your advice, we need your wisdom to help us in making a presentation to the Congress. So (1) I'm very happy to be here; I wish I could be here longer, but I think it will be long enough to get your views.

Senator STEVENS. Thank you, Mike. Our first witness is Maggie Lind, of Bethel, and we're happy to—Sir?

STATEMENT OF ROBERT NICK

Mr. NICK. Upon request from the village delegation, I was requested to welcome your committee for coming to Bethel to hear the testimony of various village representatives who elect you. Thank you, your committee, Mike Gravel, the staff for arriving here in Bethel. And the other request is regarding comments to Mike Gravel, who won't be able to be here for the duration of this hearing. It is requested that the members of this committee and its delegation that is hearing today in Bethel until all the village representatives have had the opportunity to testify. And I have also been requested to translate portions of your testimony so they can take this opportunity to translate——

Senator STEVENS. All right. Before we go on let's make sure that we understand one another about this. Mike has his commitments, and I am sure you all know that we have many other subjects we are working on. I must leave tomorrow in order to make a commitment to meet Senator Inouye to hold hearings in Juneau on Monday. So, if necessary, we will continue the hearings tomorrow morning, and we will continue as long as we can keep going this evening. But I think the most important thing we can do is to hear a representative of each village and to hear representatives of

each of the associations who have authorized someone to come here and speak for the group. We are going to make some suggestions about the lineup of the witnesses as we go along, because as a practical matter there will be others, I am certain, who will come forward who want to be heard. And, while we don't want to hurt anyone's feelings, once we have heard from two or three people from a village, we should not go back and hear from someone else before we have heard from everyone else who is waiting. So, once we go through the list of people in the villages who want to testify, and we will not hear anybody from anywhere until we go through every village that wishes to testify. We will then go back and take up a second person from a village that has already had someone testify, and we'll not hear a third person from any village until we have heard the second person from every village that wants to testify. And we'll keep going that way so that it's fair, and the people who want to wait and testify at the end of the hearing we'll be glad to do it. But I notice, for instance, that we have five or six witnesses from various villages who are listed to testify in order. I think that's unfair. I think that we ought to hear someone from Bethel and go all the way through. Then, we'll start with Bethel again and go all the way through, and that's the way that I see that we can have fairness so that everybody can have equal representation here before the committee. And, as you interpret our remarks, I would hope that you recognize our 10-minute limitation, because that's the important thing. The list is now up to 72 or 73 as I am told, and there's no way to get though that many people unless we do limit the testimony. Thank you. We are happy to have those of you who have volunteered to help us in interpreting the testimony.

STATEMENT OF MAGGIE LIND

Mrs. LIND. I am going to talk about how we——

Senator STEVENS. You may sit down. We can hear you better—Mrs. Lind—yes, thank you.

Mrs. LIND. Cooking and frying so we can use it for mukluks and parkas and mittens and use it for lots of other things. Use for wind parkas in winters and for our houses. In summer, we use to prepare it when we pick our berries and the blood we save for making soup, cook it with any kind of greens what we can gather like white spinach, white robot, and buttercups and pussy willows and fireweeds. If there is more than we need, we divide among other families who can't afford to—who can't afford to—We believe in sharing with others who aren't as fortunate and seal oil is just like when you use the Wesson Oil. When you cook they have to have grease for everything they chew and they cook and if you tell us not to use grease what will we do. Grease is just like motor oil in our body. If we don't have no grease we dry up. And, now we use grease for everything we do and now, I'm going to ask what about our problem. Why do they tell us not to hunt for whale and seal. Thank you and I'm glad to see you around.

Senator STEVENS. Thank you very much. Now, wait just a minute. Senator Gravel and I might have some questions. Do you have any?

Senator GRAVEL. We thank you very much. And, we'd like to ask

you what type of mammals you use here. You're talking about seals, primarily?

Mrs. LIND. We use the big skin for shawls and kyaks and skin boats and from the small ones we use for mukluks and what we use for wind coats in winters and even the intestines we cook and cut them up and make soup and use them for like soup, you know, we don't have no, in those days rice and flour and things like that, so, we have to use them for everything we eat, you know.

Senator STEVENS. Fine. We certainly thank you very much for taking the time to be with us. Thank you very much. Robert, would you call our witness for us, but, just make sure we don't get the second witness from each village before we have heard from every village. The next witness to testify is Nathan Toots of Mekoryuk.

STATEMENT OF NATHAN TOOTS

Mr. TOOTS. Senator Stevens and Senator Gravel and other members of the hearing committee, as it was previously mentioned, my name is Nathan Toots of Mekoryuk, Alaska, located on Nunivak Island. My home island is approximately 150 airmiles west of Bethel on the Bering Sea.

Mekoryuk, the only established community on the island, has a population of 270 Eskimo natives, which comprises the 42 families. Native village of Mekoryuk has similar subsistence endeavors as our neighboring villages, however, we differ in one aspect. We operate a reindeer slaughter plant approximately 3 months out of the year.

Much anxiety has been expressed by many Alaskans opposing the sea mammal bill now pending before the U.S. Congress. Whether the expression is an emotional or a factual one, the fact remains, once this legislation is enacted in its present form, troubles and problems will surmount by the hundreds.

Let me reiterate on three points, which have already been communicated, however, for the purpose of special emphasis, which I feel will bring with the enactment of this bill. The passage of the Native Land Claims Settlement Act does not justify the harrassment nor the denial of our inherited livelihood. Nor did the act encourage the native people effected by this history making legislation to become notorious law breakers. When the Indians of the lower 48 were compensated for their lands, were they told to abolish their traditional way of life. I guess not. What then is so different about the Eskimo natives?

Secondly, studies have not been made on the environmental and social impact the bill would have on the Eskimo natives that have depended upon, and will continue to depend for survival on the sea mammals effected by this bill. The history will reveal the natives are noted for their philosophy and practice in game conservation. From childhood, Eskimo natives are told not to kill any game for sport unless the catch is to be fully utilized.

In the last few years, the Federal Government has spent countless of dollars in attempt to help revive our fast dying way of life. These include Eskimo dancing, bicultural and bilingual programs, and establishment of Eskimo arts and crafts. The programs are increasing rapidly in many of the outlying villages with the full

support of the communities. Without the aid of Federal funds, these very worthwhile programs would not have become a reality. In summary, let me just say the mammals in the sea are symbols of hope, security, and opportunity for the many natives of our area, like that of jobs to the millions across the face of this Nation. When one gets fired from a job he loses hope, sense of security, and the opportunity for self-improvement. Many natives who have testified opposing the bill, are in fact saying, don't let the U.S. Congress make me lose my true identity of Eskimo and force me to accept the white civilization, which I know very little about. Others have protested of becoming the victims and slaves of welfare.

In further study of this bill, one should closely examine if the Federal Government is ready to accept the responsibility or has the capability of increase in funding for the thousands which will enter the role of welfare.

In other question. Will the Justice Department have the funding to incarcerate and rehabilitate the lawbreakers that will flow through their gates?

Lastly, do we have funds to train, educate, and place in jobs for the many who will be idle, and eventually become a threat to our society?

I believe, these and many more questions need intelligent investigation before the Federal Government steps into a realm of unknown and help to destroy the most peaceful race upon the face of this earth.

In closing, I join the ranks of many Alaskans who are opposed to this irresponsible, detrimental, and untimely legislation. I thank you for your patience.

Senator STEVENS. Senator Gravel? Let me straighten you out. That little microphone is for the taping of the record. It doesn't increase the volume, at all. This is the microphone that, if it works, is the one that's going to be our public address system. Senator Gravel?

Senator GRAVEL. Nathan, it's good seeing you again. What kind of mammals do you take off of Mekoryuk? What are we talking about, seals, whales?

Mr. TOOTS. Seals and walruses mainly.

Senator GRAVEL. About how many walruses a year do you pick up?

Mr. TOOTS. On the average, maybe between 20 and 25 walruses.

Senator GRAVEL. 20 and 25 walruses. And, how many seals, do you think?

Mr. TOOTS. Too numerous to count.

Senator GRAVEL. And, what's the population of the island? You said it earlier.

Mr. TOOTS. Two hundred seventy.

Senator GRAVEL. Two hundred seventy. All right. What does fuel oil cost there?

Mr. TOOTS. $27.50 about.

Senator GRAVEL. About. And, do you use a lot of snow mobiles?

Mr. TOOTS. Yes.

Senator GRAVEL. What does a gallon of gasoline cost?

Mr. TOOTS. About, roughly about 98¢ a gallon.

Senator GRAVEL. Thank you.

Senator STEVENS. And, how many whales do you get a year?

Mr. TOOTS. We do not have whales on the island.

Senator STEVENS. No whales.

Mr. TOOTS. Once in a great while, one will drift in. That's the only time that we get any whales.

Senator STEVENS. Do you trade anything for whale meat? Do you get any whale meat in the village?

Mr. TOOTS. Some people who are fortunate order, in trade, the muktuk from the people up north for something else from our area.

Senator STEVENS. And, how do you handle that exchange?

Mr. TOOTS. In terms of—in money or in exchange for something that is native to our island.

Senator STEVENS. Do you send money through some central place? Where would your people go to get whale meat if they wanted to get it?

Mr. TOOTS. Through personal contacts, perhaps, somebody that they know up north. This is all through personal mail, I suspect.

Senator STEVENS. You don't go through a store in the village and sell something to them and buy back whale meat or whale products of any type?

Mr. TOOTS. On a larger scale, the native village of Mekoryuk operates a co-operative store owned by the community, it has in plans to buy a freezer which will freeze seals, walrus, and whatnot in hopes of selling this—selling the products outside the village of Mekoryuk.

Senator STEVENS. I see. Have you had any requests for such supply? Has any other village asked you to sell to them any of the mammal meat that becomes available to you and your village?

Mr. TOOTS. This came about through a feasability study that was requested by the native village of Mekoryuk through Community Enterprises Corp. which we are a member of in hopes of bringing the revenue back to the native village of Mekoryuk.

Senator STEVENS. Thank you very much. We appreciate, Nathan, your appearance here, today.

Mr. TOOTS. Thank you for your patience.

Senator STEVENS. The next person to testify is Tommy Phillip from Kongiganak, Alaska. If you have a prepared statement that you have read from, would you kindly hand them to Miss Rice so that she could make certain of the spelling of the names that you have used? Thank you. We're most happy to have you, Mr. Phillip. We're happy to have your testimony.

STATEMENT OF TOMMY PHILLIP

Mr. PHILLIP (translated by Mr. Nick). He said he wants to start off with the inability of natives to sell seal mammal and arts and crafts for meat and seal oil. He said he doesn't have a prepared statement in writing but he is going to tell you what he knows from his own experience. Being from a coast village, he said that the people in the coastal villages subsist on these sea mammal. And that provision in the bill that provides for the subsistence harvest of the sea mammal, you know, is good, but he also objects to the provision of the act that says the restriction on the sale of the sea mammal. He said that even though that people in the coast villages, you know,

live off the meat and the oil from the sea mammal, they have to have other supplements to the sea mammal. And they acquire this other type of food from the mainland villages on the Kuskokwim. And, they do this by trading seal oil or seal meat in exchange for dried fish or any other type of food that is not available in the cost villages. He said that this, portion of the act he is strongly objecting to is the provision objecting to the sale of the seal mammal. He said that a lot of people in the coastal villages and in the mainland villages sell arts and crafts that they derive from parts of the sea mammal. And, he said that these people that sell arts and crafts do not have a steady income that is able to provide them with an economic base for making throughout the year. But, he said that he knew at least 10 people who the only type of income for them is just 1 or 2 months of cannery work during the summer time. And, during this summer canning work, the families are able to receive $500 to $1,000 and that income is all that they receive for the whole year. He said that these people purchase clothing and other food necessities, but this income is not enough to handle it throughout the year. So, they produce arts and crafts and sell these arts and crafts to make them survive throughout the remainder of the year because they are unable to purchase the food necessities and clothing from the canning income. He said the aside from the seals the villagers of the coastal areas also hunt walrus and the white beluga whale and they also subsist on these ocean mammals.

Senator STEVENS. Robert, can you ask him the number of each of these type of mammals that his village takes annually?

Mr. PHILLIP (translated by Mr. Nick). He said, when they hunt for subsistence purposes, they do not—they do not do so so that they can keep track of what they catch and what they harvest. He said for this reason, some springs, the weather is not totally in their favor when they go hunting. Sometimes when they go hunting at times, they catch nothing. But, when they are fortunate to catch the sea mammals, they take so that they will have enough to survive the rest of the months when the sea mammal is not available. He said that is why some years the catch is low and some years the catch is enough to make them survive the winter. So, for that reason, he cannot say exactly how many each family harvests of the sea mammals.

Senator STEVENS. Do you have any questions, Senator Gravel?

Senator GRAVEL. No, thank you.

Senator STEVENS. Thank you very much, Mr. Phillips. We appreciate very much your being with us. Our next witness is Robert Nick from Nunapitchuk, Alaska. Let me ask, Robert, before you start, is this tape all right?

COURT REPORTER. Yes, it's coming through all right, it's just that I'm getting interference from the radio tower at the airport.

Senator STEVENS. Is it coming through all right?

COURT REPORTER. Yes, loud and clear.

SENATOR STEVENS. Is it understandable?

COURT REPORTER. Yes, I think so.

Senator STEVENS. Okay. You will help us considerably if you can remember that we are recording this and that a typewritten copy of that, which then goes to Washington to be printed in the

record of the U.S. Senate will come off of this tape recording, Miss Rice is also making notes as she is listening; so, if you can keep the background noise to a minimum, you'll help us a great deal because these microphones are very sensitive and they'll pick up any noise from the noise of putting down a Coke can or a baby or whatever it might be. So, we'd appreciate it if you'd help us and keep the noise down. Robert, we'd be very happy to have you speak.

STATEMENT OF ROBERT NICK

Mr. NICK. Members of the committee, my name is Robert Nick.

In assembly of the members of the city council of Akolmiut, the IRA council of Nunapitchuk, and the IRA council of Kasigluk, Mr. Herman Neek was selected to testify before this body. Due to unforeseen circumstances he is unable to come in person, therefore I, Robert Nick, President of the IRA council of Nunapitchuk, was requested to appear in his stead.

Gentlemen, Today, we are gathered from near and far to discuss one of the basic food items that is placed in the lunch and supper tables, day after day, of our brothers, sisters, fathers, mothers, aunts, uncles, grandma's, grandpa's, and to some of us, our great-grandparents, the sea mammal.

Let us briefly envisage, the Eskimo as he utilizes the sea mammal:

(1) Skin—

(a) The skin is used as parkas by Eskimos, Aleuts, Athabascans, Tlingits, Haidas, and all other Alaskan Natives as well as non-natives of our great State and other States.

(b) It is also used for Mukluks by both natives and non-natives alike. These mukluks last a lot longer than store-bought shoes and boots which last no more than a year at most.

(c) It is also used by the coastal villages for kayaks.

(d) It is also hung in museums throughout the State for humanity to see and enjoy.

(2) Seal oil—

People enjoying the luxuries of Western civilization cannot do without wine, a cocktail, or some type of alcoholic beverage prior to their meals and during meals. But we of rural Alaska use seal oil because it is an enriching ingredient of our meals, not a stimulant. Many a meal, be it in a coastal village, or a mainland village, cannot be without this oil, either in liquid form or as blubber. It also has countless other uses, some as medication.

(3) Meat—

The meat of the seal is the basic food of the coastal villages and is also consumed by many mainlanders. It is eaten as fresh meat, and also as dried meat, and is eaten in both forms with its oil, even when mixed with others such as rice, potatoes, and onions. Even when aged, such parts of the seal like its flippers are the food specials of our diet. Even the interior parts like heart, liver, intestinal tubes, etc. are eaten. If bone was consumable, we would probably eat it also, but since it is not, only that part of the seal not used. However in the case of a walrus, the tusks and other parts of the mammal are used for trade in the form of arts and crafts. Even the genitals of

this mammal are bought at high cost by our white brothers for souvenirs.

MEANS OF BARTER

Every year, the people from the coastal villages exchange seal meat, seal oil, and seal skin for dried fish or any other type of mainland food. With this trade, the mainlanders receive a lot of sea mammal meat for their daily consumption, and where fish and meat is not available, they are bought for cash. Both parties in turn use this money to buy other necessities like tea, coffee, sugar, and flour.

ARTS AND CRAFTS

Many of my friends living in the coastal and mainland villages receive cash for the sale of articles made of parts of the sea mammal. Even I, myself, take to my carving tools from time to time. Many women make parkas, mukluks, mittens, and other articles from this mammal. And many families would be stripped of all their necessities if the harvest of this mammal is banned. Corporations for profit are being established in Anchorage, Fairbanks, and other major cities with major items of display being crafts made of the sea mammal. Therefore, you can see that the sale of the sea mammal is a needed necessity to supplement the cash economy of my people.

MAN IN HIS STRUGGLE FOR SURVIVAL

Men of the coastal villages, and some mainlanders spent many a day along the Kuskokwim and Yukon Bays, and along the shores of the Bering Sea and Norton Sound, hunting sea mammal for subsistence and commercial purposes. Many times human lives are risked for the catch of this mammal, and sometimes lost during the heavy storms at the above mentioned areas. The men sometimes come home empty handed from these hunting trips and this is not a happy situation especially when there is very little to prepare for the supper table. Day after day the men embark on a hunting trip for there is no other way of life yielding to the existence of the villagers in the coastal areas of rural Alaska.

LAWS AND REGULATIONS

Year after year, laws and regulations are enacted by countless governmental institutions of our State and our country. Some enhance constructive progress of the lifestyle of my people, while some are a detriment to our existence. Laws that are detrimental have never been followed by humanity. And this proposed legislation directly affects the lifestyle and survival of many. Since the necessity for survival is more powerful than any law on earth, there will be very few that will abide by any legislation of this type.

Members of Congress, Why were we not notified of this legislation in its initial stages, and more importantly, prior to its passage by the House of Representatives. Was this proposed legislation viewed good for Alaskan Natives until feedback from Alaskans indicated otherwise?

EFFECT ON THE ECONOMY

About 95 percent of the villagers are unemployed for 11 months of the year and those that are directly affected do not work at all. Therefore the people in the coastal villages rely on the sale of this mammal for their cash economy. Gentlemen, if this legislation passes, is the governmental institution prepared to meet the hike in demand for welfare assistance. If not, we the bona fide residents of Nunapitchuk request the adoption of appropriate amendments to exempt the natives of Alaska from the provisions of this legislation. Mainly to allow the native to sell products from the sea mammal.

Upon request of my father, Nick O. Nick, I would like to add the following, and I quote:

> I would like to say a few words. I do not know many laws that govern the lives of man, because I cannot read or write in the English language. But I understand this proposed legislation very well because my stomach knows all, and it is very detrimental to us.
>
> Even if this proposed legislation passes, nobody will abide by it, because man cannot be stopped from catching the food he eats and from selling it so he can purchase other necessities of his lifestyle. Only a doctor requests a person not to eat certain foods when the foods are not good for his health, This proposed legislation is known and opposed by all. Even an old lady that can only walk by crutches knows and opposes this legislation. She will oppose it knowledgably, because we are tampering with her lifestyle.

In closing, we of Nunapitchuk oppose this bill and request that corrective amendments to exempt Alaska from it provisions be included. And we request that amendments be the following:

(1) to allow the sale of arts and crafts, clothing made of sea mammal skins and other parts.

(2) to allow the natives to sell the meat, oil, skin and other parts of the seal, and to be able to trade it for other types of food available to the mainlanders.

We further request that future proposed legislations affecting our lifestyle hear our views and comments in a hearing of this type, before passage by either chamber of Congress.

I thank you for the opportunity of this testimony.

Senator GRAVEL. Robert, could you give us some of the numbers of sea mammals, the type of sea mammals, broken down to the numbers, that you have? It doesn't have to be accurate, but, just about what you catch, normally on an annual basis.

Mr. NICK. The people of my village and the closer villages to my village do not hunt at all times, as we're on the mainland. But, we purchase a lot of seal meat and seal oil. Seal oil is bought by every family in my village from the coastal villages. We purchase this seal oil and seal meat from the coastal villagers. And, the people that hunt from my village usually do in the spring time. And, like Tommy Phillips, I am unable to provide you with what we get.

Senator STEVENS. Would you tell us how far up the river the seals come?

Mr. NICK. In the summer time, we can catch seals near Bethel and also, sometimes we catch them at my home which is approximately 60 or 70 miles in the Kuskokwim River.

Senator STEVENS. Are they the only mammals that come up river?

Mr. NICK. Seals.

Senator STEVENS. Just the seals.

Mr. NICK. Yes.

Senator STEVENS. Any sea lions come up this way?

Mr. NICK. In the summer time, I think, a few people sometimes might catch them.

Senator STEVENS. Thank you very much, Robert, we appreciate it.

Mr. NICK. I damaged my voice.

Senator STEVENS. Save it, we need it, you'll have to be careful with that voice. The next person to testify is Joe Evan from Kwigillingok, Alaska.

STATEMENT OF JOE EVAN

Mr. EVAN. (translated by Robert Nick). He brought out the fact that the money derived from the sale of arts and crafts from the seal mammal supplements the income of the villages receive from cannery work and any other type of summer work that they can get. And they say that for that reason he believes that they have provided information to the representatives of the government agencies that the people from the villages and that the public officials should come to the villages and see the problems of the village people and other problems effecting the life of the village people. This information is provided to the fine men that come to the villages and since that information has already been reported by them and they have nothing else for your record for this information has been gathered by many government workers to be utilized to make legislation in Congress for the welfare of the State. And, he also said that during the campaigns, the legislators come to the villages and visit with people of the native villages talking over problems of the villages, community problems and all that and this information gathered by these people that run for public office should be used try to pass legislation not of this type. And, he said that he welcomes the congressional staff to the villages to gather the information of the campaign to prevent legislations like this to reach the floor of the Senate and the House of Representatives. He said, he referred to the amendment on that allowing permission to allow the Indians and Aleuts and Eskimos to harvest the sea mammals for taking them and using them for the native arts and crafts. He said that the hunters of the coastal villages write to the Federal Government to ask for permits like the Bristol Bay fishing regulations. He said, in Bristol Bay, the fishermen in Bistol Bay have to have permits by-rules and regulations before they can fish in the Bristol Bay area. He said, if this bill passes and this amendment will be part of the regulation, we must permit the hunt and harvest of the sea mammals. And, in closing, he said that if this bill passes, in the future, he said there should be a protection agency to support the natives of the villages. He said you should pass a bill that allows the natives of this area to hunt for subsistence and to allow them to have their arts and crafts. In closing, he said that the proposed legislation should help the native and that the native people expect to have something to happen because of legislations. He said that the people that this bill will effect will be the people of the villages and that they should be allowed to har-

vest the sea mammals and control them as they have done for centuries.

Senator STEVENS. Very good.

Senator GRAVEL. That's very perceptive testimony. I personally agree with everything he said and that's the reason why I have come to hear the testimony so that we can fight to not permit this legislation to be instituted.

Senator STEVENS. The next witness to testify is Paul Kiunya of Kipnuk, Alaska.

STATEMENT OF PAUL KIUNYA

Mr. KIUNYA. (translated by Robert Nick). He said that the fact that he is only one—that he does not know the contents of the passage but he does not read or understand English to understand the bill, but, he said that from what he has heard from other people on the contents of this legislation, namely the provision which prohibits the sale of the sea mammals and that part he understands very well. He said that the sea mammal that is being discussed in the proposed legislation is the main base of the survival of the people of the coastal villages. He said just as well as money is your base for survival, the sea mammal is the base for survival of the native people of the coastal villages. He said that he heard of an example of a time between the 1912 and the 1917 when the Bering Sea froze over to allow the people to not to hunt for a period of a few months. He said a lot of people starved along the coastal villages and the mainland villages during those few months when the sea mammal was inaccessible to the people. He said that is why the sea mammal, the subsistence harvest and the commercial harvest of the sea mammal is very important to the existence of these people along the coastal villages. This bill leave the Eskimo no job, no job at all. I tell you the truth. No job. Only thing we are live on is sea mammal and other animal from the land. We can not eat seal meat and seal oil all the time. If white people eat tomatoes for half a year he will get tired, right? But—now, when we catch seal, we eat it all, right? But, we get tired of it. When we get tired of it, when we want to eat stuff, we bring it up to the Bethel area and Tundra area and try to sell it or try to trade them for other food. And, then, there is no other way to get the animal. The government people tell us to buy some shells and rifles or shotguns in order to kill the seal. Right now, people are getting easier killing. Money is not our food, in our ages now. I don't know about your area, but, right now, it is very important to the people of Alaska, sea mammal. Why is the U.S. Government trying to do to the Eskimo and the native? Eskimo and the natives is just like one people, one man, according to what I see in lower 48. Why they are, the 49 States down there are jealous of the people of Alaska, I don't know. That would be alright if those legislators are in Congress wherever they make this bill would come up to Alaska and study the people first how they live on Alaska. Now, these arts and crafts are very, very important for the people of Alaska, especially for me and for the people who are sitting here in the audience. We have to eat. We have to buy the ammo, ammunition. We have to buy some rifles in order to kill the seal. Now, if we can not

kill these seal for the skins that make our mukluks, how we gonna live? How we gonna get money. We'll be under the—what we call the welfare assistance from the Government. Now if the Government is willing to assist us, that would be all right to have them pass this bill. Like I said, if we cannot sell this seal that make the seal skins we'll be, in Alaska, in whole Alaska area, in whole Alaska, not only the coastline, but people needing the seal oil up here. Now, for everything. What are we seeing now is if the U.S. Congressmen tried to close the gasoline that is very important for all over the United States, whole over the world and they tried to close it and tried to stop selling it and then, if it's all right, then the whole world would stop. Now, the same thing will happen to us, the people of Alaska if this bill goes, Aleuts, Tlingit, and Indians turn over to us to buy the seal oil and the sea mammal.

Senator STEVENS. You did very well, I got your message. Let me make one statement so we won't misunderstand one another. The Senate rules provides that there should not be applause, that there should not be a recognition of one witness or one statement over another. I would urge you not to applaud—it will not show up in the record. I know we all appreciate the statements here. We do not need applause. And, again, I would ask you to watch the background noise so that we can hear the tape when it is played back and after they have transcribed what the people have said. The next witness is Willie Alexie from Napakiak, Alaska.

STATEMENT OF WILLIE ALEXIE

Mr. ALEXIE (translated by Robert Nick). He said that ever since he started hearing about this proposed legislation, he and his wife have discussed this legislation a lot. And, he discussed some of the future affects upon the native people if this legislation passes. Because many people in the villages do not have the cash economy that is available to the other parts of the world and the States.

Senator STEVENS. Robert, let me be as discrete about this comment as I may. But, again, with reference to the fact that we want to hear as many people as we can, I understand the desire of some people to testify in their own tongue. I can only tell you that when that tape is transcribed in Washington, it will be solely in English. There is no one in the Senate that could read the Eskimo language and I don't think that my young lady, Miss Rice, could transcribe what you're saying to us, in Eskimo. So, while I want to encourage you to use your own language, if you feel more comfortable in it, again, I want to point out that those people who testify in Eskimo and therefore utilize twice the time that they would if they testified in English, when they feel comfortable doing so, are going to deny some people the right to testify because we must leave here tomorrow at 11:15. Now, I'm willing to sit and listen as long as I can stay awake, but, I'm—I just want you to know that those people who testify in Eskimo, if there are some people—and take this time, then some people won't get to testify; it will be the result of having the duplicated language structure. And, you're—we're relying on you to help us make that decision. So, I hope I have been clear in my message, as I can be.

Mr. NICK. Yes; I know just about everybody in the area and I'll request those who can speak English to do it.

Senator STEVENS. Yes; we would appreciate that. And, your help and assistance, in any event in clarifying what's going on to anybody who wishes to have that done, we would appreciate that too. But, again, the record will be prepared for the Senate, and, that's the main thing we're doing. Senator Gravel and I are with you a hundred percent. I think everyone ought to realize that. We wouldn't be here if we weren't looking for ammunition to carry your message to Washington. The best you can do for us is to give us something that will come out in a record and we can quote from it and point out to our colleagues the difficulties that will take place in Alaska, if this bill does not contain the amendment that we want to see in it. OK? Thank you.

Mr. ALEXIE (translated by Robert Nick). In closing, he said that the natives of rural Alaska eat all types of food and some of the food that we eat, you know, is not to be considered food by other people. He said that he and his wife eat these foods that you would not consider foods including the mouse foods (phonetic)——

Senator STEVENS. What?

Mr. ALEXIE (translated by Robert Nick). The mouse foods. They are plants that are grown in the mountain areas of our villages. He said all these foods that they eat in the villages have to be eaten with seal oil and that is why the people of the villages are opposed to the provision that prohibit the sale of the seal oil and other parts of the sea mammal. The village people use these commodities and mainly the seal oil.

Senator STEVENS. Is there any other use for seal oil other than preservatives or food?

Mr. ALEXIE. (translated by Robert Nick). He said that before snow machines became available they used the seal oil and seal meat for dog food, when they run out of dog food. And, they also use the seal oil as waterproofing for seals and skins and mukluks that they use in the springtime. And they also have many other uses for the seal oil in the villages.

Senator STEVENS. Are they taking fewer seals now that they don't have dog teams and have snow machines?

Mr. ALEXIE (translated by Robert Nick). He said that even with the snow machines now being used instead of the dogs, that the harvest of the sea mammal has not diminished. He said, because the sea mammal is not hunted for the purposes of dog food. He said the people that hunt by snow machine need to have gasoline and other parts that you need to repair the snow machines if they break down. And, they acquire this gas from money for these purchases by the sale of the sea mammal. And, even when they go by snow machine, they have to use money to be able to go out hunting in the Bering Sea. He said that just a few days ago, five snow machines from his village went down the coast to go hunting and, then, the ice flows that they were on broke away and they drifted out to the Bering Sea, but they were fortunate to have a boat; so, they got their boat and brought their snow machines to the other solid ice and were able to get back safely.

Senator STEVENS. How much does a snow machine cost in his village?

Mr. ALEXIE. (translated by Robert Nick). He said that even with snow machine is about a thousand dollars.

Senator STEVENS. Senator Gravel?

Senator GRAVEL. No questions, thank you.

Senator STEVENS. Thank you very much, Mr. Alexie. The next person to testify is Peter Moore of Emmonak, Alaska.

STATEMENT OF PETER MOORE

Mr. MOORE. I am Peter Moore of Emmonak, and my village has 485 population. I have been—the reason because I came is the people asked me to come over here for testimony. In the village I came from——

Senator STEVENS. We're happy to have you. Are you Martin's brother?

Mr. MOORE. Yes.

Senator STEVENS. Very good. We both know Martin very well and we're happy to have you here.

Mr. MOORE. The people don't have income. About the only income they have is in the month of June when, back home, they start to get the money for the whole winter and they're really short. And, we're 18 miles in from the Bering Sea on the Yukon. And, most of us are hunting seals all of the time during the fall is the most hunt because it's the best time of the year, during the fall. And, we try to gather as much as we can for the winter. We sell the skins from the seals to buy some sugar, and sugar is up to $2.50 for 10 pounds, the seal skins cost only $6 and that doesn't come to much to pay for what we need. And, some people with 18 or 15 kids——

Senator STEVENS. How many?

Mr. MOORE. Eighteen or fifteen kids in the family.

Senator STEVENS. Fifteen or eighteen kids?

Mr. MOORE. Yes, I came—I come from seven brothers and four sisters in my family.

Senator STEVENS. How many families do you have in Emmonak, now?

Mr. MOORE. Pardon?

Senator STEVENS. Peter, how many families do you have in Emmonak?

Mr. MOORE. We've got over 80 or 85 homes in Emmonak, now.

Senator STEVENS. Eighty-five homes.

Mr. MOORE. And the seal oil is caught and in order we try to save the seal oil and dry the meat out for the winter and in the fall time when there is no way of spoiling any kind of meat, and you can freeze it up and some of them are having seal meat froze up to save it for the winter. We eat the whole seal. We even eat the part of the head. Most everybody also use most part of the sea mammal.

Senator STEVENS. Let me interrupt you, there. Are there any nonnatives shooting seal in your area?

Mr. MOORE. No. Hardly any white people in my area.

Senator STEVENS. Then, only the native people hunt the seal.

Mr. MOORE. And seal oil is the most of things that stays on the table for most all of the people. For most all that there are over that they try to use it to supplement for the native foods. The only

time that we have hard winter and it is very hard to seal on frozen snow and south winds in the sea and all comes up and we have no way of getting seal. And the hardship make some people to go up river to take some seal oil for some other food that they trade for but, not with the money all the time. We really need that—to have this sea mammal—everybody get hurt—most of them understand that they will be able to hunt to catch from the sea—from the ocean. And, the way that I understand it that we will be able to do it, but it will be hard to sell the skins and try to make a living off it, but, nobody has ever become a millionaire with the seals, yet, in Alaska, here.

Senator STEVENS. That's a good point. You're not talking about any commercial operation of the seal in a large scale.

Mr. MOORE. Yes, that's it.

Senator STEVENS. It's an individual sale concept. Do you sell seal meat to inland villages?

Mr. MOORE. No, we hardly sell any seal meat because that might be caught and transported to some other place. We don't—once I tried it and get some. I had about six seals left and I carried them and brought them up and sold the seal.

Senator STEVENS. How much do you get for each seal, Peter?

Mr. MOORE. We sell whole seal for $20.

Senator STEVENS. $20 a seal. With the skin?

Mr. MOORE. With the skin and bone and meat.

Senator STEVENS. And, you sold them to another village?

Mr. MOORE. Yes. We didn't do it much. We done it about two or three times, now.

Senator STEVENS. Can you store seal meat in your freezer?

Mr. MOORE. Yeah, we do. We do freeze some seal, now. Some of them keep a few of them. It is a small freezer and they help. And, most, at this time of the year, everybody dries them up and during the season that the—in the month of June, they don't have anything to eat with exception of what they were going to throw away. The dry meat can—the dry meat couldn't—the fish—when we get tired of the fish—of eating the fish, we got the dry meat and we eat the dry meat and we use a lot of seal oil. Everywhere—everybody—it is mostly the women who make the food for the table and they always want the seal oil and when we run out they always run out and crying and when you gonna get another seal for seal oil.

Senator STEVENS. How much seal oil would you say that a family uses in 1 week?

Mr. MOORE. A week? Well, for the week, at least, most of the families use about 3 or 4 gallons.

Senator STEVENS. Three or four gallons a week.

Mr. MOORE. Right. And we don't—when the seal oil is spoiled, we use the seal oil, when it's hard to eat, we use the seal for boots, to make the waterproof boots. Some men have water boots, there, that if you put the old seal oil and paint that all over, it will be completely waterproof. And, the water wouldn't go through them.

Senator STEVENS. Very good. How much of that is used? How much seal oil is necessary for waterproofing?

Mr. MOORE. Well, at least for that use, a whole lot. A whole lot. About that much.

Senator STEVENS. About a Coke can full takes care of two boots?

Mr. MOORE. Yes. When they are all out of oil, the oil just sucks into the skins and makes them waterproof.

Senator STEVENS. And, how many times a year would you have to do that to a pair of mukluks?

Mr. MOORE. We came back from out hunting or once I come back and dry the boots up and you try to put the seal oil right over it.

Senator STEVENS. I see, about after every hunt?

Mr. MOORE. Yes, every after hunt, right.

Senator STEVENS. Very good. Thank you very much. Any questions?

Senator GRAVEL. No.

Mr. MOORE. Senator Stevens? The kids will be asking me if you received the letters.

Senator STEVENS. Peter, I want you to know that I appreciate those other letters and I will personally answer them. I want you to know that I appreciate your bringing them in. I have looked at them and they are very interesting letters and I hope that you will go home and tell people that there is no question as to whether or not Eskimos and native people can continue to kill, hunt, and harvest the mammal. The question is to what extent you can use the sea mammal to produce income for other things. That's the problem that we've got to deal with. And, we appreciate very much your testimony because it will be helpful to use.

Mr. MOORE. Thank you.

Senator STEVENS. Thank you. We'll tell Martin that you said hello. I'm going to see him on Monday.

Mr. MOORE. OK.

Senator GRAVEL. Thank you, Peter.

Senator STEVENS. The next person to testify will be Joseph Mike of Kotlik, Alaska. We're happy to have you with us as the representative of Kotlik. Could we close these doors and have the people come in just one door? Is it possible? Who's in charge of the armory? Let's have people just come in one door and go out one door, for a while. We're having a very difficult time hearing the witnesses. Please proceed.

STATEMENT OF JOSEPH MIKE

Mr. MIKE. OK. First of all, I'm against that sea mammal bill like any other native. You know, like when we go hunting, it takes money to go hunting. To buy gas and ammunition and from up the river, when we go hunting, to the coast, usually you talk about over $200.

Senator STEVENS. How far is that?

Mr. MIKE. As close as possible, between St. Mary's and Mount Alex. (Phonetic.) You have to go down and hunt the sea mammals on the coast. Like, back home some of us aren't so lucky, all of the time. We'd be hunting all day, about 8 hours and we'd come home with nothing but burnt gas, mosquitoes, and outboard motors. We have tough luck, too. Sometimes when we break down, it isn't easy to hunt sea mammals. To old people, they taught us how to hunt and when we catch the sea mammals, we bring them home and it

takes lots of work to try to cut them up, dry them up. That's why I'm against that bill because life for us would be pretty hard for us if this bill passes in the Senate. And, if the bill pass in the Senate, I'd write to Ted Stevens and Senator Gravel and ask them where is Ted Stevens, where is Senator Mike Gravel, if the bill passes in the Senate. And, if it does not pass, in the Senate. I'll clap my hands.

Senator STEVENS. And, if it does pass and it contains a provision to protect the Alaska Natives, you'll still clap you hands. I hope you will, anyway.

Mr. MIKE. You know, it's been in our culture for a long time ever since our forefathers, it was the main thing. When you catch the meat, you take it home and cut them up and cook them and dry it and store it—the seal oil in cans and when you go out hunting with other people, when somebody catch a seal, it is shared among the village. They don't keep the whole seal to themselves. And, when it's been cured, after they catch it and bring it home, they cut it up in the house and they sell it to their neighbors. I read your amendment. It's real good. The amendment to the sea mammal bill.

Senator STEVENS. We're trying. Thank you very much. How many seals do you take in your village a year?

Mr. MIKE. It depends on how lucky we are. Sometimes we don't do so good.

Senator STEVENS. How many people in the village?

Mr. MIKE. 261 total population.

Senator STEVENS. Do you think you get one seal for everybody a year? Do you get over 200 a year?

Mr. MIKE. Maybe, sometimes.

Senator STEVENS. Less than that.

Mr. MIKE. Living on the river, you know, you have to go down to the coast to hunt.

Senator GRAVEL. How far do you go down for a hunt?

Mr. MIKE. Sometimes we go 60 or 80 miles.

Senator STEVENS. One way, huh?

Mr. MIKE. Uh-huh. It's not really, but, we go beyond that, when it's nice and calm.

Senator STEVENS. Does your village have a camp down there?

Mr. MIKE. Just fishing camps.

Senator STEVENS. Do you have any carvers in your village?

Mr. MIKE. Not that I—no, we don't—there might be somebody, but, I don't know.

Senator STEVENS. Do you have any people who make mukluks?

Mr. MIKE. Yes; we do.

Senator STEVENS. And coats? Any for your own use in your own village, or do you sell them all?

Mr. MIKE. We don't sell them all. When I run my boots out, I had to go and ask a woman to make my boots.

Senator STEVENS. Do you supply your own needs first and sell what's left? Is there very much income for the people in the village from selling things that have been made?

Mr. MIKE. No; not much income. There's—like a man needs boots, he goes sees a woman and if everyone has boots or a parka, and she has a coat to sell, well, then, she sell it to a person.

Senator STEVENS. Very good. We thank you very much. Do you have any questions, Senator Gravel?

Senator GRAVEL. No; thank you. Your name is Joseph Mike?

Mr. MIKE. Right.

Senator GRAVEL. OK, Joseph. Thank you.

Senator STEVENS. The next person is not on the list, but, upon request he will be next to testify. He is Nicholi Elukak of Oscarville. We're happy to have you here.

STATEMENT OF NICHOLI ELUKAK

Mr. ELUKAK (translated by Robert Nick). He said that today that he did everything he can to come up to Bethel to be before this hearing. Even though what he might say might not be listened to by anybody. But, before he passes away from this earth, you know, he wanted to be able to come and testify for his people. He said that he is an elderly person. He has lived here in Bethel since he is born. He said that people in the old used to call Bethel as the center of the distribution of the Bethel area people. And, he said that he was not aware of what the purpose of this meeting was, but, I told him. And, he said he wanted to comment on the purpose of the meeting. So, I told him that I would translate for him while he says what he is prepared to say.

Senator STEVENS. How old is he?

Mr. ELUKAK (translated by Robert Nick). He said that when he was a young boy he never used to worry about age so, he does not know exactly how old he is. But, he said, when the first white man came to the Bethel area, they gave him an age which, you know, to his knowledge, a lot younger than what his actual age is.

Senator STEVENS. Well, how old does he say he is, then?

Mr ELUKAK (translated by Robert Nick). He said it is written on a piece of paper at his home but, he does not know it—he does not speak English or write English.

He said that ever since he heard comments about the proposed legislation he has been extremely worried about the people in the coastal villages and also the mainland villages. Because the people in the coastal villages live off the sea mammals by selling it to the people in the mainland villages. He said the people in the mainland villages purchase the products of the sea mammal from the people in the coastal villages so that they can buy other necessities. And, he said that, you know, he use the seal oil and, he said, he's got a lot of seal oil right now, because he live on seal oil. He eats it with other foods and he drinks it in liquid form. He said, that is why he is very concerned about his ability for being able to buy seal oil from the coastal people. He said, he also knows he has been, you know, a long time—longer than you and I and it is very hard to hunt for sea mammal. Many times the hunter risks his own life and puts his life at stake whether he can return or not that is the question, at times, when they are out hunting. He said that that is why the proposed legislation can greatly effect the livelihood of the coastal villages and the mainland people. He said that what he says might not be considered as important, but, he says, that he has lived long, he has lived a lot longer than you and I and knows more than you and I

because he has experienced life in periods of starvation, epidemics and other sicknesses in the Bethel area. He said that you know that you can not survive without food and, he said that if you go with out food, you will starve. He said that is why we, the natives of rural Alaska need the sea mammals for food and to be able to purchase it from the coastal people. Because, without this food, we will starve. And, he pointed out other reasons why the—why he is really concerned about the proposed legislation and mostly that concerning the native people. Now, I was just given a note, here. On record, he is 92 years old.

Senator STEVENS. Let's break the rule. (Applause) Thank you very much.

Mr. ELUKAK (translated by Robert Nick). One more.

Senator STEVENS. Alright, one more.

Mr. ELUKAK (translated by Robert Nick). He said that his ancestors, you know, in Bethel, when he was a boy he used to say that a man's hunger is his greatest enemy. He used to prepare and catch food to eat and live through the winter. Because, when a man is hungry, there is no greater suffering that a man can suffer. He said that is why he is really concerned about the legislation because it will change a man's food. He said, in the old days, his ancestors used to teach him not to ban the harvest of man's food for the means of man's existence. Because, without food, man can not exist. And, the people in the Bethel area and the coastal villages live on the sea mammal and that is why, he said, he is very concerned about this proposed legislation. And, he reiterated the fact that he's got a lot of seal oil and he gives away seal oil to other people that need seal oil. And, he said that since he is old, he has not been able to hunt and fish for quite some time, but since the Alaska Native is considerate of other—of his neighbors, he is giving seal mammals—seal oil to other people in the coastal villages. He said that he again wants to reiterate that whenever man's in need, let man not stop from harvesting.

Senator STEVENS. Thank you very much. Let's take a 5 minute recess.

(Recess.)

Senator STEVENS. We'll start the hearing again and John Shively is the first witness.

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE. They would like to have Phillip to go first.

Senator STEVENS. Phillip? Phillip who?

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE. Guy, Phillip Guy.

Senator STEVENS. Well, we'll change the order and hear Phillip Guy first. Good to see you, Phillip.

STATEMENT OF PHILLIP GUY

Mr. GUY. Good afternoon, men.

Senator STEVENS. Please be quiet, if you will. Alright, Phillip.

Mr. GUY. Good afternoon, men, again. I did not prepare a personal testimony because I felt that if I had done so, I would have repeated what the older people have already spoken of. So, therefore, what I decided to do was read some of the letters that I had received from a couple of villages. And, there are three, total. The

first one is from Della F. Nicholai of Eek, Alaska, and it reads as follows.

The letter follows:

EEK, ALASKA, *March 27, 1972.*

HI DEAR SIR: I am writing a few lines we all native people don't want to stop sew or carving Ivory I mean like sewing yoyo or Eskimo dolls. Please don't let them stop that things. We people don't have money like white people. Thanks. That's all. Hope you understand my writing.

Yours truly,

DELLA F. NICHOLAI.

This is from Della Nicholai, Eek, Alaska. The second is also from Eek, Alaska, from Ella Andrew. It reads as follows:

The letter follows:

EEK, ALASKA, *March 22, 1972.*

RURAL CAP OFFICE,
Bethel, Alaska.

DEAR SIR: I've heard about this sea mammals being or are they trying to cut this off from being hurted for food or being sold for any reason. I object this whatever they're trying to do. Because lot of jobless people make a living out of land and sea mammals. I don't know how to send a telegram or a letter so please help me make one and send it out to one of the senators (Alaska).

Thank you. Let me know if you have send it out.

Sincerely,

ELLA ANDREW.

This is from, again, Ella Andrew of Eek, Alaska. The third and the last letter came from Kongiganak, Alaska, and is written collectively by the following women. Mary Azean, Julia A. Jimmy, Mary Otto, Ruth Igkurak, Lilly A. Lewis, Elizibeth David, Olga Mute, Katie Phillip, Susie Chanigkak, Julia P. Jimmy, Edna S. Andrew, Elena Phillip, Fannie J. Otto, Sarah A. David, Carrie Daniel, Munnie Mute, Mary Black, Molly Buzz, Mary Aarn, Kathy Nelson, Polly C. Brown, Julia A. Phillip, and Annie Mute.

The letter follows:

KONGIGANAK, ALASKA, *April 30, 1972.*

TED STEVENS,
U.S. Senator for Alaska.

DEAR TED: We are writing you of this sea mammel problem, we the womens from this place of Kongiganak are meeting here to write this letter. All of us from this place don't agree of what is happening to this kind of living we are in. As we are living trying to get what we need; we do our best to work and do our best to do on working on things to sell on seal skins. When we are doing and working on them, its hard to work and clean them. When we work on them we don't finish as soon as we take them. it takes long time to finish them. And when we finish them we sell them. But we don't get enough money from them to get things we need. When the mens get and bring them home after hunting. We don't throw away what we don't need. We take care of everything we are working on. And we always don't have seals all the time. And we don't have lots to work on even its in hunting season. Sometimes we don't have enough to hold to all through the winter. We are all worryed about this sea mammel business. Cause we all the Eskimo people live good only through the foods from the sea. And we don't like this to happen to us as we are always counting on the food we eat from seals and rest of the foods we eat from land and sea. And as we are living here in this village. When a man gets a seal all the people share one seal to the whole village. All the people eat one seal when a man gets one. And that way you can see that all the mens can't go hunting. Some can't get to hunt as others. And as we do this, theres lot of Family's that don't have mens to hunt for them. And another thing. We don't throw away the intestens away. We make rain coats out of them. And there the best we use during bad weather, and it takes long time to finish them. So I wish all of you who are helping us understand that all the

people don't have jobs to work with. Most of them don't have jobs. And don't have help in doing the things that are hard to do. We the womens here in this village are against this sea mammel law. And we will always be against the laws that don't are right for the people we the Eskimo Peoples. And we won't quit making things we usually work on. We will keep on working on Eskimo crafts. This is all. We will write again soon.

Thank you,

The ladys who were in meeting and writing the letter.

(23 signatures.)

Again, this letter came from a group of women from Kongiganak, Alaska. And, the more I read—I read this letter several times and it seems to indicate to me that the proposed sea mammal legislation is going to cut out the main livelihood of the people in our region and in other parts of Alaska. And, this sea mammal law legislation is entirely, to me, not humane. I thank you for this time.

Senator STEVENS. I thank you very much for coming.

Senator GRAVEL. Thank you, Phillip.

Senator STEVENS. Do you want to give those letters to the reporter, please? The next person to testify will be John Shively of Rural Cap.

STATEMENT OF JOHN SHIVELY

Mr. SHIVELY. I have handed you a copy of the statement that I have written. I would like to refer to several sections of it.

Senator STEVENS. It will be printed in full, as though you have read it.

Mr. SHIVELY. Thank you, Senator. The statement covers, basically, three items. And, I'm submitting it because I am the director of the rural Alaska community action program, and, as such, we have some responsibilities in rural Alaska to try to alleviate the problems of poverty in this State. We basically feel that this bill is a major threat to our efforts and could be a major setback to any of the work that's being done to alleviate some of the severe situations that we have in our rural areas. The first part of my statement deals, just generally with the subsistence hunting and, I think that's been well covered by both the Senators in their statements and by other people that are here. The second part of my statement deals with the arts and crafts industry. We feel that it is absolutely mandatory that this sea—that the sea mammal legislation, if it is passed, absolutely protect the right of the Alaska Natives to their arts and crafts. It's a traditional industry. It's one of the few industry that any of the natives have. It's a half a million dollar industry directly into the pockets of native people. It effects directly or indirectly 30,000 native people in the State. There have been several suggestions as to possible ways of doing this and my understanding of the present Senate mark-up of this bill indicates that indicates that arts and crafts will be allowed on continue as long as they were not used in interstate commerce. We are totally opposed to this concept. We feel that it does not do what it is intended to do. Presently, approximately 10 percent of the market for the Alaska arts and crafts is outside the State. But, this market is a very good market. Some of the finest work that is done, generally tends to be art work. And, actually, we are trying to expand this market and expand the concept of art, rather than just crafts. The Canadians, for instance,

have a $400,000 a year market, directly into the United States in terms of fine arts and museum work. To eliminate interstate commerce as a means for the Alaska Natives to sell their arts and crafts, might well mean the killing of more sea mammals and not less because if you keep the market just to this State and do not try to develop the kind of art market that is available in the south 48, it's my opinion that you're going to drive down the prices and the people are going to have to kill more sea mammals to make more goods to make the same amount of money. I don't think that this amendment would serve its purpose in another way. It's quite conceiveable that international markets might be opened up. Actually, if you want—it does not really look at the number of sea mammals killed. Prohibiting interstate commerce, has absolutely nothing to do with the number of sea mammals killed. If you want to get at that issue, you'll have to get at it at the level of the taking, not some other way. The third issue, and, also an issue that is not related to this area, but, is related on a statewide basis and, I'm sure you heard something about it, yesterday, in Nome, and, that's the issue of the bowhead whale. None of the legislation that I have read—any of the amendments or anything else, would cover the problem of the bowhead whale. All the legislation that I have read says that Alaska Natives can continue to take, for subsistence hunting purposes, as long as they do not take any endangered species. The bowhead whale is already on the endangered species list. If any of this legislation passed, it would mean an end of whaling which is a major part of the culture of the north coast of the State of Alaska. We have done a great deal of research into this. We have talked to practically every national authority on the bowhead whale and all of them feel that subsistence hunting could continue for the Eskimo. This does not significantly affect the population of the bowhead whales, nationally or internationally. And, we have information on that which has already been forwarded to Washington. In concluding, I would just like to say that the Alaska Native people do not take a significant number of sea mammals, but, their life absolutely depends on the sea mammal. So, actually, the real damage, in terms of population has not been done by Alaska Natives, but by whites and other non-natives. Prohibiting either taking the sea mammal or the sale of the arts and crafts will contribute to the destruction of the Alaska Native culture and, in a real sense, you're punishing the Alaska Natives for things that other people have done and not things that they have done. I believe this committee has a real responsibility to the Alaska Native. They have a responsibility to people and people count just as much as animals. And, if some aspects of this legislation go through or some aspects, in terms of a moratorium on sea mammals are passed, which some people, naturally, are talking about, it's the Alaska Natives that will become an endangered species, not the animals. Thank you very much.

Senator STEVENS. Now, we made an exception for a gentlemen who is 92, but, if we have any more applause, we're going to adjourn until you can obey the rules of the Senate. I have some questions that have been put together, John, by the staff, reflecting comments that they know that other members of the Senate would make if they were here. I hope you'll appreciate them in that fash-

ion. And, we thought that you might be able to answer some of these for this record. Do you know what the average annual income is, per family in the villages and the rural areas?

Mr. SHIVELY. It's really difficult to get those figures, but, I think the best kind of estimate would show that the average income, annually, in the villages, is probably well below $2,500 per family.

Senator STEVENS. All right. And, do you have any way of knowing the source of money that's related to the purchase of things such as snowmobiles, the high cash demand items that are being increasingly used in the village areas?

Mr. SHIVELY. Well, yes, I think it is easy to pinpoint some of it. As I have said and other people have said here, some of it comes from the native arts and crafts and that's $\frac{1}{2}$ million directly into the pockets of native people. Some of it comes from the fishing industy, either directly from fishing or from working in the cannery. That's short term, 2 to 3 months' work. Some of it comes from firefighting which has become a major form of summer employment and, again, it's 2 to 3 months' work, if that and depends on whether or not we have fires. There's other kinds of income that does come into the village. Some people are in the National Guard; there, of course, is welfare for some people. There are several village jobs that are available, although, this does not effect the total village. Some villages have Headstart programs which have total native staffs or some native teacher aides in some of the school systems. That's generally where the money comes from.

Senator STEVENS. Have you found any indication that the necessity of participating in the cash economy places additional demands on the Native family to kill more mammals?

Mr. SHIVELY. I'm not sure how to answer that; we really haven't looked at it from that point of view. There is no question that there's increasing cash demands in the rural areas. For instance, the housing program that will go into rural Alaska will mean that people will have bigger houses, they will have house payments, they'll have larger heating bills because the houses are bigger. They'll probably have electric bills, which some don't have now. They may have charges for sewer and water. Of course, the snow machine has made a difference. I think if you took the snow machine, overall, it probably would have meant a decrease in take of some animals because there aren't dogs to feed. Walrus, for instance, were a major source of dog food, in the northwest. I don't really see that these cash demands are going to make a major difference in terms of the numbers of sea mammals that are going to be taken. It may increase somewhat, but, with the exception of the bowhead whale, all the species of animals that hunted by Alaska Natives, according to our researchers, are increasing in number and not decreasing. And, as I said, the Alaska Natives do not take a significant number of these animals. Like walrus, for instance, the estimates that I have seen from the Department of Fish and Game raise a couple hundred a year, out of the total population which is somewhere between 75,000 and a 110,000.

Senator STEVENS. And, again, I want to emphasize that these are questions asked to get them on the record that we thought that if other people would have been here, they would have asked them.

What are the possibilities that exist for increasing the commercialization of these native crafts into the commercial world, outside of Alaska, into true interstate commerce? You mentioned 10 percent. Now, what possibilities exist to expand that?

Mr. SHIVELY. Well, I don't know. Probably the one thing that we would be looking at most, in terms of interstate commerce, which relates directly to sea mammals, as I see it, is ivory. Ivory is certainly very fine stuff and if it is worked well, it can become a real piece of art. And, the real market, outside the State, that I see, is the art market. Fine art or art objects for homes of people that can afford it. Things like mukluks, parkas, things like that, there is possibly a potential ski market, but, I really don't think in terms of the length of time it takes these items that they'll ever really make a major contribution to interstate commerce.

Senator STEVENS. Do you know of any export of uncarved ivory? Have you come across any of that?

Mr. SHIVELY. Out of the State?

Senator STEVENS. Yes; out of the State.

Mr. SHIVELY. No; I haven't. I think there's a State law that prohibits that, without a permit. I'm not sure, I think—I'm not sure how much use it would be in other parts of the country. I don't know what they would use it for. If it were exported, I would guess that it would be exported to the Orient.

Senator STEVENS. You would see no problem about a prohibition against the exporting of any of the mammal products that had not been manufactured or developed by the Alaska Native people?

Mr. SHIVELY. No; our major concern is the initial hunting and the traditional arts and crafts of the native people. If someone were to come to Alaska and set up a factory to use ivory or something, we would probably support, as a matter of fact, legislation that would limit that, because that would probably undercut the ability of the Alaska Natives to compete.

Senator STEVENS. But, if we put such a prohibition, in this bill, as a reassurance to those people who have expressed these fears that there might be a large scale commercialization—there might be some urging to kill sea mammals solely for the purpose of exporting them into another market to be manufactured. You wouldn't see any problem about that, as far as rural Alaska is concerned, would you?

Mr. SHIVELY. I don't think so, because I don't see, right now, anyway to—for rural Alaskans to develop that kind of industry and that would have to be developed either in Anchorage or outside the State, because of—probably because of capital problems, it would have to be developed outside of the State.

Senator STEVENS. It would actually be a protection for the village economy, the way I see it. I just wondered if you had thought about that?

Mr. SHIVELY. I would concur with that.

Senator STEVENS. Do you know of any drastic or substantial increase in the sales of arts and crafts in recent years? Has it expanded dramatically?

Mr. SHIVELY. It hasn't expanded dramatically. It's difficult to get a direct figure, but Ernst and Ernst did a study in 1967 which indicated that the value of the arts and crafts directly to native people

was approximately $370,000. The last study was done in 1970 which shows the value about half a million dollars. Now, that's an increase, but I think the increase is more in price than in volume. That there has been more of a recognition of—at the village level of the value of the items that they were making. I—as the native arts and crafts market, it still marks a very insignificant amount of the total crafts market in the State. Something like less than 10 percent. Actually, the Japanese capture, by far, the greater part of the tourist trade of selling.

Senator STEVENS. Outside of the arts and crafts, you don't know of any marine mammal products that have been introduced into the State's commerce, do you?

Mr. SHIVELY. No.

Senator STEVENS. And, there hasn't been any wholesale sale of seal oil, whale meat, seal meat or walrus meat outside of Alaska that we've heard in these hearings and I've wondered if you've heard of any?

Mr. SHIVELY. No; I've known of none that exist now.

Senator STEVENS. So, when we talk about the interstate commerce concept, we're talking solely about arts and crafts?

Mr. SHIVELY. It's my understanding, Senator, that there is some discussion of really what interstate means. If interstate just means something that goes outside of the State, that's fine. If interstate commerce can be expanded to cover things that have been covered in other areas where they contribute to other things in interstate commerce, for instance, the tourist trade. Most of the arts and crafts are sold to the tourists who are from out of State and travel on interstate lines. Now, I don't know if that contributes to interstate commerce or not.

Senator STEVENS. Well, I can only state from what I've talked to other members of the committee. They were thinking of interstate commerce in the pure sense in terms of sales outside of the State of Alaska and not thinking strictly in terms of the sales that touch or effect commerce, say, through Anchorage. But, again, it's a problem that we have to deal with and I want to make sure that your people and you have done some study of this. Can you tell us about the extent of the public assistance program in the rural areas? Your people have been doing some work in this area. Are they increasing or staying about the same or what is the situation regarding this?

Mr. SHIVELY. I really don't have the exact figures. I think in dollar volume I would have to say that they are increasing whether they——

Senator STEVENS. Besides, the families are increasing, too, aren't they?

Mr. SHIVELY. Well, actually, the birth rate has dropped dramatically in the last couple of years——

Senator STEVENS. And, so——

Mr. SHIVELY. In Alaska, according to the Public Health Service figures from the birth rate which used to be astronomically high. It's still well above the national average, but it has dropped quite a bit.

Senator GRAVEL. In western Alaska?

Mr. SHIVELY. The figures that I have seen are statewide, sir.

Senator STEVENS. It is my understanding from infant mortality figures have been coming down, and, as a consequence, the birth rate, per se, has been coming down, but that the family size has been going up.

Mr. SHIVELY. That counts about—probably on the whole, you're right, the family size probably has gone up.

Senator STEVENS. Is there any relationship between the present fluctuations and the availability of sea mammals and the demand for public assistance programs?

Mr. SHIVELY. I, you know, I haven't studied from that point of view, but, I'd have to say that, you know, my guess would be yes, you know, if a number of villages, say, had a bad year; the ice didn't go out and they couldn't get sea mammals, the public assistance would go up, particularly, probably the BIA general assistance program which deals directly with families in need on a short-term basis.

Senator STEVENS. I'd appreciate it if you would check with these people and we will also check with the BIA to see about that. It produces a good kind of argument in terms of the necessity for continuing the right of interstate commerce as far as the arts and crafts.

Mr. SHIVELY. Well, certainly. There's no question that the Alaska Natives have a very marginal economy, both in terms of subsistence living and in terms of money. And, if you take any part of it away, you're taking some—you know, you are not taking a savings account or stocks or anything away, you're taking either food out of their mouths or money to heat their homes. I mean, to take something it's gone and something else has to be put there in its place.

Senator STEVENS. You mentioned 30,000 in terms of the people effected by the proposed restriction on interstate commerce activity. How did you arrive at that figure? Is that you're guesstimate?

Mr. Shively. The study was not done by us, it was done by the Community Enterprise Development Corp. and that includes direct and indirect. Now, about 10,000 people are directly affected in terms of it being the only or the major source of their income. Now, the other 20,000 are people that make arts and crafts but it is more of a sideline. You know, they maybe have some other source of income, too.

Senator STEVENS. And, you say that 90 percent of all the arts and crafts products are derived from marine mammals. Where did you get that? Was that C.E.C. figure?

Mr. SHIVELY. Did I say that?

Senator STEVENS. That's this resolution 72–3, which we will put in the record, also, after your testimony.

Mr. SHIVELY. Yes, that's a C.E.D.C. figure also.

Senator STEVENS. Thank you very much. Do you have any questions, Senator Gravel?

Senator GRAVEL. No. Thanks John.

Senator STEVENS. We appreciate your coming, John. The staff would like to call your attention to the draft report on the bowhead whale, by Art Davidson. I don't know if you have seen it.

Mr. SHIVELY. We financed it.

Senator STEVENS. You did?

Mr. SHIVELY. Very good.
Senator STEVENS. Thank you very much.
Mr. SHIVELY. Thank you, Senators.
(The letter follows:)

RURAL ALASKA COMMUNITY ACTION PROGRAM, INC.,
Anchorage, Alaska.

RESOLUTION 72-3—ENTITLED: OPPOSING SEA MAMMAL LEGISLATION

Whereas, the primary goal of Rural Alaska Community Action Program is to advocate for the rural people of Alaska and to combat poverty in these areas; and

Whereas, if Alaskan Natives are prohibited from using marine mammals as a resource for production of commercial arts and craft items, supplemental income of people in 90% of Alaskan Native villages will be greatly affected; and

Whereas, approximately 90% of the Alaskan Native arts and craft products are derived from marine mammals; and

Whereas, the arts and craft industry provides total or supplemental income for approximately 30,000 Alaskan Natives; and

Whereas, the pending marine mammals bill, in its present language, is a restrictive bill which unreasonably prohibits Alaskan Natives from pursuing their traditional endeavors: Now, therefore be it

Resolved, That the Rural Alaska Community Action Program Board of Directors oppose the marine mammals legislation in its present inhibiting language; and be it

Resolved further, That the Rural Alaska Community Action Program Board of Directors will oppose amendments to the marine mammals legislation that will unreasonably prohibit the Alaskan Natives from utilizing their natural resources in their traditional way of life and culture; and be it

Resolved further, That any legislation being acted upon by the United States government should reflect the consideration of the government for the Alaskan Natives as a proud people with cultural values of their own:

Resolved further, That the Rural Alaska Community Action Program Board of Directors will support marine mammal legislation on the basis of a sustained-yield philosophy, provided such legislation recognizes continuation of traditional Alaskan Native hunting of sea mammals as the Number One priority in any management system devised by the Federal government.

Adopted at an Executive Committee Meeting held in Anchorage, Alaska on the 22nd day of March, 1972.

Senator STEVENS. What's up?
Mr. NICK. The request has been made to translate what transpired between the John Shively's testimony and your questioning. Because the sole purpose of your trip here is to hear what the natives have to say and they insist and would like to know what you and other governmental agencies have to say about us.
Senator STEVENS. Well, I have no questions. You can read the questions that the staff wrote out, if you'd like, and give the answers that John gave——
Senator GRAVEL. Maybe it would be better if you just summarized?
Senator STEVENS. Yes, summarize it.
Mr. NICK. Yes, I can summarize it.
Senator STEVENS. The idea is that there are Members of the Senate that are not here and the staff members know them and know the questions they would ask if they were here. I was trying to anticipate those questions for them and trying to get some answers from John Shively concerning them, which, I think were very good, as a matter of fact.

Mr. NICK. Translating into Eskimo the foregoing questions and answers.

Senator STEVENS. The next person to testify is Larry John of Toksook Bay, Alaska.

STATEMENT OF LARRY JOHN

Mr. JOHN. I think that most part of the things have been explained this afternoon. There are just some questions that I have to ask Ted Stevens and Mike Gravel. Did you say that we would continue to hunt and if this is prepared to stop the sea mammal for seals, you know, for money?

Senator STEVENS. Mr. John, the purpose of the bill is a nationwide bill. For instance, we find that the porpoises are being damaged by tuna fishing, the Steller sea cow down in Florida is being disturbed, considerably by the increased number of outboard motors that are around the Florida waters. We have the problem of some of the sea mammals in the California coastal area that are going out of existence, internationally. The pressure on the whale has been so great that many of them are in a threatened situation, and the bill itself is not aimed at Alaska or Alaskan Natives. It's aimed at a general protection to prohibit the killing intentionally or unintentionally of sea mammals primarily outside of Alaska. The only people who really harvest the sea mammals are Alaska Natives. The exception that we're talking about that is contained in the House bill and in the Senate bill states that the Alaska Native people can continue to hunt for sea mammals for subsistence purposes. In effect it is a complete exemption, as far as the hunting is concerned. So, there is no prohibition in this bill against the hunting with the exception of the problem concerning the bowhead whale problem and that's because it is on the endangered species list. But, there has been an exception made for the people in the Barrow area, in the past. They're the only people who take the bowhead whale and we feel that that exception will be continued. So, from the point of view of your question, there is nothing in this bill that would change the right to hunt for sea mammals for the Alaska Natives. The problem is what happens to the products of the sea mammals that are used for the arts and crafts and are sold to other people. That's the primary issue, as I said at the beginning, that we are discussing.

Senator GRAVEL. If I could add to that. There's a great deal of misunderstanding about the problem the way that it affects Alaska. I think we can assure you that legislation will not come out that will damage the economic interests of the Alaska Natives or other citizens of Alaska who make their living off of sea mammals.

Mr. JOHN. Yeah. Is this bill prepared to stop the seals for our money? Like, if we tried to sell oil, to somebody, are we not going to use that?

Senator STEVENS. This bill could be interpreted as it has been prepared, in the sense that it states that the articles are not to be sold in interstate commerce. That could be interpreted in a very restricted manner or it could be interpreted in a very broad manner. We are worried about that and that's why we're trying to get the information to show what kind of sales are made of these products. We developed

yesterday, in Nome, for instance, that there is a considerable trade of the sea mammal meat from villages where there are many sea mammals or many hunters, into the Nome market, for instance or into the interior all the way up to Anuktuvuk Pass. Now, that is technically in interstate commerce because the people use commercial airlines to move the sales from one part of Alaska to another. I don't believe that was the intention of the people in the Senate who drafted the bill, to affect that type of sale. What I think they were trying to do was to prevent the commercialization of products from the ocean mammals to the extent that it would develop an enormous demand for the killing of ocean mammals without regard for the need for food. That's a long-winded answer, but the direct answer is that this is one of the problem areas that we're dealing with. That is, to what extent should it be possible to sell marine mammals if there is a total prohibition for everybody else. There is nothing in this bill that would permit a non-native in Alaska to take an ocean mammal.

Mr. JOHN. Doesn't answer my question. There's one thing that you haven't answered to answer my question. If this bill passes and is signed by the President, does that mean we're not going to use whatever sea mammal, itself, for somebody or money? Like, we have to make living.

Senator GRAVEL. If it is passed in its present form, it will be a problem. But, we don't think it will pass in its present form because of the testimony and the information we're now getting.

Senator STEVENS. Let me read to you, just in case you have any question about it. There is an exception written into the the bill for the Indians, Eskimos, and Aleuts who dwell on the coast of the North Pacific Ocean or the Arctic Ocean. Then, the bill contains the following statements. "The following bracketed material is subject to future committee action pending hearing in Alaska." And, then, it contains the provision that says that the Natives of Alaska may continue to take ocean mammals for subsistence purposes in accordance with traditional customs for purposes of creating handmade arts and crafts and clothing and then, there's a proviso that says, "that such articles are not sold in interstate commerce." And, that this is not done in a wasteful manner. Now, this is an exception put on top of a bill that would prohibit anyone else from killing any type of ocean mammal for 15 years. I want you to understand that this is the plan of the committee at present time. It is to put what we call a moratorium on the killing of ocean mammals for 15 years, but, it will not apply to Alaska Natives, subject to the way we write this language. That's what Senator Gravel and I and the staff are doing here, now, is to try and make sure we understand the problem thoroughly enough to write this exception to assure that you can continue to use ocean mammals to sustain your way of life. Unfortunately, if you just put that in a bill, you'd be—anyone would tell you that you'd end up in a lawsuit in a year or two because you might interpret it one way and someone sitting in Juneau might interpret it another. Now, we've got to write language that's specific enough to protect what is being done and must be done to sustain the native economy. That's our goal; I don't think we are concerned with the balance of the bill which would not affect Alaska because there is no one other than Alaska Natives that are taking sea mam-

mals today, in Alaska. We have no commercial whaling operation, we have no commercial seal operation; the only—the people we're interested in are the Alaska native people and their right to take sea mammals as they need them and for what they need them for. Is that overstated? Well, I did overstate myself. The staff called to my attention that the bill would have an impact on the non-native people who have killed polar bear and that's another part, we're not concerned with that in these hearings. Now, does that answer your question? Do you want to add to that, Senator Gravel? Does that answer your questions as to what we're doing and what the problem is? But, again, I want to assure you that these are very important hearings. The committee put right in the bill that this portion of this bill will not be written in final language until we complete these hearings.

Mr. JOHN. Yeah. Then, you'll continue to support this when you go back to Washington?

Senator STEVENS. Yes, each one of us introduced amendments, Senator Gravel has amendments, I have amendments, I have tried to argue to the committee the necessity for this type of an amendment. Some of the people on the committee were not familiar with the situation in rural Alaska and in the villages in terms of the need for the ocean mammal as far as the Alaska Natives are concerned. So, we were authorized to hold these hearings to make the record that will be prepared and will be available to every member of the Senate to let them read what you have said and what your friends have said, as to why it is important that the way you have used the ocean mammal in the past be continued in the future. Now, that, again, comes into a problem, for us, because we must write language in the bill that will do that. And, that's what we're trying to do. Both of us support the concept that Alaska Natives should be able to take ocean mammals for food and for the native arts and crafts that are necessary to sustain the economy. That's the direction of both Senator Gravel's amendments and mine. What I'm trying to get across this afternoon is that's not sufficient just having us support you. We have to have some of the other Senators with us to support that same position and we have to use a record like this to convince them that it is necessary.

Mr. JOHN. Yeah, what about the—if you change the bill to stop our subsistence living on sea mammal, what will happen?

Senator STEVENS. There is no chance that that will happen. I think we can assure you that no bill will pass the Senate that will change the subsistence rights of the Alaska Natives.

Senator GRAVEL. We have rules in the Senate that if we wanted to employ them, we could, almost single-handedly, in a very extreme fashion, stop the legislation from becoming law. It would be very difficult and very painful, but, I think that we're committed sufficiently enough to the needs of the Alaska people, that, if need be, if that were to happen, we could stop the legislation.

Senator STEVENS. But, I would hope that you would keep in mind that the goal of this legislation is to stop people from taking ocean mammals or harming ocean mammals, who have no need for them. Now, there are people throughout the world who are in that situation and the United States is trying to take the lead in saying that the mammals of the ocean should not be destroyed by either those

who intentionally take them—like the whaling operations, or through those who, through negligence, have harmed mammals, in the past. I for one believe that that is in the benefit of the Alaska Natives and all Alaskans, to assure that the ocean mammals are not harmed by those people. We cannot convince other people throughout the world to stop indiscriminate slaughter of mammals unless we, ourselves, are prepared to pass laws that make it very difficult for anyone to take a mammal if he does not need it. Again, I call your attention to the animals like the Steller sea cow in Florida, which no one eats; it's a mammal that is apparently enjoyed—people enjoy watching it, and it hasn't harmed anybody, but it is being harmed by motor boats. I also mention the porpoises that have been mishandled in the past.

Mr. JOHN. You mean Alaska?

Senator STEVENS. No, we're not talking about Alaska, in that. That's what I'm trying to say. This bill applies to the whole United States. It applies to Americans wherever they are in the world and it was not a bill aimed solely at Alaska. The exemption we're talking about is an exemption solely for Alaska Natives. No one else in the country will get such an exemption. It is one solely for Alaska Natives. And, that makes it tough on us because we're two Senators among 100 and we have to convince a majority of the Senate that we're right as far as your needs. And, that again is why we're here. We want you to tell us and have it recorded as to what are your needs and why we should do this.

Mr. JOHN. Thank you, that answers my question, thank you.

Senator GRAVEL. Thank you.

Senator STEVENS. Thank you very much.

Mr. NICK. Senator Stevens, I was again asked to translate certain parts of your conversation with Mr. John.

Senator STEVENS. Sure, go ahead. Thank you very much.

Mr. NICK. Translating conversation into the Eskimo.

Senator STEVENS. The next person to give testimony is Ivan O'Brien from Hooper Bay, Alaska.

STATEMENT OF IVAN O'BRIEN

Mr. O'BRIEN (translated by Robert Nick). He said that the natives of Alaska and the coastal villages where he is from, Hooper Bay, are very concerned about the proposed sea mammal legislation. Mainly for the fact that the people in the coastal villages and the Alaska Natives subsist on the sea mammal and by the sale of the sea mammal to other natives. The people that hunt sea mammals sell the sea mammals to purchase foods that are necessary for their survival. He said that the natives, wherever they are, in the rural villages, can not live by goods bought from stores all the time. They have to have their native foods and, to a lot of them especially down the coast, the sea mammal is the native food. And, when sold to other mainlanders, this is their native food. He said the people in the Hooper Bay area, they do a lot of hunting, seal hunting, and they sell the skins and the oils and the meat so they can purchase other necessities like the foods that they can purchase from stores. And, he also stated that potatoes are, you know, are eaten by the white man, you know, in abundance. And, just as potatoes are a necessity for

the white man, the sea mammal is a necessity for the native people. He said that every year the village people are in dire need of food, about this time of year, spring. So, they hunt sea mammals so they can have food for their families. He said that is why he feels very strongly that this legislation should be amended to allow subsistence and commercial uses of the sea mammal. He indicate some of the uses of the seal—parts of the seal and sea mammal. And, he started to talk with the sinew. He said the sinew of the sea mammal is used by the villages from their ancestors on. They dry the sinew and then wove it into a net and that net is used to catch other, you know, animals of the sea, like fish. He also indicate the bones of some of the sea mammals; the bones are used for sleds, for runners and for other parts of the sleds. And, both this sinew and bones have many other uses besides the ones he pointed out. And, he also indicate one of the uses of the sea mammal which is seal oil which is the specialty food item to the native people which is Eskimo ice cream. He said they use the seal oil with tallow to make Eskimo ice cream which is a specialty food of many of the Alaska Natives. He said if the right flavor of Eskimo ice cream was made with seal oil, you five sitting there at the table, if you started eating it, you'd keep on eating until your plate is empty. He also pointed out that in the past, you know, when food is scarce, the natives used to eat their clothing, their mukluks and their parkas. They'd cook them until they're pure of impurities and then, they eat them. They had no other type of food, you know, for their survival And, they also used to eat the sinew that they used for nets because they have no other food for their existence. And, he said that is why the sea mammal, since it has been used as the means for survival from our ancestors to date, the people and the natives are opposed to the enactment of this legislation in its present form. So, amendment to allow the harvesting of this sea mammal is requested by the people of Hooper Bay.

Senator STEVENS. We appreciate your testimony very much. Did you get that walkway fixed up to the village?

Mr. O'BRIEN (translated by Robert Nick). No, not yet.

Senator STEVENS. Is that winch fixed to pull the trucks up over the hill?

Mr. O'BRIEN (translated by Robert Nick). No.

Senator STEVENS. No, huh?

Mr. O'BRIEN. No, everything still same.

Senator STEVENS: Did your people ever really get that hungry that they did do that? Are you telling us something that someone else told you? Have you ever seen this happen? People getting so hungry that they boil their mukluks, I mean, are you serious?

Mr. O'BRIEN. What?

Senator STEVENS. Have you seen that happen?

Mr. O'BRIEN (translated by Robert Nick). He said he saw it once when he was a little boy. He used to eat the net sinew mixed with oil. He said it's true.

Senator STEVENS. Yes, sir. I'm not happy to know that you had to do it. But, we hear a lot of things, that people have been told by their grandparents. But, you've actually seen that happen. You've had it happen to you. Thank you very much. The next person to testify is

Phillip Charlie from Tuntutuliak, Alaska. I guess you're in place of Eddie Angapak.

STATEMENT OF PHILLIP CHARLIE

Mr. CHARLIE (translated by Mary Gregory). First of all, he would like to apologize. He wasn't supposed to be here and he wasn't on the list, but, the man who was supposed to be here told him that he couldn't make this morning so he would have to take his place. And, everything he said was he wished he could speak English so that you people could hear what he have to say. And, another thing that he would be speaking in terms that would not be pleasant to your ears or that might be pleasant. First of all, he said that when he looked around the room, when he came, he didn't see anybody here that is an expert on ocean hunting or hunting for sea mammals, but, he said that he noticed one man that really know how to, you know, hunt and fish from way back. But even so today, there are people who still go down and hunt and using different methods. He said that the native people of the—this area, use the sea mammal for everything. They trade the oil for dried fish or whitefish from the lower coastal areas to the upriver Kuskokwim people. And, he said that people who are not experts in this way of living just have nothing to say about the ocean mammals. He states that people use the seal skin for boots they use it for kyaks and they have used it since our ancestors used it for skin boats. And, he reiterated, again, that people who have no way of knowing how to live around the ocean and having to use the ocean mammal for survival shouldn't have anything to say about it. He states that they use the seal skin for everything. When people from down the coast would come up they traded with other foods so that they could make mukluks and other things to use. He states that since nobody comes and gives some money to use, his wife sews and makes mukluks and he sells this and then they use the money to get other foods that they need. And, he also states that these native arts and crafts his wife makes do not bring a nice a lot of money. Since he heard of the provisions in the bill that prohibit the taking of the sea mammals he said to himself he has heard other people say also that anything they say about not taking sea mammals will not stop him from taking them because when your children are hungry, you can not stop at anything but to get them what food they need to eat. He said we eat the seal meat dried and when—even if it is a year old or if it lasts that long, we eat it because we are used to it. And, for people who do not know it is—may sound impossible, but, that's what we do. In conclusion, he said that he is glad to hear that since we've been talking about it this afternoon, that the natives will be allowed to take sea mammals and he also knows that when—he says that he knows Mike Gravel and when Mike Gravel was down at his village of Tuntutuliak, he came into his house and he took his hand and he told him if people want or needs help that they are willing and able to help them. And, he said he would like to see him live up to your promises when he gets back to the Congress.

Senator GRAVEL. Well, I can promise you that I will and personally say that legislation that will be harmful to the natives will not pass.

Mr. CHARLIE (translated by Mary Gregory). He will not forget your statement.

Senator STEVENS. Thank you very much, Mary, we appreciate your help. We're going to take off now and go to the opening of the new store and we've been asked to visit the Bethel museum at 6:15. We found the Nome museum quite interesting as far as it related to our problems. As a matter of fact, we are going to see that some of the things we found there will be shipped back to show to some of our people in the Senate who have never seen some of these items. So, we will take off in a minute. We did hear about these raincoats, Mary, that were made. I think it would be interesting if we could find someone to loan us one of those to take back with us. Any of these things that we might show people of what we're talking about, beyond ivory carving would be helpful. When people think about arts and crafts they are thinking primarily about the mukluks and ivory carvings and we have to educate our fellow Senators that it is much more than that. So, perhaps we might find someone to loan us one of those, which we will return. But, since we have this invitation to go to the museum, we'll come back at a quarter of seven and start the hearings again in 2 hours. Senator Gravel does want to make a statement before we recess for this period of time.

MARY GREGORY. May I translate this?

Senator GRAVEL. You may translate this for me, also. I have to leave to take an airplane out of Fairbanks at 4 o'clock tonight, so, I'll have to leave and I won't be here this evening. And, I'm sure that Ted will be able to take the balance of the testimony. But, I did want to give you some information about something that has not been reported yet and it is something that affects the village areas. Senator Stevens is on the Appropriations Committee and the Commerce Committee and I am on the Public Works Committee and on the Interior Committee. On the Public Works Committee, we will be passing legislation for the Federal Highway System. We are going to try and include, and I have every reason to believe that we'll be successful, to include boardwalks on the Federal Highway System. This will mean that the villages will be entitled to receive money to pay for timber and to pay for the construction and installation of boardwalks. And, I am sure that we will be able to get that out of the Public Works Committee, this year and I am sure that Senator Stevens on the Appropriations Committee will be able to get the money to pay for the authorization. So, I wanted to inform you of that. I'll be giving you more information through my news letter, but, I thought it would be important to at least give you some good news from Congress in addition to always hearing some bad news. Would you translate that for me?

MARY GREGORY. Translating the aforementioned statements of Senator Stevens and Senator Gravel.

Senator STEVENS. Until a quarter to seven. (Recess.)

Senator STEVENS. Our first witness in this evening's testimony will be David Lewis of Chefornak.

STATEMENT OF DAVID LEWIS

Mr. LEWIS (translated by Mary Gregory). He said he would like to ask you a question. Why the bill was made in such a way that the natives will not take it for the purpose of selling it?

Senator STEVENS. Well, it wasn't but, Mary, I'm not going to answer any more questions. We're here to get a record for the Senate. I've tried to explain our position. The bill was not meant for that. It does not say that, it says specifically that it can be used. That mammals can be taken for the purpose of handmade arts and crafts and clothing. Now, I've tried to get this point across, but, apparently I've been unable to do so. But, we are here to get a record of the statement of people who are interested so that persons in Washington who will read the record will understand that and understand the reasons why we must have an expansion of this exemption to cover the necessity to sell these items and the necessity to increase the concept or expand the concept of subsistence so that it includes the sale. Now, the bill, again, specifically says that the—any indian, Aleut or Eskimo who dwells on the coast of the north Pacific Ocean or the Arctic Ocean can take these mammals if it is for the purposes of creating handmade native arts and crafts and clothing, so, the bill does say that it is possible. I couldn't answer the question because the question assumes that it does not say that. I'm sorry. But, really, I want to and I want to be—I want to be understood that the —I am in agreement with the people who are here and what they want. But, I can not help them unless they testify and put on the record the reasons why they want to have mammal products sold and what they sell. For instance, as I pointed out in Nome, we learned that they do trade seals, they trade with other people for whale meat. They trade walrus they sell their products not only to other villages but to buyers who come to take it to Anchorage. These are the things we have to know. And, I hope you understand my situation. The staff points out to me that the bill that passed the House of Representatives does prohibit sale. The bill pending before the Senate does not prohibit sale.

Mr. LEWIS (translated by Mary Gregory). He said that he opposes—well, he wants to tell you about how he uses the sea mammal. He uses it not only for food but to sell or trade for other foods like on the Kuskokwim River, But, people around here catch and then they dry it and smoke it and then, they can trade it with them. And, he said that there are no fish that they catch from the Kuskokwim River and that they catch the sea mammal from the coastal areas. They use those two like coastal people will come and trade with the people from the Kuskokwim area for seal oil and for fish. And, when, sometimes when they catch the bigger seals like the bearded seals they take the meat—they cut up the meat and they bring up river from the villages to trade them with the other foods even if there is not enough at home because before the food gets bad is when they can come.

Senator STEVENS. How many seals do the people of Chefornak takes a year and what type of seals are they?

Mr. LEWIS (translated by Mary Gregory). He cannot tell you because there is never limit. One year the hunting would be good, the

other years it may not be so good. So, he cannot tell you how many seals he catch a year. He said the reason behind he cannot tell you the exact number is—or they cannot be counted is some people can hunt better than the others. While others will be catching some seals, the others could go without, you know, they couldn't even—your luck doesn't hold equal to everybody. When the weather is bad, like when they are having storms, he cannot—that prevents them from catching seals. Like, for instance, this year, there season for hunting seals is by—by this time, they should be catching them more than, you know, more now, or some of them would even be starting to hang them up, but, as of this date, they have very little. When you're out hunting, you cannot, you know, catch everything you see. Like a man could go out and hunt seals and, then, he would see several of them, but he would only catch one.

Senator STEVENS. Well, how far does he have to go to go seal hunting from the village?

Mr. LEWIS (translated by Mary Gregory). Not too far from Chefornak, where they go to hunt because they are a little way up the river.

Senator STEVENS: How many hours?

Mr. LEWIS (translated by Mary Gregory). He says that even, if you hunt when the snow starts to melt and then you don't hunt any more, that's the end of the season, then there's still animals out in the ocean.

Senator STENNISS Does he have to go further now to get the seals than he used to? And, how long has he been hunting the seals?

Mr. LEWIS (translated by Mary Gregory). He doesn't hunt seals, now, by himself, but, he knows the other people, you know, who go out. I forgot what your question was.

Senator STEVENS. I want to know if the seals are further away from the village now than they used to be.

Mr. LEWIS (translated by Mary Gregory). He said they seem farther than they used to and he told you once already that when the snow melts and the ice breaks it cuts them from, you know, it cuts them short from hunting.

Senator STEVENS. I see. Thank you very much.

Mr. LEWIS (translated by Mary Gregory). He says that even if this bill is passed, you know, with provisions in there prohibiting and he said that he—people are not just gonna sit down and, you know, take we used to, before.

Senator STEVENS. Well, then, you tell him, again, there's not a bill that would prohibit anybody who is an Alaskan Native from taking mammals. And, I don't want to hear any more testimony that concerns a bill that's not before the Senate. The Senate bill specifically says that Alaska Native people can take mammals. So, he's talking about a bill that's not before the Senate. Can we get that across? We're going to be here all night listening to testimony about a bill that doesn't exist. My list shows Kenneth Cleveland from Quinhagak.

STATEMENT OF KENNETH CLEVELAND

Mr. CLEVELAND (translated by Mary Gregory). When laws and legislation come out before, people have kept quiet. For the first

time, people are concerned, even in his village of Quinhagak. He said since we were born, we've always had sea mammals for food and that is one of the reasons that people are concerned.

Senator STEVENS. Who told you that there was any bill that would prohibit you from taking mammals for food?

Mr. CLEVELAND (translated by Mary Gregory). First of all, by KYUK, somebody mentioned it. Especially the part about the taking of it for sale and arts and crafts.

Senator STEVENS. That's unfortunate, because the House bill specifically states and permits the taking of mammals for food. Again, the only area of controversy is the sale part and we need a record to say what people do with the mammals when they sell them. What type of commerce we are dealing with. Does he sell, from his village, any mammals that are taken?

Mr. CLEVELAND (translated by Mary Gregory). If they catch more than they can use in their homes, they come up river to the Bethel area and then sell the whole seal.

Senator STEVENS. To whom?

Mr. CLEVELAND (translated by Mary Gregory). Sometimes they sell the seal oil and seal to who wants them.

Senator STEVENS. Is there a store here that they use as a trading area? Or, do they sell them to individuals.

Mr. CLEVELAND (translated by Mary Gregory). Individuals.

Senator STEVENS. They sell them to individuals. For food?

Mr. CLEVELAND (translated by Mary Gregory). For food.

Senator STEVENS. Is there any part of the seals that they take that they use for other than food?

Mr. CLEVELAND (translated by Mary Gregory). He said they use the skins of the seal for mukluks, soles for the mukluks, and some women use—may use it to make yoyos, dolls, Eskimo dolls and so on.

Senator STEVENS. And, where do they sell those?

Mr. CLEVELAND (translated by Mary Gregory). They sell those to commercials.

Senator STEVENS. Well, who, is there a co-op? Is there someone who comes to the village to buy them? Do they sell them here?

Mr. CLEVELAND (translated by Mary Gregory). They sell them to either Anchorage or Juneau or those stores that buy them like gift shops and like international——

Senator STEVENS. Okay, what does it cost for a gallon of gas in your village? What does it cost for a gallon of gas?

Mr. CLEVELAND (translated by Mary Gregory). A drum of gas is about $25 to $30, at Quinhagak.

Senator STEVENS. Very good. Thank you very much. Again, I want to point out. I've had a discussion with Mary Gregory who is doing a fine job assisting as did Robert Nick. We are now down to the 15th witness. We have 60 more to go and I have the feeling that a number of the witnesses can speak English better than I an. If you want to use the interpreter in order to make the testimony more understandable to people here, I don't think it's going to help us in Washington because we're not going to get through the number of witnesses. Now, I understand the situation, I think, but I would

again urge anyone who can testify in English to do so and to use an interpreter for those people who need an interpreter so that we can understand for the record what they are saying. All right. The next witness is Andres Chikoyak from Tununak, Alaska.

STATEMENT OF ANDREW CHIKOYAK

Mr. CHIKOYAK. Hello.

Senator STEVENS. Happy to have you with us. Where is your village?

Mr. CHIKOYAK. Tunuak is a village about 140 miles west of here. It is on the Bering Sea coast above Nunivak Island.

Senator STEVENS. What kind of mammals do you take out there?

Mr. CHIKOYAK. Bering seal and the spotted seal.

Senator STEVENS. Just seal. You don't get any walrus or whales?

Mr. CHIKOYAK. Walrus is never killed around that area. We don't kill it because we don't want it.

Senator STEVENS. Is there a trading post or anything there?

Mr. CHICKOYAK. Pardon me?

Senator STEVENS. Is there a trading post in your village? Is there anywhere you can trade?

Mr. CHIKOYAK. A couple of trading posts and the native store, there.

Senator STEVENS. And, can you sell seal meat to this store?

Mr. CHIKOYAK. Not that I know of but the people—we have—the people have their own freezers, now, in which they can freeze their, you know, what they have catched. Anyway, the people there are representatives an—of a very old village. I would say it's about—its existence go way back before the Russians came.

Senator STEVENS. How many people are there now?

Mr. CHIKOYAK. There's over 200 people. I would say about 210.

Senator STEVENS. And, how many families would that be? Do you know?

Mr. CHIKOYAK. I would say about 45 occupied homes, there.

Senator STEVENS. I see.

Mr. CHIKOYAK. Anyway, the generation before this generation have depended on the sea mammals for their subsistence,you know, to survive and so does this generation. Therefore, the seal is very important and very necessary for our survival. But, my people have said that the sea mammal bill is irrelevant and unfair to their struggle to survive. I believe them because I know what they are talking about. For example, this seal hunting season is very poor. At the end of May, I would say, the men in the village will have caught less than the 10 Bering seals and less than 20 spotted seals. About the average of 20 seals are not enough for over 200 people.

Senator STEVENS. How many would you normally take in a year, do you know?

Mr. CHIKOYAK. Well, it depend on the season. If a man catches maybe about two Bering seals and maybe three spotted seals, he would be lucky.

Senator STEVENS. That would be about five per family, huh?

Mr. CHIKOYAK. Yes.

Senator STEVENS. And, what is your—do you have income in your village? That is, beyond sealing? What would be the income, there?

Mr. CHIKOYAK. Well, the men go out, the ones that are able, go commercial fishing in the summertime, and the ones—the disadvantaged ones, I would say, go to the canneries. I would say that in the wintertime, they go on the general assistance. So, the only decent income they get out of the winter, you know, is the seal skins, you know and out of seal skins.

Senator STEVENS. And, you—do you have any dog teams left?

Mr. CHIKOYAK. No.

Senator STEVENS. Is there much trading of seal meat for other things? Do you trade?

Mr. CHIKOYAK. Well, yeah, the——

Senator STEVENS. When it's available, I mean.

Mr. CHIKOYAK. When it's possible, in the springtime, usually, when you bring, maybe about 2, 3 seals you bring them to Nunampachak or Napakiak or Bethel to trade for gas or a lot of times for money so that we can buy gas, motor gas.

Senator STEVENS. Do your people make clothing out of the seal skin?

Mr. CHIKOYAK. Well, very seldom, now, because the people at home, you know, they're turning to the Western culture of living, like, you hardly see, people, you know, Eskimos with mukluks, these days.

Senator STEVENS. Is that because they are worth more when you sell them than they are to yourself? Would it cost less money to get a pair of these——

Mr. CHIKOYAK. It's simply that they are—these shoes last longer and they are more comfortable, and they are less time consuming to get.

Senator STEVENS. You mean these thermoboots that the men are wearing? They are easier to take care of than the handmade ones?

Mr. CHIKOYAK. Yes.

Senator STEVENS. You 'don't have to rub them down with oil and——

Mr. CHIKOYAK. However, I would say that the younger generation is coming back to the—the preservation of our, you know, culture and that sort of thing.

Senator STEVENS. Do you know what a pair of mukluks would sell for from your village?

Mr. CHIKOYAK. Probably about from $15 to $20, but, a lot of times we don't sell that, you know.

Senator STEVENS. Is that what your people in the village would get for them? Fifteen dollars or twenty dollars a pair?

Mr. CHIKOYAK. Yes.

Senator STEVENS. We're trying to develop a record and I think that you can help us. Do you know how long it would take for a woman to make a pair of mukluks?

Mr. CHIKOYAK. If anything doesn't interfere with her work, it would take her, something—perhaps 1 week or—it depends on the skill—the woman's skill of making a pair of mukluks.

Senator STEVENS. Is that a week of steady working, all day long?

Mr. CHIKOYAK. No, I would say 4 or 5 hours a day.

Senator STEVENS. Then, 30 to 40 hours is what you're talking about?

Mr. CHIKOYAK. Around that, yeah.

Senator STEVENS. And, they sell for $15 or $20?

Mr. CHIKOYAK. Uh-huh.

Senator STEVENS. That ought to be an indication. That's the kind of helpful information we need. And, in terms of the rest of the seal, we know you use the seal oil and the seal meat. You use the skins for mukluks. Is there any other part of the seal that could be sold?

Mr. CHIKOYAK. Well, at home, no part of the—so that we can sell it, there's the possibility of selling the seal oil. We can trade that with Nunapichak and perhaps the Bethel people.

Senator STEVENS. Is there anyone that comes around to buy just the pelts from your village?

Mr. CHIKOYAK. Not that I know. Otherwise we have to send them out.

Senator STEVENS. I see. Thank you very much. I appreciate that a great deal. The next witness is Moses White from Kasigluk. We're happy to have you with us. Mr. White.

STATEMENT OF MOSES WHITE

Mr. WHITE. This is concerning the sea mammal. We ask you not to interfere with any act. Dealing a law with the trapping of sea mammals wasn't brought up by local natives because by white brothers. We local natives don't wish for sea mammals in any other way even for the sake of putting them up on the walls for decoration. Also, the natives like sea mammals but different because the natives hunt for the mammals only for food and existence. Alaska Natives live on sea mammals as, for instance, the local natives from the Bethel area and up river trade or even buy seal oil, skins, and meat from the coastline villages. We Alaskans never make a bill against white brothers to stop what they plan, like Eskimo and what they make so why do white man try to take away needed food away from us?

Senator STEVENS. Where do you go to get seals from your village?

Mr. WHITE. I am originally from Eek, Alaska and that's down the coast of the Kuskokwim River. I move to Kasigluk and live there now. But, every spring, as much as I can, I go seal hunting, but didn't go and buying some, now, from the local and coastal villages.

Senator STEVENS. You buy them directly from the coastal villages?

Mr. WHITE. Other villages sell and I buy them.

Senator STEVENS. Do you buy it wholesale? Skin and all?

Mr. WHITE. They sell them by the wholesale or the whole seal and some cut-up meat and some cut-up seal.

Senator STEVENS. What does it cost him to buy seal when he buys it?

Mr. WHITE. $20 to $30.

Senator STEVENS. $20 to $30? How much would that weigh?

Mr. WHITE (translated by Mary Gregory). They vary because they vary in size. Some weigh 90 pounds.

Senator STEVENS. About 90 pounds? That's about $3 a pound? When he does that, does he have the skin to sell? Is it the whole seal we're talking about?

MARY GREGORY. What do you mean?

Senator STEVENS. He said that he bought the whole seal for $20 to $30, is that including the skin?

Mr. WHITE. It includes skin.

Senator STEVENS. And, what do you do with the skin?

Mr. WHITE (translated by Mary Gregory). He use them for making boot, the skin. In order to do that, he have to buy it. Another type of skin for the sole, too.

Senator STEVENS. What skin is that?

Mr. WHITE. That's the skin of a bigger seal because they last longer and because they are better for soles.

Senator STEVENS. What do you do, now?

Mr. WHITE (translated by Mary Gregory). What do you mean, he says.

Senator STEVENS. He couldn't go sealing this year and I wondered why.

Mr. WHITE (translated by Mary Gregory). His Ski-Doo broke down so he can't go.

Senator STEVENS. I see. Is there any other game available to your village? What kind of game could you hunt for, on land in that area?

Mr. WHITE (translated by Mary Gregory). He hunt in the fall time when the, you know, the season is open and he also hunt for moose.

Senator STEVENS. Birds and moose in that area? Are there any other deer and rabbits or musk-ox or beaver?

Mr. WHITE (translated by Mary Gregory). They hunt for mink, otter and muskrat.

Senator STEVENS. And, is that—we're trying to discover as we come in just how much is the seal the main staple meat. But, I think that the record is clear on the coast line that this is 90 percent of the meat. How much of the diet of the people of his village would the ocean mammals be? How—what percentage, roughly. How many meals would you have seal meat, for instance? And, do you use seal oil with these other meats?

Mr. WHITE (translated by Mary Gregory). You use oil when you make any kind of meat. You can not go without it.

Senator STEVENS. And, the second part. How much seal meat is used by their people, compared these other meats?

Mr. WHITE (translated by Mary Gregory). He said that there's about half of the other.

Senator STEVENS. When they are available you use it.

Mr. WHITE. Yes.

Senator STEVENS. I see. Very good, thank you very much. The next man is Joe Beaver from Goodnews Bay. Tell me what the people at Goodnews Bay use mammals for and how many you might take a year and if you sell them where you sell them?

STATEMENT OF JOE BEAVER

Mr. BEAVER (translated by Mary Gregory). He'd like to tell you that he didn't come here on his own, he was asked by the people of Goodnews Bay to represent them as—and, when he came he doesn't know exactly what the matter is before us right now and he'd like to let you know that before he answers your questions. Your question, first. Do you eat an egg with the bacon only?

Senator STEVENS. I don't eat eggs. I understand what he means and it's——

Mr. BEAVER (translated by Mary Gregory). He ask that because when he go to Canada people all the time they ate bacon and eggs and in order that they do this they have to have some kind of grease and he said that he knows that he can not eat anything that is dry.

Senator STEVENS. He makes a very good point. And, that's one thing that's been developed through this hearing that this is—the seal oil is a very basic ingredient to your food. I think we now understand that.

Mr. BEAVER (translated by Mary Gregory). Seal oil is just as much important to the native. And, he said that you do not only use it for food, but for medication as well. For instance, if you have a stomach ache, you can take seal oil; they use it for laxatives and because it has been in your diet for as long as you were born, then your body is nourished by it. He says when you go out hunting for seals it is not an easy task to do and often times some people are as unlucky as he is and you come home empty handed and it is not a good sight to see the children expected and you bring them nothing. And, also, he says he does not intend to sell the skins, but, sometimes when the—he gives to people who are less fortunate than he is, sometimes other people, you know, give him little money in return. But, he says his wife thinks it's nothing. A few years ago since arts and crafts—he started making them, his wife is making those things to sell and she also gives to other women, you know, to work on to make their own things themselves for themselves, too. The money he got from making arts and crafts is not that much—is not enough to——

Senator STEVENS. How much does his family get a year off that?

Mr. WHITE. Maybe $10, $15 for the whole seal. Lot work, too.

Senator STEVENS. Ten or fifteen dollars for what?

Mr. WHITE. I couldn't tell you how much we make for the home, there, she make in a whole year. It's hard to tell.

Senator STEVENS. Well, it's important for us to try and find out how substantial this income is. How much?

Mr. WHITE. I can not—I can not tell you how much because I not watching her.

Senator STEVENS. Okay, thank you. Isaac Hawk from Eek, Alaska, and Peter Samuels of Platinum. Now, let me ask some questions to try and see if we can get to some of the things that we lack in terms of knowledge for the other Senators. Are there any sealskins that leave either of your villages for a place like Anchorage or Seattle where you have orders in advance? Where you have orders where people have said that they will buy so many seals this year? That's seal skins I'm talking about.

STATEMENT OF ISAAC HAWK

Mr. HAWK. As far as I know I have never had that come up.

Senator STEVENS. Can you speak a little louder, please? Is there any central location in the village where you keep seal skins until you accumulate 10 or 15 or 20 of them so they might be sent somewhere?

Mr. HAWK. As far as I know, I have never had any—heard of any individual that had some—had so many furs, you know, and then they send them out to some people outside of the lower 48.

Senator STEVENS. If this bill came through so that it said that no skin of an ocean mammal could be exported from Alaska, would that affect your village in any way?

Mr. HAWK. In some certain extent I think it would.

Senator STEVENS. You could sell them to Anchorage and you could sell them to Nome, but, you could not sell them outside of the State of Alaska. Would that interrupt anything your people have done in the past?

Mr. HAWK. I think that most of the seals that the people that do happen to sell them, I think they sell them outside—down in Seattle.

Senator STEVENS. I see. Do you know who or where they sell them to?

Mr. HAWK. Well, there's two companies down there. Two companies down in Seattle. I don't——

Senator STEVENS. And, as they—and, do you buy any seals after they have been tanned? The sealskin?

Mr. HAWK. Oh, yes, there's a lot of—we send a lot furs out to Japan.

Senator STEVENS. Yes, this is the one thing that we are trying to establish, this so-called flow of commerce. People say that one of the bills said that the product could not be sold in interstate commerce. We're trying to define what is the commerce of the skins and the mammal products that come from Alaska villages. You sell them to Seattle. Do you get any portion of the skins back?

Mr. HAWK. When we sell them, we get our money and that is all.

Senator STEVENS. And, you just get your money and they stay down there? I see. Very good.

(Recess.)

Senator STEVENS. This other gentleman is Isaac Hawk of Eek.

MARY GREGORY. Uh-huh, he's representing Eek.

Senator STEVENS. Did he give you an answer to your question?

MARY GREGORY. He never—he don't go out very much and hunt seals. And he buys them from local stores, the seal skins, and then that's how his wife gets to make arts and crafts.

Senator STEVENS. In the local store——

MARY GREGORY. Local store.

Senator STEVENS. What type of store?

MARY GREGORY. He buys them from Napaka Trading Co., and when Mendola had his store, from Mendola.

Senator STEVENS. And what do they cost him?

MARY GREGORY. They cost $20 a skin, but now they are $30.

Senator STEVENS. $30.

MARY GREGORY. $35, rather.

Senator STEVENS. And he buys those for his wife to make mukluks?

MARY GREGORY. When he buys them, his wife makes Eskimo dolls to sell, and she also makes him a pair of mukluks and their kids. And he said that they are tanned, they are already tanned. And he said he has prepared a little statement to tell you. And since you are here, this doesn't happen very often, he is going to present his statement too.

Senator STEVENS. Well, let's listen to Peter here for a minute, and then we will take his statement. Peter, you heard those questions I asked him. Could you tell me the answer to those for your area?

STATEMENT OF PETER SAMUELS

Mr. SAMUELS. Would you mind going over the questions again, please?

Senator STEVENS. Do your people have seals available or do they have to buy them?

Mr. SAMUELS. We have our seals available. We live about less than a quarter mile from the beach. We live right close to the beach.

Senator STEVENS. Is there a store that you can sell seals or seal skins to, if you have more than you need?

Mr. SAMUELS. Yes, we do.

Senator STEVENS. Right there? In your village?

Mr. SAMUELS. Yes.

Senator STEVENS. And do you know what happens to the seal skins that they buy?

Mr. SAMUELS. Well, Platinum is mainly a mining town. And we have a lot of people coming in from different village—different places from the Lower 48. And things like what the women make is—goes like baskets, and what they make from the sea mammals, they sell pretty good there. They sell—well, they just want it. See, these guys are from the Lower 48 or 49, or whatever you call it.

Senator STEVENS. They come to the village and buy the arts and crafts or the baskets or the mukluks or whatever you have; is that right?

Mr. SAMUELS. Yeah, they are from April to November. And during that time, the women both from Goodnews Bay and Platinum, they have a chance to sell their products there.

Senator STEVENS. And is that a substantial force in the income of Platinum?

Mr. SAMUELS. No, it's not.

Senator STEVENS. Does your family have an income from sales in that area?

Mr. SAMUELS. Not that I know. Originally I'm from Bristol Bay.

Senator STEVENS. I see.

Mr. SAMUELS. I just moved there.

Senator STEVENS. Very good. Thank you very much. Let's listen to Mr. Hawk.

MARY GREGORY. What is your favorite food?

Senator STEVENS. My favorite food is beef.

MARY GREGORY. What else if your favorite pastime?

Senator STEVENS. What is my favorite pastime?

MARY GREGORY. What else do you like, he says?

Senator STEVENS. To eat?

MARY GREGORY. What if somebody told you that you will no longer have beef and you will no longer eat, what would you think?

Senator STEVENS. Well, I guess I would have to eat ham. I don't know.

MARY GREGORY. He was raised on seal meat since he was a small boy. And right now he is very much concerned as is everybody else.

Senator STEVENS. You tell him that one of the things that shocks us about our visit to Bethel is that someone has misinformed the people of this area. No one in the Congress, either in the House of Representatives or the Senate, has suggested that he cannot eat seal meat or have seal oil available.

MARY GREGORY. He is directing questions to you. He wants to know from what moneys earned do you buy food with?

Senator STEVENS. My money?

MARY GREGORY. What money you buy food with. He would like to know how you earn these moneys.

Senator STEVENS. By coming to Bethel and holding hearings.

MARY GREGORY. You are telling the truth. And because of people like this, you are getting your money.

Senator STEVENS. That's right. But tell him I have also had my days of hunting moose and caribou and deer and ducks and rabbits, and the days when I didn't work for all these people.

MARY GREGORY. He too goes out hunting and then he uses his catches and trades them for money and then he buys food from the stores as well.

Senator STEVENS. Where does he do that? Where does he trade them?

MARY GREGORY. In the stores.

Senator STEVENS. Where?

MARY GREGORY. He sells them to the local stores like N.C. And in Eek when he was living there, he sell them to the store down there. Other stores who buy furs.

Senator STEVENS. And can he trade them in and establish an account that he can buy other things like sugar and anything else he wants to buy?

MARY GREGORY. You cannot eat paper money or the other kind. You have to trade it first to get consumables, and then you eat it.

Senator STEVENS. I understand that. But what I am saying is, if he has seal meat that he trades to the N.C. Co., does he establish a credit that he can later go back in and get things for?

MARY GREGORY. He just moved to Bethel a couple years and he never used no credit cards or anything like that.

Senator STEVENS. He sells the seals for cash then, when he sells them?

MARY GREGORY. He answers that he doesn't sell them. But the fact that he told you previous was selling of the furs, the land animals like mink and other stuff.

Senator STEVENS. Oh, I see. I misunderstood. Thank you.

MARY GREGORY. He wants to tell you about something. He wants to tell you that if this legislation passes, he want it to affect only the 48 States and not include Alaska.

Senator STEVENS. Thank you. Peter, do you have anything else to say?

Mr. SAMUELS. No.

Senator STEVENS. Thank you. Joe Friday and Milton Lewis is what I have.

MARY Gregory. I have different list than yours. OK, I will go by my list. Mr. Iliodor Philemonoff, St. George. Joe Friday from Chevak.

Senator STEVENS. What happened to David Hare?

MARY GREGORY. He's next on the list. He's 23.

STATEMENT OF JOE FRIDAY

Mr. FRIDAY (translated by Mary Gregory). Never sells many seal skins. The only skins he sell are—he sells are those for mukluk soles.

Senator STEVENS. And where does he sell them?

MARY GREGORY. To anybody who will buy them, people in his villages and then some to Bethel area people.

Senator STEVENS. And how many seal skins would be sold, does he know, from Chevak in a year?

MARY GREGORY. Sells because people—when you hunt, like some gentleman before him said that hunting seasons vary, and some people may catch some and some will not catch nothing for an entire season.

Senator STEVENS. One of the things we are trying to find out is the total number of seal skins that enter into this commercial area. That's one of the reasons we are asking these questions.

MARY GREGORY. He don't know. But he said that when you sell these skins, you can only sell one skin. You cannot go beyond that, because impossible. He said that he knows the people in the village because he is the elder. And he used to go out hunting when he was younger.

Senator STEVENS. I notice you have a very attractive pair of mukluks. Is there a substantial production of mukluks in the village that is sold outside of the village?

MARY GREGORY. He says not sell them until somebody asks him to make them.

Senator STEVENS. They are on order, huh?

MARY GREGORY. They are on order. When white man comes to the village, he asks a person to make him one and then they will make them. They don't send them like in a production.

Senator STEVENS. You have a customer over here. Do you use any mammals other than seal?

MARY GREGORY. He is trying to tell you this to the best of his knowledge, and he said that—when he sell seal oil, he cannot go over 15 gallons.

Senator STEVENS. Why is that?

MARY GREGORY. Because they can only sell 15 per man, you know, per family.

Senator STEVENS. I see. Thank you very much. Tell the people at Chevak we appreciate very much your coming. Ask him if he can take the message back to Chevak that the bill is not as bad as people thought it was, will you?

MARY GREGORY. Thank you for that.

Senator STEVENS. Thank you very much. Now, we have Mr. Iliodor Philemonoff from the Pribiloffs. We are most happy to have you here, and I'm sorry that the weather has prevented you and your colleagues from joining us yesterday until now.

STATEMENT OF ILIODOR PHILEMONOFF

Mr. PHILEMONOFF. They should be coming in, but I haven't heard anything.

Senator STEVENS. It has. We got word.

Mr. PHILEMONOFF. Are they coming in?

Senator STEVENS. Yes.

Mr. PHILEMONOFF. Well, I'm here mostly on behalf of the Pribiloffs and the fur seals. I think the people in and around this area have done well in speaking for themselves. But I would like to speak of the plea and the plight of the Pribilovians because of the fur seals. I was born and raised on St. George Island. And it wasn't up until 1968 that I came to Anchorage. But before that time, I have attended Mount Edgecomb and 4 years in Pennsylvania in orthodox seminaries. And I still consider St. George or the Pribiloffs my home. And I have intentions of going back some day to live. And I am here because I understand the feelings of the people, because I was raised there and I am an Aleut, who has left the life on the Pribiloffs. And I think throughout the written history of the Aleuts, there have been many setbacks. And once again, I think they are being faced with a devastating setback of not allowing fur seals to be killed. It was not only a setback of lives, but is also the society —the lifestyle of the Aleuts has changed dramatically or drastically since the Russians came, since the discovery of Alaska. The Aleut race, at one time before the Russians came, was estimated at 20,000. But when Alaska was sold, the United States, there was roughly even 2,000 or maybe even less Aleuts. They were decimated through disease and through wars, and just cruel brutality. But now, 105 years later since the sale of Alaska to the United States, there is probably no more than 3,500 Aleuts. And we haven't really increased. Due to many setbacks, even up until World War II. I think the U.S. Government has neglected its obligations to the Alaska Natives, for many years after purchasing Alaska. I think even inequities persist today.

And do you know, up until July of 1962, I worked for $0.52 an hour. And a while before that, I had worked for $0.49 an hour. I had worked on the sealing industry. I had worked hard. I had worked as a laborer, whereas if they worked in Seattle or in Anchorage, this type of work, they would have been getting $3 or better an hour. Just $0.03 an hour raise. And I think this is well below the minimum standards—minimum wage law act. And it's a well known fact that servitude had existed on the Islands. The U.S. Government in itself had caused that servitude should exist on the Pribiloffs. And the decline was even worse. The population during World War II, when we were evacuated from southeastern Alaska, once again disease, and stress and longing for their home had caused many sicknesses and many deaths. And as I said before, now the

U.S. Government wants to set us back again by curtailing the taking of the fur seals and other sea mammals. And to me, this is one of the greatest inequities that the U.S. Government has proposed in recent times. And if the bill passes without any amendment, it will have devastating effect upon all the Natives of Alaska. And I think especially on the 600 Aleuts that live on the Pribiloffs. And we, the Pribilovians, on behalf of the Aleut race, propose that the international fur seal treaty be kept intact and in force, because of their most outstanding and sound conservation practices. The fur seal matter must be excluded from the marine mammal bill, and have it continue as it is under the present international treaty. And I think we are all aware of the consequences that could happen if the treaty should be abrogated. I don't think we have to tell anyone. But there will be indiscriminate killing on the high seas. There is no type of treaty, there is really no regulations. I think the herd, the fur seal herd, would be depleted, or near depleted or near extinction. According to the statistics of today, there are about a million and a quarter to a million and a half fur seals—fur seal herds. And on the average, the annual harvest sustains about 50,000 seals. And I think there is—there is no question in my mind that it will continue to sustain the maximum yield for hundreds of years to come. If we go under the present control. It should still be under the present control. And I think if the Aleuts, like the Eskimos and the Tlingits and all the other Alaska Natives, have had some sound conservation practices, because it was a matter of life or death. And we respected the animals and nature itself. And was not only that, they used every part, every organ of the animal, for one use or another. And I think there was a very, very small percent of the animal that was really thrown away. And I think it's really a moral question: Should the fur seal industry on the Pribiloffs be curtailed, what is the Government going to replace it with? Could you answer that now, Mr. Stevens?

Senator STEVENS. Well, I'm sorry. I'm not trying to curtail it, so I couldn't answer the question.

Mr. PHILEMONOFF. No, I know that. Did they come up with any solution?

Senator STEVENS. Well, there is one lady that says that they ought to move you all to New York City.

Mr. PHILEMONOFF. On Park Avenue?

Senator STEVENS. Yes. But there has been no satisfactory answer to that question.

Mr. PHILEMONOFF. Thank you. Not only that, there are hardly any known nonrenewable resources on the Aleutians as well as the Pribiloffs. And the ocean and the animals have been our way, our life. And I think we all agree that the present method of killing the seals is still the most humane, by clubbing them. And I think it's the quickest method of rendering them unconscious. And I think we all also agree that should there be a more humane way, we would be willing to put that into effect. And Senator Stevens and the staff, I'm sure you are all aware of the treaty session between the United States and Russia, that they had agreed to recognize the rights of the civilized tribes of Alaska and the Aleuts have considered themselves, or did consider themselves, the civilized tribe. And I think

throughout the indian history, the U.S. Government has been sort of unfair in its dealings, and really unhonorable in their dealings with the indians. Mainly, the indians of the lower 48. And I think it's really too early now to assess if we made a fair deal with the United States on the land claims. But of course, on the other hand, I think we have to commend the U.S. Congress for their most fair deals that they have made so far in any indian history. And I think you have lived up to that responsibility, by passing the Alaska Native Land Claims. And I think, Senator Stevens, that you have mentioned that what the individual Alaska Natives would receive from the land claims would be $20,000. But in taking a secondhand look, I think more like $12,000 would be more of an accurate figure, if I'm not mistaken. I recall that figure of $20,000 plus for each enrolled native.

Senator Stevens. I don't think I ever put a dollar sign on it. But you can figure it out. Once we get the roll complete. But there is no way to figure it out now. There is speculation as to the value of the land that was confirmed. We really can't figure out what an individual share is worth until you figure how many people are going to share in it. I have always been of the opinion that there are a lot more people that qualified under that act than most people think. And our mail reflects that. People from all over the United States are writing in to establish their entitlement as being of one-quarter descent from an Alaska Native family. No one can really tell what the dollar value is, until that roll is completed. But it is a sizeable amount, beyond just that dollar value, because of the tremendous value of the mineral interests in the lands that were confirmed. There is a substantial value in those minerals.

Mr. Philemonoff. And I think if nothing else, that I have conveyed to you, I'm sure you have heard all of this and you will probably continue to hear it again. I would like to stress the fact that Members of the House or Members of the Congress have felt this land claims was sort of a giveaway or a welfare act. But if you, Senator Gravel, Representative Begich, would educate some of your colleagues in Washington that this was not a giveaway, this was not a welfare act, that this was in essence, in plain words, was a real estate transaction that took place between the natives and the U.S. Government. And the natives had claimed that they owned all of Alaska at one time. But how much did we receive out of that 40 million acres and 335 million acres was sold for $962.5 million. And many have—think we have become instant millionaires. But this is really not true. So, I would like to urge you, if you would educate them down in Washington a little more, it would be of some help to us up here in Alaska.

Senator Stevens. As long as you are here, what do they do with the meat that is not consumed on the Pribiloffs?

Mr. Philemonoff. Well, in St. Paul, all the meat that is not consumed for human consumption is taken, and there is a byproduct, which is the mink food, made into mink food by grinding it and freezing it.

Senator Stevens. Do you know how much that is?

Mr. Philemonoff. They use the whole seal, you know, the rest—I think they take the whole complete seal and grind it up.

Senator STEVENS. Is any portion of it used for human consumption?

Mr. PHILEMONOFF. Oh, yes.

Senator STEVENS. How much of the seal is used for food on the island?

Mr. PHILEMONOFF. Well, you see, in earlier times when we were—even in 1952, when we were still being treated something like slaves at that time, that the U.S. Government had curtailed the selling of domestic meat, as you get in the stores, beef—if you ever did get it—throughout the summer months. They forced us to eat the seal meat. But now, at that time we ate more seal meat, but today, it's a little less. And I really—I don't think I can give you a figure.

Senator STEVENS. Do they use the oil?

Mr. PHILEMONOFF. Some. Not as much as the people do in this area.

Senator STEVENS. Do they preserve the oil they don't use?

Mr. PHILEMONOFF. No. Most of the blubber, as you know, it's used in the tanning process. But for human consumption, it's very little. On the Pribiloffs.

Senator STEVENS. You use the blubber in the dressing process of the skin itself?

Mr. PHILEMONOFF. Yes. That's what the company uses.

Senator STEVENS. And that's actually put in the casks and shipped out, along with the fur sealskin?

Mr. PHILEMONOFF. Yes, they are packed separately in the barrels.

Senator STEVENS. That's the fleshing process?

Mr. PHILEMONOFF. Yes.

Senator STEVENS. Thank you very much.

Mr. PHILEMONOFF. Then I have a three page deal here.

Senator STEVENS. Yes, if you would give it to the young lady, we would be happy to print it. Thank you very much, and thank you, Mr. Friay. We appreciate your testimony.

Senator STEVENS. Next witness is Harry Wilde from Mountain Village. And will Milton Lewis please come up? David Hare is not here.

STATEMENT OF HARRY WILDE

Mr. WILDE. I introduce myself first. My name is Harry Wilde, member of Village Council, manager of Mountain Village Co-op Store. I am here on behalf of my people.

Senator STEVENS. Very, very good of you to come, Mr. Wilde. Can you tell us what your people do with the seals? I take it that seals are the only mammals that your people would use?

Mr. WILDE. Yes. We are in the Yukon about 80 miles inside of the river, that's from the ocean. We hunt. What we hunt is seal. And the seal we catch—also the people they sell to us. We dry them and they make boots out of them. They make sewing thread out of them, like arts and crafts. And they make parkas out of them and the boots out of them.

Senator STEVENS. How many people do you have in Mountain Village now?

Mr. WILDE. Mountain Village is population 487.

Senator STEVENS. And do you go down to the ocean to get your seals?

Mr. WILDE. Yes, sir, we do. Sometimes not very many people hunt because of the too far away from our place. But most of the people, they come and sell the meat and the oil and skin to us, from down-river.

Senator STEVENS. And do they sell that to the store?

Mr. WILDE. We work with the people. We advertise it. We never buy it, because there are no facilities. But we help them to distribute to the people.

Senator STEVENS. Do you trade in skins? Do you buy skins in the store?

Mr. WILDE. Not right now, we don't. Because this Co-op that we started 2 years old, something like that. And right now, we just taking order, that's all. And we get the skins for those people.

Senator STEVENS. Are you ANAC?

Mr. WILDE. No. We are with Consumer Federation.

Senator STEVENS: Do your people rely on seal oil and seal meat to any extent?

Mr. WILDE. Yes. Our people in the Yukon, they can't go without no seal oil. Some that even—we get orders, even from States we get orders. They ask if we could buy some seal oil. And also from all the way up to Haldat and above. They ask us if we could fly them the seal oil. So that wherever it is, the seal oil, then these people use it. As myself, I grew up in Hooperville, that's where I was born. And I raised in St. Michael. That's where I was raised. So that right now, everything that seals—go through Mountain Vilaage. In wintertime around 20 to 30 seals, in wintertime. And they sell them for $20. But these young oogruks, they sell them for around $30.

Senator STEVENS. Including the skin?

Mr. WILDE. Including the skin.

Senator STEVENS. And then does someone come to the village and buy skins?

Mr. WILDE. The people there, all along the Yukon there, they buy skins. Not only to make boots out of. They buy—some of them in order to make arts and crafts out of it in order to make money. I deal with a lot of native people or poor people ever since I go in that store. We have food stamps, all right, to help our native people. But only food stamps could buy food, but they couldn't buy gasoline or something that they need. They couldn't buy it. Some of them, they only depend on art and crafts. Like skin sewing, boots, what they sell, the parkas what they sell. There are some of them—really that it hurts me sometimes when a person that she or he come in, he like to have something but he has no money to do it.

Senator STEVENS. I appreciate your testimony. And I understand the limitations of the food stamps. We tried to solve that once, but we weren't successful. Hopefully, when this form of the total family assistance plan is adopted, that will be changed and you will have greater assistance. But I do appreciate that. I didn't know that people all the way up in the Yukon did in fact use seal oil. Thank you very much. Mr. Lewis, what is the village you are from?

STATEMENT OF DAVID HARE

Mr. HARE. My name is David Hare.

Senator STEVENS. Have I got the wrong person? Is this Mr. Hare? I'm sorry.

Mr. HARE (translated by Mr. Nick). This is David Hare from Atmautlauk. He had a prepared statement, which the Village Council prepared. So he wanted to speak it. Some of it is reiteration of what has been discussed, but he wishes to present it, you know, since he was delegated by his village. So I will translate what he has stated.

Senator STEVENS. Fine.

Mr. NICK. He said that here in the Bethel area, even if their village is away from the coastal areas, they use the seal and the soil and the skin, you know, as much as the coastal area people. And they use it, you know, when the people from the coastal villages come up to trade it for white fish or any other food that is available in the tundra villages. And he said this is true because he has traded with the coastal area people many times. You know, come to the native people wanting to buy mukluks and parkas. And this is good, you know, for the natives, because, because it helps the economy of the native people. The natives in the past have never tried to curtail the livelihood and the life style of the nonnatives. We, the natives, have never in the past gone down to the lower 48 to try to ban the food products of the nonnatives. The village people are really concerned about the proposed legislation. There are many natives that cannot live on store bought goods, you know, very long. All of the consumer goods are purchased in cash, and many of the native people a lot of times do not have the cash to purchase the consumer goods. And the merchants in these villages, you know, do not allow the village people to purchase on credit. He says, lastly, his village feels that the sea mammals should not—there should not be any proposed legislation to ban the sea mammal. However, there should be some legislation to stop the sale of alcoholic beverages, because alcoholic beverages, you know, are claiming human lives day after day in the Bethel area.

Senator STEVENS. That's a good comment. Thank you. I am sending my two young men here off on a task. I am going to see that they go to some of the villages out of Bethel tomorrow along with the National Guard, so they can see some of the areas that this—do we have any more on the first page?

Mr. NICK. No, except the village clusters.

Senator STEVENS. What?

Mr NICK. Except the cluster of villages.

Senator STEVENS. Why don't we put some more chairs up and take all of the people from each village that want to testify now. Why don't you see, Robert, if there are any of these people who have statements they would like to make, and we will listen to to those. And if I have any questions, I will ask them. James Paul from Kipnuk.

STATEMENT OF JAMES PAUL

Mr. PAUL (translated by Mr. Nick). He said that he is from the coastal areas, and his village is Kipnuk. He said the people in the

coastal villages, you know, utilize this sea mammal to supplement their cash economy. And they do it by as was stated before, by the sale of seal oil to the mainlanders and to the other villages along the Kuskokwim River. He said they also sell the sealskin, you know, for mukluks and other uses. And also the seal meat, you know, for the mainland villages. He said, unlike the nonnatives who are living in cities and urban areas, the rural natives do not have many opportunities to have jobs that will provide them with cash income throughout the year. And the only cash income that they have is for about 1 or 2 months in the summertime, which is canning work and fishing. He said that is why the people in the villages, you know, are very concerned over the sale of the products of the sea mammal.

Senator STEVENS. Does the other gentleman have any comments to make? James Anaver.

STATEMENT OF JAMES ANAVER

Mr. ANAVER (translated by Mr. Nick). Jimmy has brought out the things that he observed in his boyhood, especially the harvest of the sea mammal. He said when he was a boy, he used to watch his parents in the harvest of the sea mammal, because his parents both did not have any type of work to provide for a cash economy. He used to watch them prepare the sealskin, the seal meat and the seal oil, preserving the seal oil and seal meat for sale to get the cash income for the family. And he said in those days when he was a boy, he used to envy other kids that have parents that have full-time jobs where their parents would be able to take them to stores and buy them toys and other goods that kids like, you know, when they are young. He said that many times he used to ask his father for money when he envied his fellow boys. But his father would not have any money to give him. And he said when he asked his father for money so he could buy toys and other boyhood goods, he used to realize afterwards, after he has asked, that there is no money and no type of cash economy where his father can give him money so he can buy toys and other necessities that a boy would want in his early days.

Mr NICK. To expedite so we can be within the time frame that is allowed to the Kipnuk group, I will translate just the major portions of Mr. Anaver's testimony. He said that he has observed his father when he sells the products of the marine mammal, the sea mammal. And he uses the money that he acquires from this sale to buy clothing for his family, to buy gasoline, to buy stove oil for their stove for the winter. And this money, once he receives it, is in most cases gone the next day, with no more money to come in until the next hunting season. He says it is supplemented, you know, in the wintertime, in the falltime, by land mammal hunting, which is mink. But that supplement is very little. So until the next sea mammal hunting season which is the springtime, he has no other cash economy to look for work. He says on the other hand, the nonnatives of the Lower 48 and the urban cities has a full-time job with incomes going from 10,000 to millionaires. He says these people prepare and fill their freezers with foods of all types purchased by cash. And unlike the native people, these people, the non-natives, once their freezer is empty, will fill it again with foods of all types,

using again cash, which is not available to the native people. He said that is why he feels that the amendments to this legislation are very important to the existence of our people in rural Alaska. Do you have any questions for this gentleman?

Senator STEVENS. No. I think I see the pattern of their utilization of the seal. And I understand their situation. If any of the rest of them have any comments to make, I would be happy to have them. And we are happy to have the testimony on the record representing the viewpoint of all your village. Yes, sir, do you have a comment?

STATEMENT OF KARL CARL

Mr. CARL (translated by Mr. Nick). Karl Carl stated that most of what he had in mind was brought forth by Jimmy Anaver. But he wanted to add to his testimony, and he stated that ever since he started hearing of the proposed legislation in its initial form he has thought a lot about the legislation that has passed that affect the livelihood of the native people. He said that he himself feels very strongly that the legislations of this type should not be imposed upon the Native Alaskans. He said that in his hunting terrain, which is the Bering Sea, in the future if this bill becomes law without the amendments, with conditions in the bill providing for nonsale of the sea mammal, he says that if he sees any protection agents or enforcement officers of this legislation, he will drown these people or do something with them.

Senator STEVENS. Well, that's the second time I've heard that today. And I must say that I'm sorry to hear it. I wish you would let me take it out of the record. Alaskans send me to Washington to do a job. There is nothing in this bill that would prevent you from taking these mammals. To have me go back to Washington and say that the Alaskans do not obey the law and are prepared to shoot Federal officers is not what I came to Bethel for. And I want you to understand that I could not condone that. People tell me I can't do something. We have a lot of non-native people who have in fact used sea lions, have used otters, have used whales, have used other things, and this bill absolutely prohibits them from taking any. And what you are telling me is that since there may be some people throughout the State who are nonnative who are now being denied the right to take sea mammals, that they would have a justification to shoot a Federal officer. You don't elect me to the Senate to condone something like that, and I'm not going to condone it. I don't want to hear it again. I want you to understand that there is not anything in this bill that would permit anybody to stop you from taking ocean mammals for food. What happens to them after they are taken for food is what this is about. Whether you can sell the mammal products. But certainly no one is justified in saying that they would shoot or drown somebody that is just doing his job. And in many instances, they would be some of your fellow Alaskan Natives, who are the enforcement officers throughout this State. Now, that does not make any sense for me to go back and tell the U.S. Senate that an Alaska Native is about ready to drown somebody because somebody else told him that he might not be able to take seal. It's just not the thing to have in this record, and I'm sorry

that it's in the record. But I hope that it doesn't get in the record again. Those are strong words, but they call for strong words, because someone has misled you people. I don't know who it is, but no one has said anything that would lead anybody to believe that the Congress was trying to stop the Alaska Natives from taking mammals for food. Now, that's all there is to it. And once you take them for food and you take the skins from them, they get into commerce. And the Congress has been discussing the commerce question and not the question of taking for food. Certainly, I don't believe that anybody is justified in threatening to kill another human being over a question of what happens in legislation. Now, it's a very serious thing to make that statment on a record that is printed and will be for all time, for the whole history of the world, it will be in the U.S. Senate that someone threatened that if Congress acted in a way that many responsible and concerned people in the Senate are considering to act, and that is, concerning the question of the sale of marine mammal products. And there is a dispute about that, that someone might get killed. I'm sorry you said it, I really am. Now, I listened to 18 hours of testimony yesterday in Nome, and that was not raised at all. I don't understand it here. And I hope you understand my position. I am trying to defend what you people want to see happen, and I cannot do that on the basis of threats. So, I hope that we will not hear that again tonight or tomorrow. And I hope you understand why I'm saying it. I'm sure you do. Don't you? Do you understand me?

Mr. CARL. Yes.

Senator STEVENS. We ought to be tough enough and friends enough to be able to put it right on the line and talk to one another directly on things like this. That does not help our cause to have one of my friends in the Senate who represents a very large city where people are worried about killing anything, they don't kill anything any more. And they worry about it. And they see these television shows that show people hitting seals over the head or shooting a seal and leaving it on the ice or shooting a wolf from the air. We have had a whole series of these And along comes the records and it says if someone does what Congress tells them to do, and that's what they would be doing, that one of my friends in Alaska, you, say you might—and I hope that's the way it comes out—that you might consider killing him. Now, that's just not right. You know that's not right. What's more, I know you enough to know you wouldn't do it. At least, I trust to God you wouldn't do it, because I don't know how I would defend you in court if you did it. If a man was just carrying out his job. Now, there are a lot of things that go wrong in this country. Sometimes laws are made that are bad, but that's why we have a government like we have. We try to change them. This law hasn't been made yet. And there would be no justification for an action against an officer of the Federal Government on that basis. But I do understand your concern about the utilization of your seals, and I hope that you will go back to your village and tell the people there that there has been misinformation about this bill. I think it's very unfortunate misinformation. But that we have had a good hearing and that we have gathered a great deal of information that will be useful, I feel, in helping us to convince the Congress

that the sale of seal meat and seal products are as important to you as the food, in terms of continuing your life and enabling you to take care of your families and your children. I think we have gotten that message, and it's a good message. But don't—please don't anybody mention killing anybody else, a human being, again tonight. I think that's unfortunate.

Mr. NICK. The floor has requested that your reply be translated to avoid future inferences to the threat of human lives.

Senator STEVENS. Okay.

(Mr. Nick translates.)

Senator STEVENS. Thank you. Mary, did you have anything to add?

Mr. NICK. Mary Anaver is Jimmy Anaver's mother.

STATEMENT OF MARY ANAVER

Mrs. ANAVER (translated by Mr. Nick). She said that Jimmy, you know, did very well in explaining the use of the sea mammal, explained fully the uses as they use the sea mammal in Kipnuk. But she wanted to add the fact that every spring until recently, the whole village—the entire village people used to go to spring camps where they can be closer to the sea mammal. They go about this time of the year. And it would be cold and they would live in tents. And she said that after they go to spring camp and they dry their seal meat, the men would go to cannery, and that would leave the women behind with no means of acquiring fish or fresh seal meat. So the women, you know, that dried the seal meat, would eat the seal meat all summer with no other supplement except for wild celery which they are able to gather from near the villages. So they would live on the dried seal meat and wild celery throughout the summer until their husbands return after their 2 months of cannery work. And she said that is why, you know, when the village people were told—were led to misunderstand that the sea mammal would be banned from harvest, even for subsistence, she said that is why she knows from the number of village representatives that came here, that they are really concerned about the information which they had received concerning the legislation.

Senator STEVENS. Thank you very much. I understand that fully well. And I can understand the reaction. I'm sure that the members of the Congress would have understood that too. Could you tell me, since we don't have many women who are testifying, if the women of her village do sew seal skins?

Mrs. ANAVER (translated by Mr. Nick). She said that many women in Kupnik do sew sealskin for mukluks, yo-yos and parkas, which we see everywhere worn by natives and nonnatives. She says they do this to supplement the cash economy for their survival. And she said that—she has one question. I don't know if it has been asked before. And she was going to give it to somebody else if she didn't get the chance to testify. I want to ask it for her. Her question was, why was the House legislation, you know, included the condition of the nonsale of arts and crafts of the sea mammal?

Senator STEVENS. The house bill contained a provision that said that the taking could not be done for purposes of direct or indirect

commercial sale. And the reason that that was in there, according to the statement that's in the House record—and I think you may have it available, the staff has it here, if you have not seen it—was that one of the members of the House made specific reference to the Land Claims Settlement bill, and misunderstood that bill. But I don't think that—again, I don't think that that had reference to the type of trading type economy, where skins or mukluks or meat is traded for other things. That's why we were trying to develop the manner in which these sales took place. A trade, a barter economy, as opposed to large commercial sales of 500 or 1,000 sealskins at a time; this is what they really meant. They did not say that. They were looking at it for a sole purpose of taking a seal primarily to sell it, and not to take it and use what you have to use yourself and sell the balance, or use part of it yourself to supplement your income. They were talking about primarily commercial taking, like commercial whaling. We used to have commercial whaling where they would go out and take whales solely for the whale oil or whales solely for particular portions of the mammal. That's what they were talking about—going out and taking seals solely for the purpose of getting the skins and selling the skins. But it was a misunderstanding on the part of the House, and I think we straightened that out now. Thank you very much. We appreciate your patience. It has been a long day. And I appreciate your testimony.

Mr. NICK. The second group of delegates will be from Kongiganak, Alaska.

Senator STEVENS. We will have to know who this is as we go through, Robert, all right? Evon Azean.

STATEMENT OF EVON AZEAN

Mr. AZEAN. This bill—getting into our area and to all the Alaska Natives, is one of the things that we start feeling that it might be one of the problems if it passes, to the Alaska Natives. But as I consider it, we both have two things that we usually do before we get into the job or to the experience. In Gussick side, what they call an education must be first obtained by the Gussick people. And in our tribe, Eskimo tribe, the experience must be first obtained before we get into the things that we must need. So it all works together. Education must be first gotten if the job has to be taken. And if there is lack of education, there won't be any proper job. Also, it may—they make get job all right, but it won't get to the proper rate. But they think be best for their own living. And similar to ours—before we get into the times that we could really get things we need, we do first get a proper experience to get things. Like for instance, if we have to hunt seal meat or seals or walrus, we must learn the proper way in experience to get seals. And other than that, it takes lot of time for us Eskimos to get this good experience to get the seals. Now, getting into the seals that we use for our living is the greatest part of our living. And it's most important that we must have these foods, especially the seal meat, the seal oil, as well as the sealskins. If one village can't get no seal oil or sealskins to support his family or himself or his relatives, it's just like he's having no job at all. Nothing to support his family, nothing to support the other rela-

tives. So it's very important that we must get this good experience to get all these things we need. And most of all, also, it's part of living that our women—the Eskimo women do get experience to try and get these arts and crafts to make a little money out of it. But yet, it's not enough for their own family, except just for a little part of it. And what we have out of these things or the sea mammals, as they call it, one family may have enough just barely to make it over the winter. To get things in a short time or over a short season. And if he do it, have enough, he may have to trade some to the upper people, for the similar foods. But it's—it all depends on experience to the people who must get all these things. It's just like comparing to the man who got a good job and earns good money to make his own living. And that's how our living is with these sea mammals, as they call it.

Senator STEVENS. Thank you very much. I see you are in the Guard. You are in the Guard, are you? When people from this area go out to maneuvers or the annual encampments, do you take seal oil with you?

Mr. AZEAN. Yes. Most all of them take seal oil and other seal meats with them. That's the important thing.

Senator STEVENS. Thank you very much.

Mr. NICK. Dick Kiumya of Kongiganak.

Senator STEVENS. Yes; I know Dick.

STATEMENT OF DICK KIUNYA

Mr. KIUNYA (translated by Mr. Nick). He is going to tell you what you have been asking today on the use of the products of the sea mammal. He says that he considers seal oil an important part of the livelihood of the Eskimo people. He says he himself, at every meal, a bowl of seal oil is always by his bowl of meal. He said that is why he is fat. Earlier today, you asked questions to the village representatives on how far they had to go to catch the sea mammals. He said from his experience, you know, as a seal hunter, he is going to tell you how far he goes and how long it takes him. He said when he used to hunt, he never used to go by dog team. He just used and walk and drag his kayak. He said that about this time of the year, the days are long, the nights are short. And he said when they prepared to go hunting, they get up, you know, long before the sun comes up. And they start walking down towards the sea. And they just make it out to the edge of the water about sunset. He said that's how long it takes him to go out to go seal hunting. And he said many times during seal hunts, they sleep about at the most 3 hours a night. He said they go to bed around midnight, and get up long before the sun comes up. And by sunrise, they be along the Bering Sea waiting for sea mammals. He said that is how long and how far they go to catch the sea mammal. He said that these hunting trips, they do not always catch seals right away. Sometimes it takes them all day and sometimes they catch seal right away. And when they do catch seal, they try to take them back to their families right away, because their families are expecting them to bring home food. And also, they are—the hunters are hungry also for seal meat. He said that today, you know, many times he wanted to know what the

people use the sea mammal for. He said that he, himself, and his wife, once they get the sea mammal, they prepare and serve the food and dry the skin and most times, you know, he doesn't try to go out and sell his sealskin. But his wife would make some Eskimo clothing or clothing out of sea mammals, sealskin. And even though she does not try to sell them, many people see them and try to buy them, nonwhites. So, she sells the arts and crafts, you know, whenever a person wants to buy something that she has made, she sells it. And he said that he is grateful whenever an opportunity comes for them to sell the arts and crafts that are made by his wife. Because this money derived from this sale is a supplement to their cash economy. He said many times when he comes to Bethel and the Bethel area villages, he is asked if he has any seal oil for sale, any seal meat for sale, any sealskin for sale. So even though they do not go out and try to sell their sealskins and seal meat, they are asked by their fellow natives for the purchase of this commodity. He said that is how they sell and bring cash economy to their families from the sea mammals. He has heard of some condition on the sale of Alaska from Russia to the United States, and he says he has heard that this conditon read that the Russian Government requested the United States upon its sale, requesting that the U.S. Government do not interfere with the rights of the Alaska Natives, because the Alaska Natives own Alaska. And their modes of subsistence not be altered by the U.S. Government. And he is asking if this condition or if this reference on the sale of Alaska, you know, is true.

Senato STEVENS. There is such a provision in the treaty. I don't have it with me, but there is such a provision in the treaty. The representative from the Pribiloffs mentioned that too.

Mr. KIUNYA (translanted by Mr. Nick). He wants to thank you for your knowledge of the conditions in the treaty. And in summation, requests you and other congressional Representatives and Senators to allow for—to have the amendment included in this legislation to allow the natives to sell the arts and crafts derived from the sea mammal. He says, because the people in this area will continue to barter with the sea mammal for their means of subsistence.

Senator STEVENS. Thank you very much. As we stated—I'm certain that will be the result after these hearings are completed that the other members of the Senate will listen to us. But I also think that the possibility of commercial operations in the sea mammal—by that, I mean the big vessels that go out to take, slaughter sea mammals, solely for putting them into a commercial market, will not occur.

Mr. NICK. Carl Jimmy.

Senator STEVENS. Yes, Mr. Jimmy. Happy to have you here.

STATEMENT OF CARL JIMMY

Mr. JIMMY (translated by Mr. Nick). Carl stated that some of his testimony has been brought forth by other people, but he is going to touch on some of the stuff, you know, which he considers important, because he has prepared his testimony. He says that the sea mammal is looked upon by the coast villages as their main source of subsistence food. He said many times you asked a question today on how many sea mammals or how many seals each family catches during

the year. And he said that that is a tough question, because like Evon Azean said, in order to catch the sea mammal, you have to have experience and you have to know how to hunt. He said that some of the hunters that go out to the Bering Sea and to the Norton Sound to go hunting do not catch seal, because every hunter is not as lucky as the next hunter. He said especially this year, sea mammal is very scarce down the Bering Sea. He said you can tell by their facial complexions that they have been out in the sun all day, everyday, because they are suntanned. But a lot of them like him have never killed one sea mammal yet this spring. They have not shot one rifle toward a sea mammal. He said that many hunters spend day after day out in the Bearing Sea going around in ther boats hunting for sea mammal, but if they don't see the sea mammal, they don't catch the sea mammal. And he said that the sea mammal, once they catch it, has many uses. And to some of them, the meat does not last very long, as was stated earlier. That the dried meat is eaten in the summertime by the women while the husbands are in the cannery. But seal oil and seal skin last throughout the winter. But the meat does not last very long. So since they cannot live on seal oil and seal skins, they barter what excess seal oil and seal skin they have for other types of food like fish, because they do not have any salmon that is available on the Kuskokwim. So they barter this excess seal oil, seal skins, so they can live throughout the winter. He wants to agree with some of the statements or some of the reasons behind the proposed legislation. He said he has heard that this legislation is proposed by Congress because of the wanton killing of sea mammals in other parts aside from the State of Alaska. He says he believes that, because the sea mammal is becoming scarce in the State. He said they do not see as many sea mammals as they do any more. He said that is why he believes that other countries and some countries in the eastern coast of the United States must excessively kill the sea mammal for wanton purposes. And he urges that corrective amendments be legislated to allow Alaska Natives to be able to continue as they have done in the past.

Senator STEVENS. Thank you very much.

STATEMENT OF JOHN PHILLIPS

Mr. PHILLIPS. My name is John A. Phillips, and I am the president for the council at Kongiganak.

Senator STEVENS. You are John Phillips, and you are the president of the council, John?

Mr. PHILLIPS. Yes, I am.

Senator STEVENS. Happy to have you here.

Mr. PHILLIPS (translated by Mr. Nick). In answer to your questions on the uses of the sea mammal, he is going to bring out certain things which he knows, because he lives with the sea mammal on his body from the day he was born. He said when he was a young boy, he was not—he did not grow up in a house nor in a quonset house. It was in a sod house, what you call a pasigay (phonetic).

Senator STEVENS. What?

Mr. PHILLIPS (translated by Mr. Nick). "Pasigay," which is a mudhouse where the men stay. He says he grew up in that type of a

house. And as far as he can remember, all the clothing he had on his body was from sea mammals. He said when his mukluks or mittens or any other type of clothing wears out, his mother would make him a new pair. He says the sea mammal has been used as clothing by him and others in his boyhood and is still being used at this date for clothing. In his early childhood, his mother passed away. And since his father cannot make the necessary clothing out of sea mammal, he had to buy from other women that were able to make them. And he said he had an aunt. His aunt was able to make the mukluk or the mitten or the parka, his aunt made it. But if his aunt was not available, his father had to buy the clothing from other families. He said that is why the people are very concerned about the sale of goods from sea mammals. He said that is not true only of the coastal villages, but also to the mainland villages that use sea mammal for their mukluks and other winter clothing. He said that when he became a hunter, every time he came into the villages along the Bethel area, people would ask him, "Do you have any seal skin for sale? Do you have any seal meat for sale?" He said these people everywhere he goes ask him the same questions. He said that is why he knows that many people use the seal skins. In closing, he would like to request the people involved in this legislation to trust the testimonies of the many village representatives that have testified before this body, because they are telling the truth, because they have no other way of lifestyle. And the testimonies brought forth are from actual experiences. And he is also requesting—he stated that many times he sees copies of legislations, bills, in the State legislatures, in congressional legislatures, but they take one look at them and just lay them down, because they don't know what they are. Many times, you know, they are sent newspapers, congressional records, but since they cannot read, they use them for bathroom tissue. So he says any legislation that is detrimental to the livelihood of the native people, he says don't send them copies of the legislatures, because they use them again for bathroom tissue.

Senator STEVENS. Edna Andrew.

STATEMENT OF EDNA ANDREW

Mrs. ANDREW (translated by Mr. Nick). She is the mother of eight children, and she says when she heard about this proposed legislation, she was very concerned about her family. That is why, she said, she made very effort to come to Bethel to testify about her problems. She said when she came up, she used all her money and had to charge part of her fare with promise to pay later whenever she can have money. She says she has eight children. And her eight children, even though they eat the sea mammal, they can't eat it everyday. And she said her husband, although he hunts, does not get—catch very many seals. She said that is why she as a wife must prepare of this animal, you know, takes very careful preservative—care of this mammal. When these women receive the seals that are caught by their husbands, they prepare the seal oil and preserve it in pokes and other containers, and dry the seal skin and also dry the seal meat. And when their husbands go to the cannery, they need the seal meat during his absence. Ahe says that many times long before

the return of their husbands, the seal meat goes out, even though the consumption of it is supplemented by wild celery. And when the food, the dried meat goes out, the only thing left for them is the seal oil and seal skin. She said she is going to ask you a question, if you have ever seen a dried seal skin and if you have ever seen rendered seal oil, she is questioning you if you know what it takes to prepare this, to dry it and to render the seal oil?

Senato STEVENS. I have seen it but I have never done it. I don't know how to do it.

Mrs. ANDREW (translated by Mr. Nick). She says if you have seen it, it is not appetizing nor can you drink seal oil. She says she herself cannot do it either. She cannot cut up a seal skin and eat it for her survival. Nor can she drink seal oil for daily consumption, food. She says when they run out of this dried meat, when her husband returns from cannery, they make plans what to do for the remaining 10 months, how to provide food for their eight children. And they make plans to try to sell this seal oil and sealskin so they can exchange it for food for buying other consumer supplies.

Senator STEVENS. Thank you very much. Julia B. Jimmy.

STATEMENT OF JULIA JIMMY

Mrs. JIMMY (translated by Mr. Nick). She said that her grandparents in the old days used to tell them about things that will happen to her and to her children and to their children. And her grandparents used to sympathize with what is going to happen to their children when the white man come with his rules to govern the lives of her children. She says many things that were taught to her by her grandparents who have never seen white man nor have any read any books are coming true. And this is exactly what her grandparents used to prophecize that is going to happen to them and their children. She said she never thought that these things which her grandparents used to say would come true in her lifetime. But they are happening. She said that when she was young, she used to observe her father when he goes out hunting for subsistence purposes. That some winters, he would catch too mink, and he would sell one mink for a 50 pound sack of flour, and then the other one for a 5 gallon can of blazo (phonetic). She said that since that time, food was scarce and money was—there was no money to be derived at any other way except by hunting. They used to space the usage of these food commodities. And she said when she got married, she was happy about that training that she derived from her parents, because she was able to preserve and make many uses of the sea mammal that is caught by her husband. And that very training and experience that she has preserved has helped them to live on the sea mammal to this date. She said that when she got—before she got married, she never used to sew or make many articles out of the sea mammal. But when she got married, she started making articles of clothing and other necessary items out of the sea mammal. And she said that the women in the villages take care of the drying of the sea mammal and they are responsible for what is done with the skins and meat. But in the case of oil, they decide with their husbands on what they can do with the seal oil. And many times, they

make arts and crafts to be able to provide or make an added cash income so they can be able to purchase the necessary food items. And she said that is why the women are very concerned about the amendments to this proposed legislation. She said that she closes her testimony here, because the many things she had prepared were already brought forth by the other people that testified.

Senator STEVENS. Susie Chaniguk.

STATEMENT OF SUSIE CHANIGUK

Mrs. CHANIGUK (translated by Mr. Nick). She said like the lady before her, she came up to Bethel solely for the purpose of being able to testify before this committee. And she had prepared comments which she wanted to bring out at this time. She said her comments pertained to the older times when she was a young lady. She said during those times when their fathers wished to go hunting, they, the women, the young women, used to go out to the Bearing Sea to go out to get the catches of their fathers. And she said she used to go by dog teams down to the bay—see. And they didn't have many dogs at the time, and she used to work very hard to bring home the catch of her father and to help prepare the seal and other sea mammals that are caught by her father. She said that in the springtime, especially when the snow goes out, she used to work very hard to bring home the catches, and says many times when they get to sand bars they have to unload their sleds—move their sleds further up and then take the seals up to the sled and try to get him to the villages, and it is extremely hard work. When they get closer to the villages, sometimes they would be assisted by some of the village people. And when they arrived in the villages they right away prepared the seals, cut them up and gut them, and then get the meat out. She said that the women when they prepare the sealmeat, like the other lady say, they dry them, put the seal oil in pokes, and then dry the seal skins. And then during the summer months they eat the seal meat but when they start worrying about running out of seal meat, sometimes during the summer months, since lot of the seals that are killed by the hunters drown, and they are unable to get them at the time they catch them—in the spring time. But, in the summer months some of these dead seals wash up to the shore and when the women who stay behind in villages while their husbands are in canneries see these dead seals that have washed along the shore they pick them up, even if they are deteriorated, because they have no other fresh foods. They prepare them, they cook them and they eat them. They also prepare the oil that is taken from these dead seals that they have found along the beaches. She said that the women in the summer months take excellent care of the seal meat because they can—they can exchange it catch for other foods in the winter time, and in fall time from the other villages. She was reiterating some of the comments from the other ladies and since Mr. Jimmy would like to say a few words. I've told her that some of the comments she's made will be brought out by the other ladies. He closing comments were that the women in these coastal villages, in the summer time eat these dried meats, with the supplement of other wild celeries and other things that they can gather from the tundra.

And she pointed out that the seal oil, even though it is an important ingredient of their diet cannot be consumed every day, and that is why the women prepare as much as they can out of the sea mammal and dry it for future consumption.

Senator STEVENS. Do they use seal oil to preserve——

Mrs. CHANIGUK (translated by Mr. Nick). Right.

Senator STEVENS (Continuing). Vegetables? What type?

Mrs. CHANIGUK (translated by Mr.Nick). Not so much vegetables, but fish and seal meat.

Senator STEVENS. They don't use it to preserve greens of any kind?

Mr. NICK. I couldn't answer that question.

Mrs. CHANIGUK (translated by Mr. Nick). The answer to your question is that they do not preserve wild celery in seal oil, but they eat it with seal oil. But they preserve it in other ways, besides using seal oil as a preservative.

Senator STEVENS. Thank you. Adloph Jimmie?

STATEMENT OF ADOLPH JIMMIE

Mr. JIMMIE (translated by Mr. Nick). Mr. Jimmie acknowledges he has learned from his ancestors, and from his experience in his life time. He says that many years, many springs are not the same. Some springs the sea mammal would be abundant, and some springs it would be very scarce. He said that this year the sea mammal is very, very scarce down the coastal villages. Many hunters have not had any luck in acquiring any. He said it reminds him of the year 1918 when many people starved due to lack of any type of food. He said this spring is deathly like the year 1918 when the sea mammal was not acquirable by the hunter. He says that year many people starved because there was no stores in the villages and he said that is why the village people when they started hearing about this proposed legislation they were very alarmed abut their livelihoods, and they have made every effort to come to Bethel today upon request of many people that have asked them to come and testify on their experiences and their life styles. He said that is why they are here in Bethel today, in assembly, to testify—to give testimony on the uses of the sea mammal for their survival.

Senator STEVENS. Tell him I'm grateful for the number of people who have come, and I realize the great expense that is involved to them to come, and I'm certain that we will point that out to the Senate as evidence of their deep concern. We know that they have deep concern over this bill. I hope that when they go back to their villages that they will be able to explain some of the reasons that were behind the bill by the exchanges we have had here tonight.

Mr. JIMMIE (translated by Mr. Nick). He said that he had many times has thought of occasions in the past of when times when legislation will be imposed upon the native people of Alaska. He said that this very occurance of this legislation is one thing that he used to think about. That the people of the State would be imposed upon by legislation that would affect their livelihoods. He said that he used to worry of what would happen to the Alaskan Native when that time comes. He said that the wanted to bring this out, because he

used to worry about the situation that would occur when this arrived, and that situation is at present. He concludes his testimony with that.

Senator STEVENS. Thank you very much. We have now reached the hour of 11:20, and we have to start again tomorrow morning at 8:30 and I can see our young lady here who is running our machine is getting a little worn around the edges and so are we all, I think. So, I want to express my thanks to you, Robert for your help and Mary Gregory, for your help. We will start in at 8:30 in the morning and it would be my intention to start off with Miss Wentworth who has come over to tell us the viewpoint of the Sierra Club on the legislation and finish the witnesses that we have—the people that have come in a long way, I know that we will want to give everyone a chance who has come into to Bethel to testify tomorrow. I hope that we will be able to conclude by 11:30 tomorrow. Thank you all for your help, and we will recess the hearings until tomorrow morning at 8:30 a.m.

(Whereupon at 11:20 p.m. the hearing was recessed until 8:30 a.m. Saturday, May 13, 1972.)

OCEAN MAMMAL PROTECTION

SATURDAY, MAY 13, 1972

US. SENATE,
SUBCOMMITTEE ON OCEANS AND ATMOSPHERE
OF THE COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE,
Bethel, Alaska.

The subcommittee met pursuant to call, in Nome, Alaska, Hon. Ted Stevens, president.

Present: Senators Stevens

Senator STEVENS. Last night I indicated that this morning we'd like to hear from Miss Wentworth who is a representative of the Sierra Club, and has come over from Anchorage. I appreciate your coming, Cynthia. Cynthia Wentworth.

STATEMENT OF CYNTHIA WENTWORTH

Miss WENTWORTH. The Sierra Club is a national environmental organization, and I represent the Alaska Chapter of the Sierra Club. You've probably heard how some of the National environmentalists are against the killing of sea mammals. The Alaska Chapter of the Sierra Club shares the motives of those conservationists who are fighting to protect to protect the Alaskan sea mammals. We are especially eager for laws which will protect endangered species. We oppose trophy and sport hunting of sea mammals. However, we feel that those who support a total ban on the killing of sea mammals need to be better informed on the situation in Alaska. Even if the Eskimo did not need to supplement his cash income with income from sea mammals, which he does, he should still be able to take sea mammals because it is part of his culture for thousands of years. Taking away sea mammals from the natives is like taking away the white man's cow; if the white man has the right to buy and sell beef and pork, shouldn't native have the right to buy and sell seal and walrus? As long as the native people does not increase much—as long as the population doesn't explode—the seal and walrus will not be in danger of extinction. Besides this, seal meat and other wild meat is more healthful than beef and pork. Seal and other wild meat do not have chemicals and artificial color in it, like beef does. The Alaska Chapter of the Sierra Club also supports the present sale of ivory and the Alaska Chapter of the Sierra Club thinks that one way the U.S. Government could help prevent waste of meat is to install freezers in the different villages.

Senator STEVENS. Thank you very much. We appreciate your coming and I'm sure that everyone here supports your support although they don't realize as much as I do how important it is for us to be

able to tell the people in Washington that the Alaska Chapter of the Sierra Club does support what we are trying to do for the Alaska Native people. And now, if I may ask my good friend Robert to call Mr. Issac Mute.

Mr. NICK. The next speaker will be Issac Mute.

STATEMENT OF ISSAC MUTE

Mr. MUTE. I'm Issac Mute from Kipnuk, down the coast. I move in here 5 or 7 years now. I was hunting every year down the oceal mammal. First time I was hunting by kyak, and here a few years ago I was hunting by boat. And I used different rifles. Sometimes I use a 30.06, or .222, sometimes I kill the one walrus. And I used the tusks for the seal, and I used everything. My wife will make a skin walrus—cook him—boil him—and put in some box and I can sell that little piece of walrus the different price. And I sell seal oil the different price. For I sell the different price, because we have no—Eskimo people, mostly—we have no job. I know some would like to buy seal meat, or seal oil, but we have not enough to buy one can—or one 5 gallon. That's why I was sent to say we need our seal oil buy different price. And, every year hunting down the mammal we have a different—Sometimes we have a hard time to find a seal down the ocean. Why? Because sometimes a lots of ice. When the tides a coming in will cover up the town on the bay—on the ocean—another tide going out a little bit deep in the water. Six, seven miles sometimes cover the ice under the ocean. Behind that ocean—they have a lots of seals—we go up to north and some times when we are hunting down our mammal they have a bad weathers—from south, either west and north.

Mr. MUTE (translated by Mr. Nick). He said that he discussed some of the things which he knows from his experience. But he wanted to add a few more and since he doesn't know English too well, he wanted me to translate him. He said that when he used to live in the coastal village of Kipnuk and he used to go out hunting—when he was down there. When they used to go out hunting they would catch the walrus. When they would catch the walrus they would take the entire walrus home; even the head and everything. And, they would butcher the walrus. And he said that he, himself, used to take care of the head you know—and make it into arts and crafts and sell it and try to defray the expenses of the hunt—you know—the gasoline costs and the other costs that are incurred from the hunt. He said that in this way they are able to assist their cash economy. He said that many villagers still do this when they go out hunting. They utilize the entire sea mammal. Some for subsistence and some for sale for cash. He wanted to add, in closing, that he would like to vote for the knowledge of the Representatives, the Representatives from Alaska and the other Representatives that they have made a grave mistake in passing the legislation in it's present form in the House of Representatives. He said this legislation can be stopped by the Senate, by enacting the appropriate legislation. He wanted you to know that you have in your power, the power to amend, and change the legislation that was passed by the House of Representatives.

Senator STEVENS. Thank you.

Mr. MUTE. You are welcome. Now I give you big power and this man too when you are going back to Washington, D.C.

Senator STEVENS. Thank you. James K. Anaver

STATEMENT OF JAMES K. ANAVER

Mr. ANAVER (translated by Mr. Nick). James Anaver says that his son, yesterday brought out things that he knew from his lifetime. But he said that since he was delegated from the village of Kipnuk to come in, and since the council paid his way he wanted to say a few words. He said—you know—he said that since he has become a hunter here he has never seen a spring when he didn't go out seal hunting. Because, that is how he survives, and that is how he supports his family. He says like many other people that gave testimony yesterday he is himself, has supported his family by the catch of the sea mammal. He said that the sea mammal—when that they were misled that the sea mammal harvest would be banned—you know—and that is why the delegations from the villages came in this size. He said that is why they were concerned about the legislation. He said not only because the coastal villages utilize the sea mammals, but also the mainland villages. And he said that—and I explained to him that the legislation does not prohibit the sale—the subsistence harvest of the sea mammal. He says that he knows that now, but he still wanted to testify, and get on record because he was delegated by his village to be the representative.

Senator STEVENS. Thank you. I appreciate his testimony last night, with the whole group, and I understand the reason that you all came in. I'm happy that you did come in, because now we have that problem straightened out and we understand that there was misinformation concerning the subsistence hunting. Well, I do appreciate your comments again today. Are there any other people?

Mr. NICK. The Kwigillingok group was supposed to appear.

Senator STEVENS. Yes. Please call Milton Lewis, Andrew Beaver, Henry Evon, Agnes Lewis, Frank Andrew, Charles Phillip, David O. David, Lucy Manchuak, and Joe Pavil.

Mr. NICK. Milton Lewis, Andrew Beaver, Henry Evon, Agnes Lewis, Frank Andrew, Charles Phillip, David O. David, Lucy Manchuak, and Joe Pavil.

Senator STEVENS. Well, that's a very big group. Your village is well represented. I leave it to you to decide who is going to speak first.

Mr. NICK. Henry Evon is president of the village council of the village of Kwigillingok.

Senator STEVENS. I welcome you, Mr. Evon.

STATEMENT OF HENRY EVON

Mr. EVON (translated by Mr. Nick). Henry brought out some of the maximum uses of the seal oil. He said that the seal oil has been brought out by many people that testified yesterday. But, he wanted to add that of what his wife and his family and the women of Kwigillingok do. The women when they prepare the seal oil they

render it in a poke. Once the blubber is totally rendered they cook it; they cook the blubber. Then they render it further, by doing that. And then they use that oil that in rendered by cooking. And they also eat the blubber that has been cooked. That is how they totally use the seal oil, and blubber from the sea mammal. And he got into some of the things that he had heard on the proposed legislation, and one of the main things that he said that his village people were alarmed about was the provision for the nonsale of the seal mammal products. He said that this is brought forth by many of the people who gave testimony yesterday—it was brought out that many of the mainlanders buy a lot of the sea mammal foods, and a lot of exchange is done by both people, the coastal people, and also the mainland people. He said that in his village, in being president of the council, and being aware of many programs that are available to the village there are many widows. And, a lot of these widows are not assisted by any type of general assistance programs. And, these widows use the arts and crafts to bring cash economy to buy for their children. He says that many men in his village are not able to receive assistance, also. They are not able to qualify for unemployment benefits. And, these people sell arts and crafts to purchase some of the items that are necessities of survival. He said that is why he, himself, as a leader in his village was very concerned that the amendment to allow the sale of arts and crafts made of the sea mammal be added to the sea mammal legislation. He wants to say that his delegation, and the other village representatives, when they return home to their villages, and when you, Senator Stevens, and the other Senators, return back to Washington, the village people are going to expect some legislation—some corrective legislation to allow the request that the villages have asked, in their testimonies, yesterday and today. He says he, himself, has given you his total support for these corrective legislation, and urges you, and Senator Gravel to use whatever authority and power you have to enact these legislations.

Senator STEVENS. Thank you. Tell him we will do that. Daniel Mann.

STATEMENT OF DANIEL MANN

Mr. MANN (translated by Mr. Nick). He wants to add that you gentlemen have observed the men in this room, and observed that their complexions—you know—their facial complexions are dark. They are like colored people. He wanted to point it out that is because they go out for subsistence hunting, day after day.

Senator STEVENS. You tell him that they all look very healthy, too.

Mr. MANN (translated by Mr. Nick). He says that the others have brought out that—you know—yesterday some of the basis of testimony on the misunderstanding that the subsistence harvest of this sea mammal would be banned. I explained to him that the bill does not provide for the preservation of the harvest for subsistence purposes. But, he brought up and occurance, which used to occur in some years, which he said—which he wanted—you know—to put on record, that he has observed this occurance in his lifetime. He said in his lifetime he has observed two types of springs. Because spring is the only time for the coastal people to hunt the sea mammal. He

has seen one type of spring where there is an abundance of sea mammal—where people would go out and hunt and provide subsistence and some type of economic based on the sale of the sea mammal for their families. And, the other type of spring is the spring where there is prevailing south winds, day after day, and along the ice, the jam on this side of the Bering Sea. He said that in those springs there is very little sea mammal. That day after day the men would go out and hunt, and would return empty handed. He said that those are the two types of spring that he has observed in his lifetime. And, during the latter season, he says that he does not want to bring out—but since it is a fact he is going to bring it out. He says that in some years when sea mammal is not available and when there is no other type of food for families some of the people in the coastal villages kill their dogs and eat them. We know that this is not an appetizing situation—but, when there is no other food available, the people are sometime forced to do that. He said that is why when they were led to understand that the harvest of this mammal was going to be banned that they were very alarmed and concerned about this legislation. But, he wants to add—now that he knows that there is provision for subsistence harvest of this mammal—that you, as elected representatives of our people of the State, are enpowered to promote legislation for the betterment of our people. He says that in the future—any legislation that is detrimental to the environment and livelihood of our people—the people should be notified of the context of this legislation—so their comments can be heard, and corrective legislation can be enacted.

Senator STEVENS. Thank you. You tell him that's what I tried to do, as soon as I found out this bill was growing in interest. That is why we are here. Milton Lewis.

STATEMENT OF MILTON LEWIS

Mr. LEWIS (translated by Mr. Nick). He stated that he has heard testimony, and even though some of the testimonies heard were repeats of the others, he would like to add a few because he has been a hunter and provider for his family, using the sea mammal. He said that he has sold the sea mammal for people around the tundra villages. That is why when they heard of the proposed ban on the sale of the sea mammal, they were very alarmed and concerned about this legislation. He said that at the time they heard this legislation they felt that no matter what law, or how big a law can be enacted by congressional, or governmental institutions, that they would not abide by these laws. But, he wants to add that he is happy that he has now discovered that the commercial sale of this mammal would be allowed, with the corrective amendments which you have stated, that passage of these corrective amendments are in favor of the native people.

Senator STEVENS. Thank you very much. I appreciate what he says, and I'm sure that the hearings will produce information that will be quite helpful in convincing our friends in the Senate that we must have a change in this legislation. These people have come a long way, Robert and I think we should hear them. The other people will understand, and they will have their turn, too. Just sit right

down there and give your testimony (speaking to witness). Go right ahead. David O. David?

STATEMENT OF DAVID O. DAVID

Mr. DAVID. Thank you. David O. David. As you see me now——

Senator STEVENS. Wait a minute. Robert, there is some misunderstanding. The Pribilof (phonetic) people know that—you know—that the people from this village have come a long way, also. And we want to hear them all who want to testify. So, be sure that you let them understand that. The ones that are here—if they want to testify, we want to hear. Go right ahead.

Mr. DAVID. It will be probably—2 or 3 minutes.

Senator STEVENS. You go right ahead.

Mr. DAVID. I don't have a written testimony, but I am going to testify. It will be from the experience that I have. And, as I understand this bill, the main part that you are here is to amend it that the—that we don't stop using the sea mammal for arts and crafts. And I am grateful—that you are doing that—and supporting us for what little—for what little money that we get out of crafts.

Senator STEVENS. That's good. Thank you. How many people live in your village?

Mr. DAVID. About 200. But there isn't one person who has already got money in the bank from arts and crafts that they have sold. Not one person. So, what little money that we get is needed to go on—from arts and crafts.

Senator STEVENS. I understand that. How many seals—do you have any idea how many seals you need each year?

Mr. DAVID. As you have already been told, we don't keep track of the seals we get. There is no telling of how many seals we will get this year since the season has been bad down here.

Senator STEVENS. If you get more than you need is there a place—a way—that you can sell them?

Mr. DAVID. If we got more than what we need we will trade them with what we need, to the people of the mainland for what they have. Or we can sell them for money—for a little money—if we can.

Senator STEVENS. Yes. Do any people ever come into your village to buy sealskins?

Mr. DAVID. If we do have to—if we do have to sell them we bring them up river to the people of this area.

Senator STEVENS. To the Bethel area?

Mr. DAVID. Yes.

Senator STEVENS. And they use them here then, for arts and crafts.

Mr. DAVID. Yes; they use them. And not only for arts and crafts. They use them for themselves too—for their families, too.

Senator STEVENS. That's the meat you're talking about. As far as the skins are concerned—do you bring them to market, or does someone come and get them from you?

Mr. DAVID. Rather than having them go down, we bring them up.

Senator STEVENS. And how far is that to Bethel?

Mr. DAVID. Air miles, it is probably about 80—80–90 miles And by boat it takes 6 to 8 hours. And so by boat, it's probably somewhere around a hundred miles.

Senator STEVENS. Thank you very much. I appreciate your testimony. Do any of the rest of the people from your village want to add to what you've said? The other people that were with you—do they want—to add to what you've said?

Mr. DAVID. I suppose so. I suppose they have their own ideas of what they have in minds, rather than what I've said. That's all I wanted to—I hated to walk out before saying anything.

Senator STEVENS. Thank you. I'm glad you did——

Mr. DAVID. I will strongly support you in the—in this bill to be amended.

Senator STEVENS. Thank you very much. Let's go off the record, Rosie.

[Off the record]

Senator STEVENS. You go right ahead now. Frank Andrew.

STATEMENT OF FRANK ANDREW

Mr. ANDREW (translated by Mr. Nick). He pointed out that he has heard many testimonies on the use of the sea mammal. But he wanted to point out, again, the necessity to his people of the sale of the sea mammal to provide a supplemental, cash economy for the coastal village people. And he wanted to bring out the fact that many kinds of skins are imported from the other States for the use of arts and crafts in Alaska. Seems like calfskin, and any other type skins. But in the coastal villages, in the southwestern part of Alaska, the sea mammal is the major article, or the major skin that is used for basis of making arts and crafts, and for clothing—of skins that is sold to stores, locally, or in cities. He said that the economy that is brought by the sale of arts and crafts is not very much to the village people. But, it is a supplement. It allows the village people to survive throughout the winter, because the income that they derive from what little jobs that they can have is not enough to provide cash income for the entire year. He says that these arts and crafts that are sold by the native people are sold at low cost, because they are sold to their fellow natives. And, that when they are sold to nonnatives—they are sold at the same cost. But, these nonnatives turn around and sell these arts and crafts at a very high cost. He said that is why the sale of arts and crafts is important to all Alaskans. Because everybody profits by the sale of arts and crafts.

Senator STEVENS. That's very good. I understand that. I'm glad that he did make that comment. Charles Phillip. Mr. Phillip, nice to see you.

STATEMENT OF CHARLES PHILLIP

Mr. PHILLIP (translated by Mr. Nick). He has stated that many of the things that he has heard while he been here are things that he had prepared to say. So many of the things that he had prepared are already given in testimony. But he wanted add more to the sale of arts and crafts from the skins of the sea mammal. He said like

the gentlemen before him stated, that many skins, like calfskins are used for purposes of crafts, and are sold with no restrictive legislations banning the sale of this calfskin. Any other type of skins that are brought—imported—to the State of Alaska are not restricted as to being used for crafts. He said he has never heard of any legislation against the sale of beef, or any other type of meat that is sold in the market. He said that he has never heard any legislation against the sale of lard, tallow, or any other type of oil. He said this legislation that in it's present form—prohibiting the sale of meat, skin, and seal oil would be the same as enacting legislation against the sale of Wesson Oil, lard, tallow calfskins, and beef in the lower 48. He said that is why he requests that these Senators, in enacting these amendments to this legialation, use—enact them in good judgment, and respect requests of the Alaska Natives because any other type of human tribe would do the same thing if their life style and means of subsistence is hampered with legislation. He wants to state that he knows that you are concerned about the Alaskan Natives and that is why you are here, in person, to hear testimony by the village people, and he said in showing your concern to the natives—he, himself, totally supports any legislation that you would enact for the amendments that are to be enacted on this legislation. He said that in his hometown—right now—landing conditions are almost out, and they might be here until breakup. Even though they were aware they might be here for the next 3 or 4 weeks, they made every effort to come to Bethel to testify in this hearing, because this is their life style.

Senator STEVENS. Thank you very much. Agnes Lewis.

STATEMENT OF AGNES LEWIS

Mrs. LEWIS (translated by Mr. Nick). She stated that even though it has been requested that repetitions not be made, the testimonies—from the village representatives. She said that she came up here solely for the purpose of expressing her feelings on this proposed legislation. She said that the sale of arts and crafts is very important to the people of her village—Kwigillingok. And she said she totally agrees with the president of her village on their sympathy toward the widows in that village, because not all of them receive assistance of any type. So these women sell arts and crafts and other crafts from the sea mammal for their cash economy. She says unlike the native, the nonnative, someone in cities await monthly checks every month so they can provide food for their families. She said there is no jobs available in these villages so they can await and expect a monthly check. She says especially those families with many children utilize sea mammals to the fullest extent. She said she has 13 children, and all of them are living with them. She says she herself sells arts and crafts to help her husband in his efforts to purchase consumer supplies from stores. And she says that many times they are in situations where they have to have cash so they can purchase food for their families. And in these situations, they utilize this mammal. And she said that their husbands, like everyone else, like to live. But in their efforts in hunting trips, many times they risk their lives to try to catch the sea mammal. She said that is why

she herself as the mother of 13 and the wife of a hunter and a seller of arts and crafts, totally supports the amendments proposing the sale of arts and crafts and other parts of the sea mammal. And she said that she agrees with many of the people that testified that when legislations and laws are enacted, the people in the villages never understand these legislations, because laws in written form never reach them. And even when they do reach these people, the village people do not read these laws. And even when they are told that there are certain laws against certain things, this law not be abided by anybody in the villages. She said that is why the amendments should be totally supported, and she supports the provisions to allow for the sale of arts and crafts.

Senator STEVENS. Ask her if there are any arts and crafts that would not be handmade, anything that's not handmade that's in this area of arts and crafts that she is talking about?

Mrs. LEWIS (translated by Mr. Nick). No.

Senator STEVENS. What kind of articles does she make?

Mrs. LEWIS (translated by Mr. Nick). She said the other women that testified before her testified on the articles that are made by all women in the form of arts and crafts, which are mukluks, yo-yos, parkas, and any other type of arts and crafts that is sold in the market.

Senator STEVENS. Thank you very much. Lucy Manchuak.

STATEMENT OF LUCY MANCHUAK

Mrs. MANCHUAK (translated by Mr. Nick). Mrs. Manchuak stated that she is going to discuss the many things that has been discussed by their people and give testimonies. But she wanted to bring out things that she used to be told and things that were the tradition of our people. She said in the days when she was young, the men and women were taught by their elders on the ways of life, and how to live a quiet life and how to respect the rights of other people. She said that in this day in her village, there is not very many elderly people like herself. So there is very little teachings about the ways of life and the right—and respect to the rights of the elders and her fellow neighbors. And she said that she is one of the few elders in her village, and she knows and respects the testimonies that were given by the people from various parts of the Bethel area. She said these people were telling the truth. They were not telling stories that they made up. They were telling stories from their actual experiences, because it is very hard to hunt the sea mammal. And skills are needed for its catch. Like any other hunted animal, the sea mammal tends to shy away from its hunter. So these men need skills to catch the sea mammal. And she said these skills were taught by the elderly to the younger generations in those days. And she said she agrees with many of the testimonies given by the women on the uses of arts and crafts. And she is not going to add to those. But she wanted to bring out things that she was taught when she was young. She wants to say that this is the first time that she is speaking in a gathered body, in a meeting. And she is wondering why in meetings of this importance and meetings where she attends, you know—this is for her fellow natives—why the people always walk away, walk

out from meetings even when they are important. And she is urging her fellow natives to attend the meetings of this type whenever they are conducted. And also in closing, she wants to further agree with the other lady that testified before her on the importance of the sale of arts and crafts and other products of the sea mammal.

Senator STEVENS. Thank you very much. I know you have come a long way, and I am happy that you spoke up. We will take a 5-minute recess, Robert, if that's all right, and then we will hear from Gabe Stepetin and the Pribiloff people.

(Recess.)

Senator STEVENS. Back on the record. Can we have quiet, please? This is Mr. Gabriel Stepetin from the Pribiloff Islands. He is not only well known but is a good personal friend of mine. And I'm happy that you have come over. We understand the problem you had with weather. Would you, for the record, tell us who is with you? And I understand you did receive my telegram concerning the change in the bill as it affected the Pribiloff people.

Mr. STEPETIN. Yes.

Senator STEVENS. And I am most pleased that you took the time to come over so we can have a record of your reactions to that section.

STATEMENT OF GABRIEL STEPETIN

Mr. STEPETIN. Honorable Senator Stevens, we had 14 people yesterday coming, but due to weather and today due to shortage of time, there is only five of us. And my name is Gabriel Stepetin from St. Paul Island, representing the Aleut people of the Pribiloffs on the ocean mammal bill. We, the Aleut, ask you to continue harvesting of the North Pacific fur seals. If the harvesting is terminated, it will take away what we have been fighting for years, self-determination. We have been second-class citizens all our lives. Now we are finding ourselves and becoming first-class citizens. If this ocean mammal bill passes as it is, it will put us back to what we were years ago. You are telling us—I'm saying this to all the Congress up on Capitol Hill—you are telling us to use our ancient way of hunting, after you have been telling us to civilize and live your way. All us Natives, Aleuts, Eskimos, and Indians have protected all mammals effectively and successfully without any waste. As you are aware, the fur seal harvesting is the most humane way of harvesting in the name of conservation. Every—and every part of the seal carcass is processed. And we freeze the meat, salt it, dry it for the winter. The intestines are used for crafts, sausages, and the stomach is also used for making sausages. We also make cheese from the flippers, like you do with the pig's head. If I may, the nuts are just like oysters when fried, and the penises are dried and sold. The students earn their income for school. Let me assure you again, nothing is wasted. It is also done with the sea lions, hair seals. These are the only mammals we on the Pribiloffs use for consumption. By passing the bill as it is, you are the ones that are going to endanger the fur seals and other species. There was a comment made in the House of Representatives that we are going to be instant millionaires in Alaska due to the land claims. I am making this statement because it is false, especially in the Pribiloffs and the Aleutian Chain. We of

Aleuts, species of the human race, are fighting for our survival, to have the fur seal harvest continued. Not only as our economy, but to keep the future Aleuts together and to protect from extinction and losing their culture. If you abolish the treaty, how will you go about protecting the fur seals? The United States has no conservational jurisdiction over the high seas. There would be no way of the United States protecting fur seals and other ocean mammals outside its own ocean boundary. We have been negotiating with Red Russia, a communist country, for years on arms limitation. On that point, all we have been getting is promises. On the other hand, Red Russia and other nations have been honoring a national commitment on conservation. We would lose that by passing this bill. We as Aleuts are fighting for the survival of human race. In this endeavor, we feel we are fighting for the survival of the American—the Alaska Northern fur seal and other ocean-going mammals. I urge you, Senator, to make a trip to the Pribiloff Islands to see exactly how we will be situated if this ocean mammal passes as it is. Thank you. And I have three statements that were made by my fellow Aleuts but they couldn't make it, so I was wondering if you could take this to—

Senator STEVENS. They will all be put in the record, yes. Why don't you all give your statements to Miss Rice when you are finished, and we will print them all. And I think it would be helpful if you would all make your statements. Maybe you could summarize them. We will print them in full, but I would like to ask you some questions about that language, if I could, while we are here. Who would you like to have come next, Gabe?

STATEMENT OF GREGORY FRATIS

Mr. FRATIS. Senator Stevens—Senator Gravel isn't here—

Senator STEVENS. Which one are you, now?

Mr. FRATIS. I am Gregory Fratis. I was going to talk about that after I give my——

Senator STEVENS. Okay. All right.

Mr. FRATIS. Senator Stevens, Senator Gravel, distinguished guests, and fellow Alaskans, my name is Gregory Fratis. I am an Aleut from St. Paul Island. I want to thank you, Senator Stevens and Senator Gravel, for giving us the opportunity to testify to you and to the Congress of the United States. My deepest and sincere thanks will come to you when this bill is defeated and thrown in the waste-paper basket where it rightfully belongs. I feel the animals, water fowls, and fishes of the lower 48 States should be the ones who should be getting all these bills and acts pertaining to them, instead of our State and of its native people. The reason I say this is because most of the wildlife in the lower 48 are dying from pollution. In other words, poisoned by waste materials drained in lakes and rivers by big industries who produce various chemicals and products. They should be the ones to be getting all the presses instead of us, natives of Alaska. I believe we harvest our wildlife in a most conservative and humane way. None of the meat or other parts of the animal is wasted. Everything is put to good use. Now, about our fur seal industry. The fur seal industry which we have now, and hope and pray we will continue on the the benefit of my people and

the world, is our only source of employment and income. Without the fur seal, I believe the community of St. Paul and St. George would not exist today. The fur seal carcass is not wasted in any way. All that is not consumed by the people is processed into food for mink. And that even includes the bones. The carcass of the seal is ground and made similar to the way ground beef is processed. The teeth of the seal is used for arts and craft items to be sold to tourists, which come to St. Paul every year to watch the harvesting of the seal. Now, I would like to know how this bill will affect the fur seal treaty we have with Russia, Japan, and Canada. Also, I would like to mention that our fur seals have been found to have large quantities of mercury in the meat, especially in the liver. So this makes me believe that pollution itself will cause the extinction of the fur seals, instead of the method with which we harvest them each year.

Senator Stevens, I need not say any more. Because this matter was discussed before, when bill S. 1315 was introduced and defeated. I thought our problems were over then. Now, this new ocean mammal bill is similar to it. I feel the Congress of the United States is unfair and have been listening to false statements made by organizations and other parties about the harvesting of fur seals and also all the ocean mammals which dwell in the Alaskan waters. I feel it would be of great importance to my people, also for the native people of Alaska, if all you Senators and Congressmen would come to Alaska and see for yourself, instead of reading and hearing false statements of what is happening to our ocean mammals and all other species and waterfowls of our beautiful State. I am thankful this bill will not affect us, like it is affecting our fellow brothers, the Eskimos. I feel this bill will bring them much harm, to their culture, their way of life, and their diet of consuming food they get from the sea. I will fight this bill to protect my people and our fellow Alaskans throughout Alaska from being passed, in the most democratic way I know, without breaking any laws of the Constitution of the United States. I thank you.

Senator Stevens. Thank you very much. Jason Bourdukofsky

STATEMENT OF JASON BOURDUKOFSKY

Mr. Bourdukofsky. Senator Stevens, honored guests, and fellow Alaskans, my name is Jason Bourdukofsky, an Aleut, from St. Paul Island, Alaska. This proposed legislation is very injurious to the social and economic welfare of my people and other Alaska Natives. My people are very scared and concerned. They feel that the future is being darkened. We just incorporated as a fourth-class city, and we were really looking forward to the future. The Pribiloff fur seal has through the years increased in number from near extinction, due to conservation and proper management by my people and government biologists and scientists. When the fur seal is growing during the winter, we eat sea lion meat. All the carcass is used. We do not kill these mammals just for sport. We need them, we hunt them. If this bill passes, what are we planning to do, what are you planning to do for us natives? Have you all planned a new economy for us? Where are you going to move us? What of the elder people? Will they sur-

vive a longer life on beef, turkey, chicken, and so forth? If so, who is going to buy this for them? Are they willing to teach our people a new way of life? The land claims don't buy our food. It wants use to choose land away from home, land that the State or Federal Government don't want. Ninety-five percent of my people don't live away from home. If the Pribiloff fur seal is not properly managed, they would multiply to a great extent and food would be scarce for them. There would not be enough breeding grounds, foreign nations would kill them, because they claim they eat the fish. Disease would be great in the herd. Is this what Congress wants? Is Congress willing to throw out one of the greatest conservation moves that the United States has been involved with, out the window? I would like to ask every Member of Congress to really study the fur seal program, before they make a move on this act. Let it be on their conscience, if the herd does not survive due to poor management and research. Over the years, thousands of foreign ships have been around the Bering Sea and the Pribiloff Islands. We have been pushing for a harbor as an alternate for economy, way before this act was introduced, but no action has been taken. Now, if this bill passes, we will be left without any income at all, no economy. I would also like every Member of Congress to come to Alaska and see for themselves how the ocean mammals are being used by the native people, before they make any nasty decisions. Rather than having to listen to various organizations that are making false statements on ocean mammals. I ask this committee and all others to please help us defeat this unjust act. Don't darken our future, but brighten it for us, Alaskan Natives. Thank you. Example of overpopulation of sea mammal. At St. George Island, the sea lions get overpopulated and don't have enough food, so they go out at sea and eat fur seal pups. It is a bloody sight to see.

Senator STEVENS. Thank you.

STATEMENT OF TIKHON STEPETIN

Mr. STEPETIN. Senator Stevens, members of this committee, my fellow Americans. My name is Tikhon Stepetin, I am here to represent the Aleuts of the Pribiloffs and the Aleutian Chain. As an Aleut, as an Alaskan Native, I can appreciate the moral aspects of this bill concerning conservation. When it comes down to protecting our natural resources, I don't believe that you will find anyone more conservative-minded than the Alaska Native. We have been living for centuries under the laws of conservation that were already set down by Mother Nature.

It is my belief that in submitting this bill, certain segments of our society are attempting to ease their conscience concerning the misuse of our natural resources throughout the whole of these United States. This is all very good. I feel that it needs well be done. But I do not feel that it should be done at the expense of Alaska and Alaskan Natives.

I am dedicated to the fact that we have a moral obligation to our lower animal life, but I feel that we have a higher moral obligation, that of man to mankind. I am not sure it Congress is aware of this, but I want it on the conscience of every Senator on Capitol Hill,

that if this bill goes through in its present form, it passes as a possible death warrant for two large Alaska Native communities. These are the communities of St. Paul and St. George Islands, whose only means of existence is maintaining a conservation program designed to protect the North American fur seal. The irony of this bill is that it may do away with this program, and permit the possible extermination of a species of oceangoing mammal, the Alaska fur seal. From that point of view, I feel that this bill is defeating its own purpose.

It is not a question of conserving certain species of oceangoing mammals that Congress will be considering. But whether or not to preserve the Alaska Native's unique way of life. Congress will be questioning whether or not to preserve the unique culture of Alaska and Alaska Natives. Congress will be questioning whether or not to allow the Aleut people to survive as a species of the human race.

This all adds up to one big question: Will Congress vote against this bill in its present form, and by doing so, prevent another case of man's inhumanity to man? Thank you.

Senator STEVENS. Thank you very much, Tikhon. It's nice to see you again. Does the young lady have—You have a statement. Thank you.

STATEMENT OF MARY FRATIS

Mrs. FRATIS. My name is Mrs. Mary Fratis. I am an Aleut from St. Paul Island. I am also the president of the Arts and Crafts Industry on St. Paul. Like the rest of my fellow representatives mentioned, we need the fur seal harvest to continue our little industry to exist to make various items to sell to the tourists. Without the fur seal, we cannot make these things. We receive reject skins from the fur seal harvest. By rejects, I mean skins which are torn and have been damaged during their processing stage. From these skins, we make items like gloves, slippers, hats, and items like this bag I have here in front of me. So you see, we feel it is a must that this bill be abolished, not for the benefit of my people but for all the natives of Alaska.

We hope and pray that in the near future, which we have now, could be manufactured into large quantities to be sold to private enterprise, such as Sears, Roebuck & Co. So you see, we want the fur seal harvest to continue.

I am representing all the women on St. Paul Island. I hope the wives of all you Senators and Congressmen understand our problem, and try persuading your husbands in abolishing this bill. Thank you.

Senator STEVENS. Thank you very much. Now, Gabe, you got my telegram about the change in the language of this bill, and this new print that the Senate committee is considering? Did you get that?

Mr. STEPETIN. Yes; I got that.

Senator STEVENS. Did that improve the bill in any way, as far as you are concerned?

Mr. STEPETIN. Not the way we would like. It has improved it, but it could be still improved.

Senator STEVENS. I understand that. The bill has been changed so that the direction is in the Secretary to continue the fur seal treaty in any event. You want the fur seal treaty continued, don't you?

Mr. STEPETIN. Yes.

Senator STEVENS. And if the Secretary found, as he has in the past, that the population was not sufficient to support the level of taking of fur seals, say, that you had taken the year before, and the decision was made to reduce the number in order to sustain the herd, you would be in agreement with that, aren't you?

Mr. STEPETIN. Yes; we are.

Senator STEVENS. There have been variations from year to year. What you are really seeking is to only harvest those animals that can be harvested without affecting the sustained population of the herd, isn't that right?

Mr. STEPETIN. Yes, sir.

Senator STEVENS. And if possible, you would like to see the herd increased too, wouldn't you?

Mr. STEPETIN. Right. Not over what it is now. If you increase the seal population more than what it is now, there is only lack of food for them in Bering Sea. I said that before. From what I understand, they are dying now in the high seas due to lack of food. because the foreign vessels have been around taking tons and tons of fish. And again, if they are overpopulated, there will be disease, hookworn. And you have thousands and thousands of pups die. We had that problem before. And it has been eliminated. That is why we harvest the female to keep the population in balance.

Senator STEVENS. You seek a scientific balance of the population?

Mr. STEPETIN. Right.

Senator STEVENS. Based on the best advice we can get.

Mr. STEPETIN. Right.

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE. Mr. Senator, I believe all the points you mentioned in your telegram have already been taken care of, in terms of conservation. All the points you just mentioned here are standard procedure in the Pribiloff Islands.

Senator STEVENS. Well, I think there are some people in Congress that want a reassurance that that's our goal.

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE. Mr. Senator, I would like to question, just who is—I heard rumors that there would be research in ways of trying to find another—a more humane way of harvesting our seals. Is this true that they are going to go on the Pribiloffs and have experiments again?

Senator STEVENS. Yes; that's what I understand. There will be another research team involved in that.

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE. And what do they think they will gain by doing this? Who will they satisfy? Will they satisfy the friends of animals and the organizations—the other one I can't recall. I wish they would just start thinking about people, instead of animals. It's making us feel that the animals are dominant over the human race. I know they will be there years to come. They say their children—they want their children's children to see these animals. Well, I'm 31 and my kids are seeing it right now. My dad, my granddad, way back there, I don't know how far back it goes. But they are still

seeing it. And I'm pretty sure that's the most conservative way of harvesting.

Senator STEVENS. Well, there have been changes. But I think the real question is that has been raised again, whether this is an inhumane way of taking seals. And I think we have all agreed that if there is a more humane way, we would like to use that way.

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE. Well, in some of the experiments, they use gas, they try to electrocute them, some of them just came right back to life again. I mean, to watch them electrocute it was pitiful and to watch them gas it, to see them laying there trying to—I mean, dying and suffering. I wish they had seen that instead. And I thought that was more inhumane.

Senator STEVENS. I agree. But that, again, was done to demonstrate the fact that the way you are using today is the most humane that we know. And the study is to see whether there is any way that is more humane, in view of the uproar that you know exists. So I don't think we are being harmed by a study to determine if there is any way. Every study we have had so far has said there is no more humane way. I personally am not opposed to a study to determine whether there is a more humane way. I feel from what I know now that it will come out with the result that says that the way you are harvesting the seals is the most humane way.

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE. I was talking about that mercury deal. The mercury found in the meat of seals. Now, I would like them to have further studies to see if this will kill the seal in the near future.

Senator STEVENS. We are conducting studies on that to determine what the mercury content and what the safe mercury level is. Apparently, there is a lot that needs to be known about that. It is being done worldwide, as a matter of fact. The Germans, the Scandinavian people, the British, the Canadians and we are doing it. Not only to find what harm might come to them, but where it's coming from.

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE. I'm pretty sure it's coming from the coast of California where the seals migrate every year. Because I'm pretty sure they wouldn't get it from the Alaskan waters. I feel it's coming—

Senator STEVENS. It's interesting to note that in the halibut that don't migrate out of Alaska waters, the larger they are, the more mercury they have.

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE. Probably consuming the fish that come from California. Do you know if the fish migrate?

Senator STEVENS. Well, our salmon don't go to California. Our herring don't go down there. But there are some real problems, and I would urge you to be positive about the approach that has to be taken to these problems. But we are working on this, and I want you to know, I look forward to hearing from you and your attorney. This bill will be back before the Commerce Committee later this month. So if you have any more comments concerning the technical drafting of that language, I would urge you to confer with your attorney and to get the language to us. And I think that we are trying to move in the direction that we discussed when you were in Washington. And I'm sure you all know that Dave Boorkman did a very good job appearing in the Washington hearings. And we are

carrying on from there, from the conversations that we had at that time.

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE. I think, our large group here, we had more to say. And about this television series they had about our people, is there a possibility we could sue this company? I need a straight answer on that, because that was a disgrace to the Aleut people. And our religion too, the way they put it. I had, you know, there was some doctor came to St. Paul. He looked at it, he seen it, and he thought we were cannibals. There was even some white people that wanted to come up there, they were afraid—exactly what they saw in the films, you know, the way we slaughtered, the music in the background, our religion, our church. And they thought we were cannibals. I mean, I had a doctor tell me this. And he believed this when he saw it on television. And he came up there and I explained it to him and he saw for himself. And he really was hurt about it. He felt sorry that his feelings towards us——

Senator STEVENS. I am a lawyer, but I'm not in the habit of giving free legal advice.

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE. I sure wish you could. Well, anyway, thank you.

Senator STEVENS. Thank you very much. Gentlemen, thank you for coming. We have some other witnesses here, and I hope to be able to chat with you before I leave, Gabe. Robert, why don't you come over here and sit with me and talk to me about that language while we are looking at this, will you? You have that language?

Mr. NICK. The next to testify will be from the village of Napakiak, Teddy Clark.

Senator STEVENS. Mr. Clark, it's nice to see you. Are you related to that big friend of mine, Andy Edge?

STATEMENT OF TEDDY CLARK

Mr. CLARK. Yes.

Senator STEVENS. Well, you keep him on the straight and narrow. He has been a good friend for many years. It's nice to see you.

Mr. NICK. Mr. Clark has brought up written testimony of another person in the village, and he has requested me to read the testimony.

Senator STEVENS. All right.

Mr. NICK. It's from Alexie K. Evon, Napakiak, Alaska. It starts, "My wife doesn't want me to leave her, because she is always afraid of drunks. Many people wanted sea mammals for food and clothing. The people want the sea mammal for food, even though some of them don't hunt the sea mammal. The skins are used through the cold winter for mukluks. The oil is the main thing that we wanted. For also clothing. When we don't eat seal oil, our stomach gets bad and gets gas and also constipations. These are the few things that I testify, but there are still lots of way that we could use sea mammal."

Senator STEVENS. Thank you very much. I appreciate what he says about the increasing use of alcohol in the Alaska villages, and I think that's one of the things we are going to have to get to work on very hard. It's an unfortunate part of this that we have to face problems like this, instead of working on the real problems of the

Alaska villages. But I do appreciate the fact that he says he doesn't want to leave his wife because of the people that have had too much to drink. We have all seen that, and it's not just native people. It's the increase in use of alcohol throughout the country, that's something we have to control. And we have a great many programs in the field of alcoholism that I hope that we will have more of them spread throughout the villages in the future. So you can tell him that I'm grateful that he sent the message.

Mr. NICK. We have now——

Senator STEVENS. The Bethel group?

Mr. NICK. Almost 30 minutes for the Bethel group. And one of the villages has requested, you know, time before the Bethel group, and that is Napakiak.

Senator STEVENS. Oh, yes. All right. So, at this time, I would like to call on Wassilie B. Evon of Napakiak.

Mr. EVON. My name is Wassilie B. Evon from Napakiak.

STATEMENT OF WASSILIE EVON

Mr. EVON (translated by Mr. Nick). He is from the Kuskokwim River, and last winter, long before the proposed legislations and amendments were seen on paper by them, they heard about this legislation, with the information that it would ban the harvest. They were really concerned here in the Kuskokwim River, because even though he does not hunt it all the time, they live off the sea mammal.

Senator STEVENS. Well, originally, you remember, the Harris-Pryor bill, but even the House didn't approve it.

Mr. EVON. (translated by Mr. Nick). The sea or the coastal area people, where they hunt, is sometimes closed from the catch of the sea mammal by ice. When there is a lot of ice, the hunters do not catch any sea mammals. He said you heard a story by one of the people yesterday of what happened in 1918. He says he knows, because he was one of the people during that era. He said that last year he was told that the people ate their dogs, because they had no other food. He said they not only ate their dogs, because the dogs weren't very many either. When they ran out of dogs, they went to their clothing. Their sealskin mukluks, their sealskin parkas, and clothing they had made of sealskin. He said they cooked them and ate them. And they also ate articles made of birds. They cooked these skins and ate them. He said that the legislation in its initial stages was very detrimental to the lifestyle of the coastal people and also the mainlanders. Because the sea is the provider of food for the coastal villages, just as well as the Kuskokwim River is the provider of food for the Kuskokwim River people. He said the people along the Kuskokwim, every year when seal hunting season arrives, even though they do not hunt, they wish for the coastal villages to catch lots, so they will be able to buy sealskins, seal oil, and seal meat. He said that is why the people in his village need to have provisions in this legislation to allow them to be able to purchase these sea mammal products from the coastal village people. He said that he wants to bring out an item which nobody is unable to close, which is alcohol. He says that likewise, the Alaska Natives have an item

which they cannot ban or change, which is their means of subsistence. And that is the harvest of the mammals of the sea and of the land. And with that, he closed. I stopped him at that, because we are running short of time.

Senator STEVENS. Thank you. The next group of people will be from Bethel. Calvin Black, Joe Evon, James Peter, Wilson Simon, Roy Hall, Nels Alexie, Margaret Cooke, John Hinz, Peter King, Mary Gregory, Joe Andrew, Paul Gregory, Connie Black——be sure the reporter has all of your names.

Mr. NICK. Do you want me to say the names? The last three are Mami Strauss, Hazel Peter, and Sophie Jack, Elena Kuvlela. The two people that I had a note on that were going to speak are Janet Shantz and John Hinz. Janet?

STATEMENT OF JANET SHANTZ

Miss SHANTZ. Mr. Chairman, I am Janet Sand. I have lived in Bethel, Alaska, all my life. After graduating from Bethel High School in May of 1971, I attended the University of Alaska at Fairbanks for the fall semester. In February, I traveled to Juneau to begin a 6-month internship in State government. I was assigned to the Commissioner in the department of economic development. Bill Chambers of our department gave testimony in Nome, and the statement I will give is, in addition to his, the statement of our State department of economic development. Because we are allowed this time, I will submit my statement for the record, and speak directly to this legislation. The exceptions integrated into S–3161, not included in H–10420, which permits the Alaska Natives to utilize the sea mammals for subsistence is a thoughtful and welcome addition to the bill. We understand that section 10238 would not require the Alaska Natives to comply with the permit system detailed in section 103. In section 107-A, lines 16 to 19, one exception should be made for the bowhead whale, which is included in the endangered species. The number of whales taken in the last 20 years ranges from 1 to 19 whales for our northern villages. According to the Alaska Department of Environmental Conservation, the bowhead whales appear to be increasing in numbers, and this species and the Eskimos are certain in equal equilibrium with their environment in the northern community. A last and extremely important suggestion is in section 107-A3, line 25. This should be revised to read—is not done for the sole purpose of commercial sale of any parts of the mammal. There is no good reason why the inedible parts of the mammal cannot be completely utilized by the people. With great skill, the bones, teeth, and tusks are carved and etched into art objects. There have been very few avenues under which the Eskimo people could participate in the cash economy. Eliminating the traditional arts and crafts and making of clothing for individual use and for commercial sale is an incomprehensible sacrifice to ask, in order to appease recent environmental pressures. In conclusion, the last traditional culture of this continent is being rushed to extinction. And to quote Dr. Max Brewer, Commissioner of the State department of environmental conservation, who probably has said it best,

"For what other than a (indecipherable) to Western Man's environmental (indecipherable)." Thank you.

Senator STEVENS. Thank you.

Mr. NICK. The next person has donned the raingear that is made of the stomach and the intestines of the sea mammal. He also has donned the mukluks made of seal skin.

Senator STEVENS. He looks very nice.

Mr. NICK. And he is going to explain the clothing that he is wearing that has been made out of the sea mammal.

Senator STEVENS. How was it made?

Mr. NICK. He said that he did not don this clothing just to show it to his fellow natives, because they know it. And the men have the same clothing that he has. But he put it on so you can see the mammal on his body, which is his clothing. And then he explained that the raingear that he has on is the warmest type of raingear that you can get ahold of, and much warmer than the rubber raincoats that you can buy in stores. He said that many a man's life has been saved by this raingear. Because otherwise, in cold weather, cold, wet weather, many men would have frozen to death it they had been wearing rubber raingear. But they have been able to reach safety and survival because this raingear keeps them dry and also keeps them warm. And this gear is made of intestines of sea mammals. He says these intestines are eaten by them. And what is not eaten is dried and made into this raingear. It is used by all the men that have wives that know how to prepare and make this raingear. And also, the mukluks, the waterproof mukluks. This is made of the seal poke, the poke, the skin that was filled with seal oil. Once the seal oil is totally consumed, the seal skin is then saved—the fur. And then dried and then tanned, and then made into the waterproof mukluks, which all the men at this time of the year wear when they go out hunting. And like the raingear, is the warmest type of waterproof footwear that the hunters can wear in this cold part of Alaska. He said these dried sea mammal clothing are sold to others where the women or the men do not have wives or women that would be able to make these clothing. And he said that even the men that no longer hunt have to live off the catches of the hunters for subsistence. And also for cash economy in arts and crafts. And he explained some of the preparations that men have to make in order to survive when they go out hunting. And I won't get into those, because they have been presented by the other people that have testified before him. And some of the things that he pointed out have been explained by the other village representatives. So, to give another person a chance, I will stop translating his testimony. But the main comment—the major comments were made of the clothing that he is wearing, and he explained for you to see at this time.

Senator STEVENS. Thank you very much. Do we have time for the others? Hazel Peter.

STATEMENT OF HAZEL PETER

Mrs. PETER (translated by Mr. Nick). Her family is now living in Bethel, but they used to live down the coast. And she said that even though they had moved into Bethel, they still continue to use the

seal skins. She said every year, they buy seal skins from their friends from down the coast. And she used the seal skin, the entire seal skin, to sew mukluks for her children, because she has many children. And sometimes she uses the entire seal skin just to sew up soles for the mukluks that she makes for her children. And when she uses seal skin for their mukluks, she also uses a lot of seal skins. And even the scraps and leftovers when she makes seal, she uses that to make arts and crafts like this (indicating). She said every little part of the seal skin and sea mammal she saves, because she will make something so she can supplement the cash income that her husband has. And she is using these little mittens as an example. These little mittens were scraps and leftovers from the seal skins that she has made mukluks for her children from. And she said that her husband has a full time job here in Bethel. But even though he has a monthly income, their income is not enough to tide them over. Every month the income goes out long before the necessities have been totally purchased. And she said that is why she saves all the scraps so she can make arts and crafts and try to purchase what clothing they might be able to buy from stores. And she said that even though they have a lot of children, they buy clothing for their children, the money they make is not enough to buy all of their children the needed clothing they need, at the same time, you know. So she buys clothing for her children after she sells the arts and crafts that she makes, like these mittens. She want to bring out another item of the sea mammal. Which even though they have moved to Bethel, every day they use the seal oil. She says the seal oil is one of the most important preservative oils for food that they have. And she said that is why, when she heard of the legislation, she was very concerned, because they buy seal oil for their daily use from their coastal village people. So in closing, she wants to itemize the three most important things that they consider that they buy all the time, and that is the seal skin for the mukluks, and the tanned seal skins for the soles of mukluks, and the seal oil, which they need every day.

Senator STEVENS. Okay. We have just 3 more minutes. And we have just been told we are going to have to give up the room too. We have used the room longer than we are supposed to have used it. So why don't you see if anyone who has any short comments they want to make. I'm sure that you can tell these people from Bethel that are here that I haven't had the time to hear, that if they want to write out a short statement, if they want to write down their comments of up to two pages, we will put them in the record. If they want to send them to me, we will put those in the record too, right here along with all of the Bethel comments. But my plane is in, and they are waiting for me, unfortunately. We have to get out of here. So, is there anyone that wants to make some particular comment?

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE. We are concerned on the welfare of the native people. He has seen your letters and he has had your letters read to him and he knows of your concern.

Senator STEVENS. Thank you.

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE. For this reason, he want to thank you, because you have to try to assist the native people and your efforts

toward the betterment of their lives. And the native people in turn will have to assist you in your efforts to assist them.

Senator STEVENS. Thank you.

STATEMENT OF WINSTON SIMON

Mr. SIMON. My name is Winston Simon, of Bethel and president of the co-op store.

Mr. SIMON (translated by Mr. Nick). Even though he is now in Bethel, he is from the coast and he still considers himself a coastal villager. He used to hunt the sea mammal. He said even without a weapon in the summertime, he used to swim and kill the sea mammal with his bare hands. He said that is why when he did that out of necessity to provide food for his family. And he said that is why when he heard about the legislation, he was very concerned about the harvest of the sea mammal.

Senator STEVENS. One more, than I have to go.

Mr. NICK. This is Owen David.

STATEMENT OF OWEN DAVID

Mr. DAVID (translated by Mr. Nick). Mr. David is one of the elders of the coastal villages. He is now living in Bethel. He said, like the other gentleman, he agrees on the usage of the sea mammal in dried seal skin for clothing. He says he has lived down the coast for a long time, and has utilized the sea mammal. And he said that is why when he started hearing about the legislation, he was very concerned in its initial stages. And he said the people utilize the sea mammal as was given in testimony by the other village representatives.

Senator STEVENS. Very good. No use raising your hands. I really must go. I want to thank you all. We will be closing the record, but I will receive the statements from those of you who are here whose name is already on the record. If you want to send me a statement written out, if we didn't get a chance to hear you. Margaret, I'm sure that you are included in one of those. What did you want to say, Mary?

MARY GREGORY. Can we give a couple minutes?

Senator STEVENS. All right. For old times sake.

STATEMENT OF MARY GREGORY

MARY GREGORY. I would like to say, I would like to make a comment that I have never been arrested or put in jail. But if this bill passes in its present form, I am sure I will become a criminal, because I have to have seal oil.

Senator STEVENS. Well, this present form doesn't ban you from taking seal oil.

MARY GREGORY. I cannot—I never go hunting. All the seal oil I get I buy from the coastal people.

Senator STEVENS. That still doesn't ban that.

MARY GREGORY. It's our commercial—

Senator STEVENS. It's the native arts and crafts in commercial that the thing bans, if you read it right. It's not the seal oil, it's not the trading of seals, in terms of the sale to the Eskimo people that they were concerned with, Margaret. But I don't want you to go to jail. That pretty baby I saw you here with yesterday.

MARY GREGORY. And the second comments, I have a lot of respect for your job as Senator. I hope all the Senators in Congress give our jobs and occupations the same respect. And I'm sure you will, because I know you are concerned.

Senator STEVENS. I will try to see that they do. Thank you very much. I appreciate your comments and I appreciate all your help.

(Whereupon, the hearing was adjourned:)

ADDITIONAL ARTICLES, LETTERS, AND STATEMENTS

Statement of George Miller, President of the Cook Inlet Region

Mr. Chairman and members of the Subcommittee: My name is George Miller. I am president of Cook Inlet Region, Which is one of the twelve regions designated in the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act to receive a portion of the land and monetary benefits provided in this legislation. In submitting this testimony, I am speaking in behalf of the six constituent villages of Cook Inlet and the Native Population which has enrolled in our region pursuant to Sec. 5 of the settlement legislation.

At the outset, I should state that the Natives whom I represent are virtually unanimous in their opposition to any legislation which would impose a ban in the taking of marine mammals or otherwise alter the present laws and regulations respecting the taking of such mammals. There are several reasons for the position that we have taken, and I believe that it would be helpful for me to state them briefly at this time.

As the hearings which the Subcommittee held in Nome and Bethel showed, a substantial portion of Alaska's Native population, including many Natives who reside along the shores of Cook Inlet and other bodies of water near our region, rely very heavily on marine mammals for subsistance purposes and as a source of income. Thus, the natives of Cook Inlet traditionally have used the hair seal, which is found in the waters of Cook Inlet and other offshore areas, for food and to make clothing and footwear. The liver of the seal has proved to be an especially nutricious food source, and seal oil has been used as one of the main ingredients in Native cooking. Similarly, the Beluga whale has traditionally been an important source of meat and of oil for heating and cooking. In addition, the whale's natural tallow makes an excellent detergent which is almost pollution free.

Marine mammals are also an important source of income for Alaska Natives. Thus many natives who reside in the Cook Inlet Region sell seal hides for use in making coats and other garments. These hides are sold for both domestic and foreign use. Because of their unique ability to withstand the rigers of an Arctic climate, many of the hides are sold to Alaskans for use in making parkas and other garments. Since many seal hides are processed in Alaska by the Native population, income is earned not only from harvesting but also from tanning.

In addition to the income derived from marine mammals harvested in Cook Inlet and nearby offshore areas, the natives of our regions also share in the monies derived from marine mammal harvesting by Natives living elsewhere in Alaska. This is so because ivory and skins from the North are shipped to Cook Inlet for carving and sewing, respectively. Thus, while ocean mammal harvesting by the Natives of Cook Inlet is not as extensive as that conducted by Natives living further north, we nevertheless share in the rich bounty which they take from the sea. In addition, it is important to note that some of our people travel north to participate directly in the seasonal ocean mammal harvesting which takes place in the North Pacific and Berring Sea.

A graphic example of the economic importance of marine mammal harvesting is Aleskind, which is one of the most promising retail outlets for Native handicrafts and artifacts in Alaska. This organization, which is located in the Cook Inlet Region, was formed to market the handicrafts of all three segments of Alaska's Native population—Aleuts, Eskimos and Indians. If a ban on ocean mammal harvesting were to be imposed, Aleskind would immediately lose it economicy viability, and many Natives would lose their jobs.

Mr. Chairman, as you know, the unemployment rate among Alaska Natives is extremely high, much higher than in the population as a whole. For many Natives, hunting and fishing for commercial purposes are the sole sources of income. Although the twentieth century has affected Alaska's Native popula-

tion in many ways, it has not altered the fact that hunting and fishing are vital to the very survival of many Native families. When viewed in this contest, the deleterious consequences which would result from enactment of the pending Ocean Mammal bills becomes alarmingly clear.

Some have argued that the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act, which was enacted into law on December 18, 1971, will provide sufficient income for Alaska Natives, thus, supplanting the need to engage in the harvesting of marine mammals. This is simply not true. For one thing, monetary distributions to villages and to individuals will not take place until after the enrollemnt process is completed in late 1973. In the meantime, only regional corporations established pursuant to the settlement legislation will receive monies from the Alaska Native Fund, and it is likely that the use of these monies will be limited by the Department of the Interior until enrollment is completed. Even after the enrollment process is finished distributions to individuals will probably be quite small and will terminate after the first five years. The distributions to regional corporations and, through them, to village corporations will be for many purposes; thus, such distributions cannot reasonably be expected to supplant or even satisfactorily supplement income lost as a result of any ban or moratorium on ocean mammal harvesting.

We believe that the stated purpose of the various ocean mammal protection bills now pending before the Subcommittee is a laudatory one. Every right thinking person wants to preserve the natural flora and fauna of our world for the benefit of ourselves and future generations. A ban or other change in the present system of laws and regulation respecting ocean mammal harvesting by Alaska Natives would have virtually no effect on the continuing viability of the various species of ocean mammals. Alaska Natives have traditionally been good conservationists, taking only what they need for subsistance and reasonable commercial purposes in a manner which, by its very nature, could not result in the depletion of the marine mammal population. Rather, this depletion has been caused by foreign nationals using modern harvesting methods, such as the explosive harpoon. Only when this type of mass commercial harvesting is prohibited on a worldwide basis will ocean mammals increase in number. In the meantime, Alaska Natives should not be penalized for the actions of others.

Another important ecological factor should be considered in connection with ocean mammal harvesting in Cook Inlet and adjacent waters. Three species of ocean mammals are found in some abundance in these areas: sea lions, hair seals, and Beluga whales. Each of these species preys on salmon, which is one of the staples of the Alaska Native diet and one of the most important components of the Alaskan economy as a whole. As an illustration of the dimensions of this problem, it is not uncommon for Beluga whales to eat twenty-five or more adult salmon during a single feeding. Sea lions pose a similar threat. Inhabiting such places in lower Cook Inlet as the Barren Islands, Pye Island, and Seal Rocks, the sea lion population, in the absence of harvesting, is growing at an alarming rate. If this growth is allowed to continue unchecked, the salmon population in the Inlet and adjacent waters will be seriously jeopardiezed. Thus, it can be seen that the continued harvesting of ocean mammals is necessary to perserve a proper balance between the various species of creatures which inhabit the marine areas of our region. In the absence of such harvesting, all those who depend on salmon and other fish as food or as a source of income will suffer.

Recognizing the nature of the exosystems in Cook Inlet and other marine areas, many responsible conservation groups have opposed the imposition of a ban on ocean mammal harvesting. As one example, most knowledgeable conservation groups in the United States have opposed any change in the Pribiloff Island seal harvest, which is one of the best examples of scientific wild life management in the world. Under the administration of the Department of Commerce, the seal population on the Pribiloff has grown to an optimal level and is now in total balance with its environment. This could never have occurred without the harvesting of certain seals. Similarly, the limited type of harvesting conducted by Alaska Natives in lower Cook Inlet is necessary to preserve the health and vitality of the ocean mammals which inhabit this area and the fish which they eat.

Mr. Chairman, as time passes, we are evolving new ideas about the relationship between various cultures. We now recognize that it is harmful to both majority and minority cultures if the former tries to dominate or completely assimilate the latter. Rather, each has much to learn from the other. I believe that these hard learned principals are especially true in the relationships which exists between Natives and non-Natives. In recent times, it has been recognized that Natives should be able to choose freely between their traditional way of life and a non-Native life style or to pick elements of both. The enactment of any of the ocean mammal protection measures now pending before this Subcommittee would have the effect or potential effect of denying Alaska Natives this choice. Perhaps, this could be tolerated if the circumstances were sufficiently compelling. However, as I have indicated in this testimony, there are no such circumstances. Rather, there are compelling reasons for permitting Alaska Natives to harvest ocean mammals for subsistance and commercial purposes as they have always done. This activity is so interwoven into the fabric of traditional Native life that it cannot be altered or terminated without seriously jeopardizing the culture of our people. Given this fact and the other reasons for continuing to harvest ocean mammals which I have mentioned previously, we of the Cook Inlet Region are very hopeful that this Subcommittee will not recommend and the Congress will not enact legislation that impairs our traditional harvesting methods or compels us to seek a permit from the Federal Government to do something which we have done without interferance for so many years.

In behalf of the Cook Inlet Region, I want to thank you for this opportunity to present our views on the legislation which you are now considering. We respectfully request that careful consideration be given to our position to the many similar expressions that you have received from Alaska Natives, many conservationists, and others familiar with this situation.

Data on Salmon Predation [1]

(Translation of pamphlets issued by Hokuyo Bosen Kyogi Kai (North Pacific Mothership Association), Japan. 1959.)

Translated by Hack Chin Kim

PREDATION ON SALMON BY FUR SEALS

(Exclusive of harbor seal, sea lions, white whale, and mackerel shark)

1. From the "Joint research report (Fishery Agency) for February to June, 1952, planned by the governments of Japan, Canada and the United States, concerning the distribution of fur seals in the North Pacific Ocean and their food habits", it has become clear that 60% of the fur seals inflict predation harm on the salmon during their migratory season, both on the American and Asian sides of 40° N.

From the "Research report (by Fishery Agency) on the fur seals on the Japanese side during the first year of the provisional treaty for the preservation of North Pacific fur seals", it has become clear that similar tendencies are conspicuous in the waters adjacent to Japan.

About 40 years ago, there were about 270,000 fur seals, but by 1952 they multiplied 7 to 8 times, to more than 2,100,000 individuals, the greatest number in history.

At the Pribilof Islands (U.S. territory) an average of 1,830,000 fur seals has been maintained since 1952, but the fact that about 3,000 fur seals have recently migrated to the Northern Kuriles would seem to indicate that the three great breeding grounds on the Pribilofs, Komandorski and Robbon have reached a saturation point.

---

[1] Issued by Hokuyo Bosen Kyogi Kai (North Pacific Mothership Council), Japan[5] p. Mar. 15, 1959. (Text fully translated by Hack Chin Kim.)

2. The status of recent propagation of fur seals:

Pribilof Island (U.S. territory), 1912	210, 000
At present since 1952—average	1, 830, 000
Komandorski (Soviet territory) 1934	150, 000
At present, 1958	250, 000
Robbon Island—Maintained average	50, 000
Northern Kuriles—Recent migration	3, 000
Total about	2, 130, 000

3. The Pribilof fur seals and the Alaskan salmon catches compared:

	Fur seals		Salmon (Computations by the "Pacific Fisherman Year Book,"	
	Individuals	Percent	Metric tons	Percent
4-year average:				
1935–38	940, 000	100	279, 800	100
1939–42	1, 120, 000	119	233, 200	83. 3
1943–46	1, 250, 000	133	192, 800	68. 8
1947–50	1, 470, 000	156	167, 000	59. 7
1951–54	1, 770, 000	188	140, 000	50. 0
1955–58	1, 830, 000	194	112, 600	40. 2

4. Let us attempt an estimation of the extent of predation by the Pribilof fur seals on the Alaskan anadromous salmon resource.

The commercial catches of salmon and the effort in Alaska reached the maximum during the period 1928–1938. The greater part of the catches was disposed of as raw material for tinned production, and so we are in a position to know the amount of catches on the basis of the accurate record of tinned production for the past scores of years.

Since the approximate number of fur seals is also clear from the Government report, we decided to estimate the amount of predation by grasping and contrasting their tendencies to increase or decrease.

The Pribilof fur seals multiplied to twice as many during the 18 year period from 1935 to 1952. In contrast with this, the Alaskan salmon catches decreased more than ½, from 279,800 to 112,600 metric tons, during the same period.

It would seem safe to assume that the changes in environment, including this correlation, amount to the increase in the number of fur seals and the decrease in the number of salmon.

If the decrease of 167,200 metric tons in the commercial catches of salmon is due to the increase of 890,000 fur seals, the predation rate is 1.88kg. per fur seal. The predation by 1,830,000 fur seals is 344,000 metric tons. Besides this, if we assume that the amount of predation on the non-commercial salmon resource is of an equal amount, the predation amounts to as much as 380 kg. per seal, or about 700,000 metric tons for 1,830,000 fur seals.

5. Estimation of predation on salmon by the Komandorski, Robben and Northern Kurile fur seals: (Method used is that of the Pribilof computation above)

Komandorski Islands	Fur seals 250,000 individuals, predation per sea 380 kg., 95,000 tons.
Robben Island	Fur seals 50,000 individuals, predation per seal 380 kg., 19,000 tons.
Northern Kurile	Fur seals 3,000 individuals, predation per seal 380 kg., 1,140 tons.
Total	303,000 individuals, predation 115,140 tons (metric).

6. The predation on salmon by about 2,130,000 fur seals is about 820,000 metric tons, of which 85% and 15% are estimated respectively to be American and Asian.

7. What species of fish get much predation?

According to the Alaskan Salmon catches given in the *Pacific Fisherman Year Book* dated January 25, 1959, for the last 20 years the decrease in pink salmon is specially great, and presumably predation on red salmon and chum salmon ranks next.

This is also due to their power of propagation (being weak), but could not it also be an indication of a comparatively high rate of predation on pink salmon?

According to Mr. Kozo (Mitsuzo) Ikeyama in the February issue of the *Suisankai* published by Dainippon Suisanka in 1935, of the 15,450,000 fish caught in 1934 by the Japanese mothership drift nets and the Northern Kurile based drift nets, the fish with nail marks of harbor seals and sea lions were 5% red salmon, 8% chum salmon and 15% pink salmon.

A few individuals insist that the fur seals eat cod-fish and small fish, and do not attack salmon, but that will be true of the period outside the salmon fishing period. They form a large group on the salmon migratory route in July and August and attack salmon frequently. Since many of the salmon have nail marks, the predation must not be slight. There is no reason why only the fur seals will remain aloof and above predation, when they see their kindred sea animals attack and eat salmon during that period.

The text of this pamphlet ends here. The rest are tables and charts which were not duplicated.

PREDATION ON SALMON BY HARBOR SEALS AND SEA LIONS

(by Kozo (or Mitsuzo) Ikeyama)[1] The article begins with a philosophical observation of the balanced operation of natural laws "A worm is eaten by a frog, a frog is eaten by a snake, a snake is eaten by a pheasant, and a pheasant is eaten by man". This goes on not only on land but also in the sea. A brief history of conservation measures taken to protect the seals and their subsequent increase in population is given.

Fishing seasons at various migratory routes

Near Komandorski	First part of May.
Near Cape Kronotsky	From latter part of May to the latter part of June.
Near Uskam Bay	From the first part of June to the latter part of June.
Near Olga Bay	From the latter part of May to the middle of July.
Near Shipunsky Cape	From the latter part of June to the latter part of July.
Near Utashud Island	From the first part of July to the latter part of July.

Estimated number of salmon caught by harbor seals and sea lions is enormous.

1. Assuming there is a minimum of 500,000 harbor seals and 50,000 sea lions that are bred on the east and west coasts of the Kamchatka peninsula and on Northern Kurile Islands,

2. and estimating that one harbor seal catches an average of 2 salmon a day and that one sea lion catches an average of 3 salmon a day,

3. let us say that the two predators catch salmon for 80 days. We arrive at the estimated figure of 92,000,000 fish caught by harbor seals and sea lions during the fishing season. Nail marks on the salmon: 5% among red salmon [percentage in relation to the total catch], 8% among chum salmon, and about 15% among pink salmon, of the fish caught by driftnets. (cf. previous article —translator).

If we classify the fish according to the proportion of nail marks, we get the following figures: Red salmon, 16,428,000 fish; chum salmon, 26,285,000 fish; and pink salmon, 49,287,000 fish.

[1] From *Suisankai* (Journal of the Fisheries Society of Japan) Tokyo, February 1935. Reprinted by Hokuyo Bosen Kyogi Kai. (Translation summary by Hack Chin Kim.)

If we estimate the damage on the red salmon in terms of the going price of the tinned goods, or salted goods in the case of the other salmon, it reaches as high as several million yen, almost exceeding the number of fish caught by man. Moreover, the wounded salmon become incapable of spawning when they return to their stream, because germs grow on their wounds. This is a serious problem.

While we do not deny the need for high seas fishery control, we hope that fishery experts will establish a long-term plan after having duly considered the effects of the struggles in the biological world upon salmon.

PREDATION ON SALMON BY BELUGAS, DOLLY VARDEN, AND MACKEREL SHARKS

THE BELUGAS WHOSE MAIN FOOD IS SALMON

(by A. G. Tomilin)[1]

According to V. A. Arsen'ev (1939), belugas eat mainly chum salmon *(Oncorhynchus keta)*, Navaga *(Eleginus navaga)* and herring. The food which ranks next is flatfish, *Leuciscus brandti* Dyb, *Hypomesus* sp., *Myoxocephalus* sp., *Zoarces elongatus* Kner, Blenniidae, lamprey, *Salvelinus leucomaenis* Pallas, and 4 species of crustacea *Crangon septemspinosa* Say, *Mesidotea entomon orientalis* Gurianova, *Cambaroides schrenckii* Kessler, *Pagurus capillatus.* To these however, *Oncorhynchus gorbuscha* and *Coregonus ussuriensis* Berg must be added, and these were found by S. V. Dorofeev and S. K. Klumov (1936) in the stomachs of the belugas of the Sakhalin region. They also eat *Oncaea bergiiet kamchatika* and *Gonatus fabricii* (A. F. Middendorf, 1869, M. M. "Nureptsov" (?) 1952).

V. A. Arsen'ev (1939) established the existence of the following differences according to age in the food of Far Eastern belugas: namely, the staple diet for the infant mammals is milk; grey-colored infants eat crustacea (43.5%), chum salmon (4.4%); the infants whose color has turned blue-gray eat chum salmon (55.9%), navaga (20.6%), various species of fish, crustacea (14.7%), pure crustacea (8.8%); the mature belugas whose color has turned white eat chum salmon (60%), Navaga (11.1%), Chum salmon and other fish, crustacea (15.5%), crustacea and miscellaneous fish (4.5%) and pure crustacea (8.9).

In short, the mature belugas feast mainly upon chum salmon. The weight of the beluga stomach with its contents is from 20 to 25 kg. according to V. A. Arsen'evs' measurement, and (the beluga) has devoured as many as 10 medium-sized chum salmon. The salmon species become their most important food at the time of the former's mass migration along sea coasts toward their spawning areas. In the north of the Okhotsk Sea (Gizhiga Bay) also, roughly the same food habit was observed. In other words, mature belugas feast mainly upon large-sized fish (chum salmon, pink salmon).

Toward the end of May, the belugas in Gizhiga Bay gather in large numbers around a group of herring. The number (of belugas) decreases from about the middle of June, but they again become numerous in July when the salmon appear. From the end of August the number of belugas again decreases; they become very rare in October, and disappear with the formation of ice.

Pink salmon survival rate

	Percent
Amount of eggs carried by parent fish	100
Eggs spawned onto redd	58
Eggs surviving until spring	4
Young fish that have descended to sea	1. 8

Young red salmon are eaten in large quantities by char (*Salvelinus malma*), juvenile silver salmon and other fish in rivers.

Young silver salmon eat at first plankton in rivers, but later they eat fish, especially red salmon fry.

---

[1] From: Animals in Soviet Russia and adjacent countries; vol. 9, whales. Published by Akademiia Nauk SSSR, Publication Division, 1957. In Russian. Reprinted in Japanese as a summary by Hokuyo Bosen Kyogi Kai. March 1959. (Japanese summary further summarized in translation by Hack Chin Kim).

PREDATION BY DOLLY VARDEN [1]

(by K. I. Popov, Chief, Bureau of Okhotsk Fish Protection and Propagation)

One of the measures adopted for the protection of salmon on the Okhotak coast is to destroy the predators. From ecological observations on the char (*Salvelinus malma*) conducted in 1957, effectiveness of the destruction of predators can be seen.

The char feed intensely upon salmon eggs and young salmon during their fresh-water period. In other words, the salmon gather at the mainstream of a river from the end of April to the middle of June, and the chars descend toward the expanse of the river mouth along with the descending young salmon and eat them. In areas off the river mouths and in river mouths, the chars catch and eat young salmon. During the Okhotsk herring spawning season, they eat the herring eggs. From August through October the chars again descend to the river spawning areas. and there they eat the salmon eggs during the salmon spawning season. In October–November after spawning, they gather at the deeps on the main river bed and spend the winter there.

The quantity of mature chars (average body weight 250 g.) is very numerous, and at the Okhota River alone the stock of chars is estimated at several thousand tons.

Abdominal sections of chars at the Okhota River in spring revealed that each stomach of char of the average weight of 250 g. contained about 170 small chum and pink salmon. It is possible to conclude from this that the stock of chars, numbering several million fish at the Okhota River, catches and eats several million small salmon in one night alone during the period of their mass descent. Consequently, the amount of small fish predated throughout the entire period of downward migration reaches astronomical figures. If we decrease the number of chars, the survival of chum and pink salmon will improve. There is no doubt that catching of chars in large quantities will be beneficial to the fishery, and great quantities of char catches will provide not only valuable food products but also increase the number of mature salmon returning to the home stream.

The fishery enterprises in the Sea of Okhotsk should radically intensify the catch of chars by using the most intense fishing method. From the end of April through June is the most suitable time for the char fishery.

Pursuit of the chars in the springtime will not entail intermixed catches involving other valuable fish.

Small-scale processing factories equipped with refrigerating facilities and tinning factories for chars ought to be established along rivers in the Okhotsk area.

MISCELLANEOUS INFORMATION ON PREDATION ON VARIOUS FAR EASTERN SALMON SPECIES

(by G. V. Nikolskii)[2]

(1) In the case of chum salmon, a fairly large portion of the eggs are washed out of their redd immediately after spawning and are eaten by other fish that swarm in large numbers around the spawning ground. They are eaten in Kamchatka mainly by mountain trout (Dolly Varden and other *Salvelinus* species) and at the Amur River by Lenok, whitefish and other species.

The Far Eastern char (*Salvelinus malma*) eats enormous quantities of eggs during the salmon spawning season and large numbers of small fish while these remain in streams. Whereas the chars are predators from rivers to river-mouths and offshore areas, the lenok (*Brachymystax lenok*) live in mountain streams and do not descend to sea. They eat eggs in the Amur River during the chum spawning season and eat the young fish while these descend the river.

(2) Great quantities of pink salmon eggs are eaten by various predator fish, especially by the char. They perish also by other causes. The mortality of the

---

[1] Original title: Measures for increasing Far Eastern salmon stocks. (O merkh po uvelicheniiu zapasov dal'nevostochnykh losogei). From: Rybnoe Khoziaistvo, *34*(8): 9–10. August 1958. In Russian. Abstracted and reprinted in Japanese by Hokuyo Bosen Kyogi Kai, Mar. 15, 1959, under title "Predation by dolly varden". (Japanese summary further summarized in translation by Hack Chin Kim).

[2] From: G. V. Nikolskii, *Special Treatises on Ichthyology*, 1954. In Russian. Summarized in Japanese by Hokuyo Bosen Kyogi Kai, Mar. 15, 1959.

pink salmon eggs and the young fish during their fresh-water period at the Iska River is according to the data by A. IA. Taranets.

MACKEREL SHARKS AS SALMON PREDATORS

(by Osamu Sano)[1]

This report sketches the information gathered so far on mackerel sharks as salmon predators. This is not the result of a systematic research and the data are insufficient.

I. Data used

The following materials were used either directly or indirectly in compiling this report:

(1) The data collected [by the author] as a fishery inspector on board the A-maru fleet during the 1958 mothership salmon fishing season, and several instances of observation;

(2) The records kept by each fleet on the mackerel catch intermingled in the catches by the mothership salmon drift net fishery in accordance with the request made in October, 1958 by Hokkaido Regional Fisheries Research Laboratory of each salmon mothership company:

1956---------- A′, B′, C′-maru fleets (3 fleets).
1957---------- A″-maru fleet (1 fleet).
1958---------- A, B, C, D-maru fleets (4 fleets).

Very rarely were the records kept in a uniform fashion by all the fleets;

(3) Operation logs kept by the salmon research vessels in 1956, 1957, 1958;

(4) Past experimental operational records concerning various mackerel sharks in the adjacent seas of Japan and in offshore areas;

(5) Oral reports gathered at Kushiro and elsewhere and operational records kept by vessels engaged in the tuna and shark long-line fishery in the offshore area of the Tohoku (Northeast) district.

II. Offshore distribution of mackerel sharks

The mackerel shark is a comparatively cosmopolitan species, whose habitat is cold sea, dwelling in a large area in the North Pacific Ocean, the Bering Sea and adjacent waters from near 40° N. to 50° N. (figure 1). Their geographic distribution is extensive all along the offshore area of Ibaragi Prefecture, Tohoku coast, Hokkaido coast, Kurile and Aleutian Islands, Alaska coast and near Southern California, over the North Pacific Ocean, the Bering Sea, a part of the Seas of Okhotsk and the northern Japan Sea. This wide distribution would seem to indicate the existence of several different populations, but systematized information on the subject is scarce.

According to Matsubara's classification (1955), this species has the name *Lamna ditropis* Hubbs et Follett. In the United States and Canda, it is called common perbeagle, salmon shark, and sometimes mackerel shark, bottlenose shark or blue shark. The Russians call it (Sel'devaia akula).

III. The mackerel shark's food habit and what it tells about salmon predation

(1) About 30% of the dissected mackerel sharks had almost empty stomachs containing digested matter showing nailmarks barely visible;

(2) The remaining 70% had stomachs which contained fish bodies or parts of bodies;

(3) Only in one instance were fish other than salmon found in the dissected stomach; all other had eaten salmon;

(4) Among the salmon species eaten by mackerel sharks, red salmon were most frequent, and pink, silver, and chum salmon ranked next.

(5) The amount of salmon contained in the stomach of one mackerel shark was 1–3 salmon (of roughly the same size as the commercial fish); more instances in which only one fish had been eaten. Though detailed data are lacking, there is said to have been an extreme instance recorded in which one mackerel shark contained as many as 8 red salmon in its stomach;

---

[1] From: Data on salmon predation (3). Issued by Hokuyo Bosen Kyogi Kai, Mar. 15, 1959. In Japanese.

(6) Whenever more than 2 salmon were found in the mackerel shark's stomach, except for the one fish which seems to have just been eaten, the others were often fairly well digested;

(7) In waters where the density of distribution of red and chum salmon is presumably about the same from a consideration of the catch composition, the stomach contents of mackeral sharks are more often red salmon, and only very rarely are chum salmon detected. This may mean that mackerel sharks have a taste for a particular species, or their difficulty or facility in catching food (is) in relation to the delicate ecological differences between the red and chum salmon.

IV. Conclusion

(1) Of the mackerel sharks distributed over the wide area extending from the North Pacific Ocean to the Bering Sea, it is clear that in the waters of the Aleutian Chain there is a food-searching migration of predatory mackerel sharks that is presumed to be closely connected, through the food chain temporally and spatially, with the ecology of salmon.

(2) Concerning these mackerel sharks that appear in the North Pacific salmon fishing area, within the limits of information obtained, a report on the distribution, migration and food habits was here prepared.

(3) It was impossible, from the available data, to make an accurate estimate of the amount of damage done to the salmon by direct mackerel shark predation in northern waters.

(4) An effort to understand the biology of mackerel sharks together with other predatory animals as salmon predators, is necessary as a factor in the natural waste of the salmon resources and for a study of the balance of the animal world with salmon as its center.

PREDATION ON SALMON BY FUR SEALS AND HARBOR SEALS

(by Hokuyo Bosen Kyogi Kai)[1]

1. Report on the research for the study and development of the northern fishing area (Fishery Bureau, Forest-Agriculture Ministry, 1937):

Prepared by technician Masao Togawa and two others who had been sent to Alaska on board the research vessel *Taiyo-maru* during May through August in 1937, with photos showing salmon damaged by fur seals. (See photos 13, 14 glued to the original report). The note on the photos says, "Presumably fur seal nail marks".

2. In the *addenda* are found the operation logs kept by the *Matsu-maru*, the *Teru-maru*, and the *Nishitsu-maru*, and the remarks state that the damage caused by fur seals and harbor seals is very great.

3. There is a brief discussion of the belugas and lamprey eels, that are predators of salmon, extracted from the translated *Research on the Yukon River Salmon Fishery* (translated into Japanese in 1937).

The operation logs mentioned above show that the damage done by fur seals and harbor seals is very great during June.

At the end of the logs is found a chart showing the locations where damage is done, in relation to the location of each of the three research vessels mentioned above.

(All these data dated 1937.)

STATEMENT OF CHARLES KONIGSBERG, PROFESSOR OF POLITICAL SCIENCE ALASKA METHODIST UNIVERSITY, REPRESENTING UPPER COOK INLET CHAPTER, ALASKA CONSERVATION SOCIETY

This Anchorage-based group of Alaskan conservationists strongly supports amendments to the proposed legislation which would allow the Native Peoples of Alaska to continue their taking of sea mammals for subsistence and handicrafts. Our support is based on two major considerations: (1) economic necessity; (2) cultural respect and admiration.

As to the matter of economic necessity, all of the relevant factors have been thoroughly expressed and documented by others, and we believe the case to be an irrefutable one: the taking of sea mammals is absolutely essential to the

[1] Issued by Hokuyo Bosen Kyogi Kai (North Pacific Mothership Association), Japan, [6], p. Mar. 25, 1959. In Japanese. (Summary translation by Hack Chin Kim).

economic well-being of many Alaskan natives, especially the Eskimos and Aleuts. We do not believe the numbers of animals to be taken would seriously affect the population levels of the sea mammals concerned.

In regard to the merits—we would also say the *necessity*—of preserving the native cultures which still depend to a significant degree on subsistence hunting and handicrafts, we believe the case to be an equally compelling one, perhaps more so. The protection of what remains of the traditional culture of these people is essential not only to them but to all Americans, and indeed to all peoples of the world.

This is so because we are all benefitted by the continued existence of cultures different from our own; we are all enriched by the presence of different life-styles—by the successful reality of alternative ways-of-life which may provide standards by which to measure our own. More hopefully, such alternatives may help to show us where we might find ways to improve our own culture in those areas where we have failed. The preservation, then, of Alaskan native culture is as important to us as it is to them.

If it seems a bit strange for conservationists to be so strongly in support of such a measure, the answer is that it is not strange at all but, rather, entirely consistent with what is central to the conservationist concern: DIVERSITY. This plea for the preservation of cultures based on subsistence hunting and handicrafts is based on the same fundamental concern underlying our plea for wilderness preservation, for parks, for open-space, etc.: on DIVERSITY. The animal species that is man has need of alternative in human cultures as in physical environments—in either case he is the less healthy without them. Indeed it would be self-destructive to have a world without such diversity of cultures and physical environments.

In the present case it would be more than tragic to allow the cultures of the Alaskan natives to pass from the scene, not only because they incorporate ways different from our own, but because their ways-of-life still have much to tell us about how to re-learn to live in harmony with our natural environment —a desperate need throughout our world.

For all these reasons we are in support of the amendments to allow continued taking by Alaskan natives of sea mammals for subsistence and handicrafts.

STATEMENT OF ERNEST MUELLER, PRESIDENT, ALASKA CONSERVATION SOCIETY

Mr. Chairman, I am Ernst Mueller, President of the Alaska Conservation Society, whose office address is Box 80192, College, Alaska 99701. I am pleased to be here to represent the Society at these hearings, and wish to thank you for coming this long distance to secure testimony from many of those most directly concerned with the pending liegislation to help protect our marine mammal resources.

The Alaska Conservation society strongly supports marine mammals protection. It is essential that we take action now to protect these wild creatures from destruction at the hand of man. The concept of stopping senseless killing —the main consideration in legislation now being considered by Congress— helps to solve part of the problem. The most difficult part—the destruction of habitat through intrusion and pollution—will still be with us.

Four points must be made when preparing legislation controlling the killing of marine mammals:

1. A first consideration should be to design the legislation so that each species of marine mammal can be considered individually and a protection system designed to the extent necessary for that species. The concept "marine mammal" is extremely broad. These animals range from polar bears, walrus, seal and sea otter, who spend most of their lives at sea, yet often use the shore as breeding grounds and staging areas; to whales, dolphins and porpoises who spend their entire lives at sea. Obviously, each of these animals has different habitat requirements and the impact of man on each will be and is different. Certainly, it is essential that wasteful killing of these animals must cease. It is equally essential, however, that the restriction of harvesting of marine mammals be made upon a scientific base, not based upon emotions and pathos. If the individual species is not threatened, or if it must be harvested to prevent over population, then hunting and taking of these animals, properly controlled, should be allowed.

2. A second consideration should be the impact of this legislation upon the culture and, to a lesser extent, the income, of people who use these animals, or parts of them, for either susistence industry or food. It is important, of course, that species so harvested not be seriously threatened with extinction. But it is also important that we not threaten a culture with total extinction just to solve a small part of a big problem. Where ever possible we must protect traditional rights of people using these animals as a source of cultural enrichment, income, or for food. These earliest Americans are today recognized as having been our country's greatest conservationists; let us not make them the object of the guilt feelings resulting from our own greed.

3. A third consideration is that of cooperation and strengthening of on-going State programs. To replace a successful State program with an untested federal one could very well result in inaction, or, at worst, disaster. The State of Alaska has successfully controlled and brought back the population of Northern Sea Otter by a management program involving complete protection. Recently the State of Alaska announced the outlawing, beginning next season, of the use of the airplane in hunting polar bear. To replace these responsive, competent, although modestly funded, local programs with a successful Federal program might very well be impossible. There are no United States Fish and Wildlife Service portection agents north of the Alaska Range, nor are there likely to be any even if severely restrictive legislation passes. Enforcement would then be virtually non-existent, and the hoped-for results negated.

4. A final consideration is that of the international nature of many of these animals: particularly the polar bear, fur seal and cetaceans. In order for any protection program to succeed, we must encourage and promote international cooperation. Our experiences in the past have been mixed. The International Whaling Commission has been a complete disaster, yet the North Pacific Fur Seal Commission has been quite successful. I hope we have learned enough from these two efforts to be able to construct a good international Ocean Mammal Protection Program. If we haven't, no national protection program can succeed in the long run.

During the course of this legislation, many well-intentioned people have severely critized the concept and programs of wildlife resource management and sustained yield harvests. They have claimed that the only effective program must be a total ban on killing ocean mammals.

Certainly some of this criticism is justified; it is particularly true of the International Whaling Commission's programs. However, like it or not, man is an important, perhaps even critical, part of the habitat and ecosystem of every other organism on this planet. Consciously or unconsciously, man and his works "manage", in the broad sense, all the earth's animals and plants. Perhaps this is not the way it should be, it certainly is not the situation of my choice, but it is a fact, and we must live with it. This being the case, it is only sensible to structure this management, through research, harvest control protection, and other methods, so that our wildlife resources, terrestrial and marine, can be preserved. I only hope that the final form of the Ocean Mammal Protection Legislation strengthens rather than destroys the management program in the United States..

Thank you.

Mr. Chairman. I am further authorized to speak for, and on behalf of the Tlingit and Haida Indians of Alaska. The Tlingit and Haida is an organization which represents approximately 15,000 persons in 18 communities.

My people are unanimous in opposition to HR 10420 as it emerged from the House of Representatives. As a matter of fact, we oppose Federal Intervention in the Management of our Resources.

My people, since time immemorial, have used and taken sea mammals—for livelihood, tribal regalia, and in earlier times, for trade or barter.

In more modern times, my people have used the seal for food and clothing and artifacts.

A substantial number of my people, particularly our elderly, make a living sewing, and selling their handiwork on the commercial market. For you to place restrictions on the taking of Sea Mammals will have adverse effects on those of my people who know no other way to make a living. In a cash economy system, which has been unsuccessfully launched in my rural communities, this bill, if passes, will work against my people.

We favor an exemption from the Act for Alaska, recognizing that the Congress will pass some form of legislation, and we are therefore in support of

Amendment No. 1148. Amendment No. 1148 will accomplish what we believe to be a realistic approach.

We take no issue with the intents and purposes of an act that places protective provisions on certain species that may be endangered.

The record of Alaska though is clear. We do not believe that Marine mammals in our area are in that category. We strongly urge adoption of Amendment No. 1148.

Further, we oppose restrictions on the interstate commerce aspect as is now under consideration by the Senate. The implications of this bill and the restrictions on interstate commercials infringes on our right to self-determination—the national policy for the original inhabitants of the United States.

My people are well organized and have been for many generations. We have been concerned about our resources, much more so than any Conservation minded group anywhere—as to us, it is our way of life. As a matter of fact—in the 1890's 22 of our tribal chiefs met in the Village of Klukwan for the purposes of deciding what to do with the intruders who were ravaging our villages, wasting our fish and killing our seals. The tribal leaders decided we had no recourse but to drive out the whites from our shores. This action never materialized, but the point is, we are by practice and instinct. a conservation/preservation minded people.

For those of my people who are dependent upon our way of life; for those generations to come, we stand opposed to HR 10420 and ask that the Congress —with all of its wisdom, pass if it must upon a bill with appropriate amendments. Hopefully, an exemption for Alaska.

We appreciate the opportunity to be heard. We are prepared to submit into the record, facts as I am sure our Tlingit and Haida president and Board Chairman or the Southeast Regional Corp, John Borbridge, jr., can provide you with documentation.

In these days of great decisions, we could not consciously sit idly by saying nothing on this most important issue. We had to take a stand.

STATEMENT OF MERLIN KOONOOKA OF GAMBELL, ALASKA

For the natives of St. Lawrence Island, the only source of food, our very life, livelihood and existence depends on the sea mammal, and always will for our children and thier children. For most of the natives, it is the only source of income.

What beef, cattle, farming is to all other people in this country, is the sea mammal to the Eskimo and other natives of Alaska.

Even if our people had steady jobs and income, they could not afford the extremely high cost of living without subsistence hunting. At this time when the average American is affected by the rising cost of meat, consider what it does to our people who depend on the sea mammal and where cost of living is many times more.

The Eskimo takes from the sea mammal, the meat and oil for food, the furs and ivory for his clothing and hunting equipment, and also turns it into beautiful arts and crafts which he must sell to pay for gasoline that costs up to a dollar a gallon, he must pay for expensive motors and many other needs for hunting.

We live where weather conditions are severe with prevailing cold winds blowing consistently. Many time conditions may permit us to hunt only a couple times a month. Many times we come home with empty skin boats and sleds.

The native subsistence hunter is nature's only true and natural conservationist, and must continue to be so. The commercial aspect of the natives use marine mammals in no way affects conservation. But it is necessary to continue his subsistance hunting and his way of living. Why must we suffer for what others have done? It is your job as our countr'ys lawmakers to see that justice and fairness is for all people's pursuit of happiness. We hope and pray that these hearings will result in that you will feel as we do that we do not intend to be victims of unfair legislation. We may be the farthest citizens from Washington, but we are a part of these United States, so others must learn not to ignore us.

Some people say that the land claims settlement money will compensate our losses. Certainly, congress passed the land claims money. Now must congress tell us how and what to spend it on? It is our money, we have enough problems to take care of without others telling us what to do.

Our way of existence with nature is the best way of conservation. Any other way has proven by civilization in our country a shortcut to pollution and ruin of the ecology and balance of nature.

STATEMENT OF JOHN KULOWIYI, NELSON ALOWA, AND WAYNE PENAYAH FOR THE BOAT CAPTAINS OF SAVOONGA

Since 1966 over $50,000 has come into Savoonga from white sport hunters. (There are four other villages hunting walrus for sport representing about 1000 people.)

This "$50,000 plus" represents over half of ALL non-government money that has come into the village during this time.

This spring (1972) we have commitments for over $25,000 coming into Savoonga from sport hunters, and guides at Gambell and Diomede also have hunters.

In 1962 roughly 60% of every walrus taken was utilized for food, clothing and dog food. Of this amount only about 15 to 20% was people food, the rest was dog food.

Now, in the 1970's, the snow machine has all but replaced the dog team and only about 35 to 50% of each walrus harvested is now used for human subsistence. If laws are now passed that make us throw away all the parts of walrus that are not eaten we will only be able to use less than 50% of the available raw materials.

Also during the past ten years, hunting has become more and more expensive. This is partly due to the payment of the crew by the boat captain. In the old days the crew was paid with meat, but now they want and need some cash. Gasoline is $0.95 a gallon, and oil a dollar a quart. A day of hunting takes 15 to 25 gallons of gas for the motor. The motor costs over a thousand dollars and is usually ruined after two years of running in the salt water. Cash is also needed for ammunition on the hunt and other materials.

Point is this.—Economy is dependent on subsistence hunting, but it is a *cash* economy. The villages need cash as well as meat from subsistence hunting and MAXIMUM utilization of every animal taken should be one of the goals of any laws protecting sea mammals.

This utilization must include:

1. sale of ivory products
2. sale of meat and skins (over 20,000 pounds of meat was sold on the Seward Peninsula in 1971 commercially, and there is an established walrus skin market.)
3. Sale of the hunt itself for trophy walrus—this is a very important use because it supplies (a) cash income for the hunt, (b) leaves the meat and skin for village use, and (c) additional cash income from food and lodging and purchases in the village.

Assume HR 10420 passes as it is now written:

(1) What will the native hunter do with the excess meat and valuable ivory? He will probably be forced to waste the meat and may sell the ivory on the black market. This will result in a very small use for materials for which there is already a good market.

(2) Limiting the use of all but a tiny portion of each walrus taken to subsistence only will NOT cut down appreciably on the harvest. The Eskimo people are hunters from birth, and even if laws are passed that prohibit the use of a single part of the animals we will still hunt. It is our way of life, and many of us live for the hunting. We have already lost too much of our culture.

(3) Sport hunting will be outlawed and we will loose the best source of income we have from the walrus.

(4) With the passage of the Native Land Claims Bill we have only a few short years to become self-supporting. Passage of this bill (HR 10420) is like putting food on the table and then telling us we cannot eat it. How will we be able to pay for our new store and other improvements if our only source of income from private enterprise is deprived us. (There is absolutely no biological justification for such restrictions).

Suggested changes for the Sea Mammal Bill

Require maximum utilization of every sea mammal harvested. Make illegal not to use most or all of the raw materials from every animal taken. (This would cut down on the numbers of animals harvested each year and at the same time provide a strong base for the meat and hide industry that has already begun to develop.

Allow sport hunting of bulls only, but make it mandatory that a sport hunter must be accompanied by a permanent resident of the village from which the hunt is conducted.

Prohibit the sale of raw ivory. w/out permit

Set up a joint State/Federal management program for all of Alaska's Sea Mammals.

Thank you for your consideration. If we do not have a chance to speak, please enter this as offical testimony.

Signed

JOHN KULOWIYI,
NELSON ALOWA,
WAYNE PENAYAH.

STATEMENT OF BEN L. HILLIKER, DEPUTY COMMISSIONER, ALASKA DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND GAME

Mr. Chairman: My name is Ben Hilliker. I am Deputy Commissioner for Sport Fish and Game, Alaska Department of Fish and Game.

It's a pleasure for me to again appear before you and to discuss marine mammals and to present to you our views on a specific bill concerning marine mammal legislation that is before this Committee.

Mr. Chairman, at the last count there have been over a dozen bills introduced in both houses of Congress dealing with marine mammals. One bill, H.R. 10420, was passed by the U.S. House of Representatives by an overwhelming margin on March 3, 1972. This bill, H.R. 10420, in its present form does not provide for sound resource management from a biological standpoint and the five-year moratorium provision is not consistent with sound resource management of marine mammal stocks which are neither depleted nor in danger of depletion. H.R. 10420 further specifically provides for federal government management or administration of all marine mammals, including those primarily resident in the waters of the respective states; and finally H.R. 10420 minimizes the opportunity for the respective states to make scientific and administrative contributions to a coordinated state-federal management program.

H.R. 10420 is not responsive to either the needs of the people or the principal aspects of marine mammal management and utilization in Alaska, or anywhere else, for that matter. It is therefore imperative that the United States Senate take a positive, logical approach to marine mammal management. It is our opinion that the approach taken by S. 3161 is a substantial improvement over HR 10420 and more nearly provides the type of marine mammal legislation that is both responsive to sound biological management principles and the wise use of a renewable natural resource of extreme importance to our citizens.

The approach taken in S. 3161 would be further improved by the incorporation of the following amendments.

FINDINGS AND DECLARATION OF POLICY

Sec. 2(6) lines 21, 22 and 23. New wording recommended as follows: "Marine mammals have proven themselves to be resources of great international significance, aesthetic, recreational, subsistence, as well as economic."

By adding this reference to subsistence, it will recognize a necessary and legitimage use of marine mammal resources by Alaskan residents.

Sec. 101(b) line 13. (1) "Pregnant at the time of taking." Delete this sentence. This will be difficult to enforce, and even more impossible to obey. Most species of marine mammals, except some whales and the walrus, give birth to their pups, and are bred again almost immediately. Biologically speaking, after the females attain breeding age, all are essentially pregnant throughout the year.

Sec. 101(c)(2)(c). Alaska marine mammals, especially hair seals and sea lions, are commonly involved in commercial fisheries depredations. These ani-

mals upon occasion may become entangled in gill nets, seines, longlines, and shellfish gear. Unless the Secretary is extremely judicious in his interpretation of this Section, the Alaska salmon, halibut, herring and shellfish fisheries could be seriously and disastrously affected.

We realize the entire Section deals with "importation" into the United States; however, shellfish, halibut and salmon troll operations are commonly conducted beyond the three mile and contiguous zones, and landings from these operations might be considered "importations" under some legal determinations.

Sec. 103 Permits. We have submitted comments relative to the permit procedures before; however, we are again compelled to comment on the administrative burden imposed on both the Secretary and the individual by this Section. Sec. 103 provides that the Secretary may issue permits which authorized the taking of marine mammals under the provisions described and detailed in Sec. 102.

In recognizing that in most cases, the marine mammals of Alaska are not endangered, and are at relatively high population levels, it appears likely that permits for harvest of this resource will be granted. In Alaska, a conservative estimate, primarily submitted to this Committee, indicates that in excess of 20,000 permits will be required to allow a normal and realistic administration of this Act.

Even with the Indians, Aleuts and Eskimos excluded from the permit procedures, fishery depredation permits, commercial harvest permits, sport hunting permits and scientific collecting permits could easily exceed 10,000 per year.

Instead of this obviously lengthy and costly permit procedure, we would suggest that the permit procedure be maintained only for rare and endangered species, and that a harvest report procedure or some other method for determining the annual harvest be instituted for the nonendangered species.

Without this latter approach, we are certain that the permit procedures will lead to an unenforcable federal law, which is cumbersome and practically impossible for many Alaskans to obey.

Sec. 107. We concur with the amendment to Sec. 107(3) which provides for utilization and sale by the Indians, Aleuts and Eskimos of marine mammals for native arts, crafts and clothing. However, the wording in lines 17, 18 and 19 apparently excludes the native subsistence whale hunts which have been previously granted by exceptions in the provisions of the International Whaling Convention.

Because whale hunting and subsistence use is, and will continue to be, a significant part of the Eskimo culture, it is recommended that S. 3161 continue to provide for the present relative low (15–25 bowhead whales) annual harvest.

Sec. 109. This Section authorizes the Secretary to adopt the laws and regulations of the respective states relating to protection and management of marine mammals which primarily inhabit waters or lands within the boundaries of a state. This is a positive, logical approach to marine mammal management. We feel confident that Alaska's laws and regulations are consistent with the policies and purposes of the Marine Mammal Protection Act, and that the Secretary would adopt our laws and regulations as provided in this Section.

That concludes our remarks, Mr. Chairman, and we wish to express our appreciation for this opportunity to address this Committee here in Alaska on an issue that is of vital importance to many Alaskans. Thank you.

STATEMENT OF JOHN SHIVELY, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR, RURAL ALASKA COMMUNITY ACTION PROGRAM, INC.

The sea mammal legislation which is presently pending in the U. S. Congress presents three major areas of concern as we see it. The first major area of concern would be legislation that would completely eliminate hunting of any sea mammals by placing a moratorium on such killing. The second major concern is the elimination of the arts and crafts industry even if subsistence hunting of sea mammals by Alaska Natives is permitted. The third major area of concern is the placing of a moratorium on the killing of bowhead whales under the endangered species act if subsistence hunting of nonendangered species is continued to be allowed. I will address each of these issues separately.

It is my understanding that a number of conservation groups and congressmen have proposed a complete moratorium on the killing of all sea mammals. We feel this is a totally unreasonable stand and completely uncalled for when the existing situation regarding sea mammals is considered. In Alaska, almost all species of sea mammals are increasing in number, according to the best available information. A possible exception to this would be the polar bear. If indeed there has to be sea mammal legislation, we favor management of the resources and not a total moratorium on killing. Regardless of what kind of legislation passes, we feel it is absolutely essential that the traditional hunting rights of the Alaska Indian, Aleut and Eskimo be protected.

House Bill 10420, as passed by the U.S. House of Representatives earlier this year, provides for a moratorium on the killing of all sea mammals but allows certain exceptions including the right of Alaska Natives to subsistence hunt. Whereas we support this concept, we do not feel that the legislation as presently written gives adequate protection to the Alaska Native. The bill would not allow Alaska Natives to hunt animals purely for use in arts and crafts. The major animal involved here would be the walrus, an undetermined number of which are shot each year for use in the arts and crafts industry. However, the walrus herd has been growing in Alaska and we feel that this kind of hunting has proven not to be detrimental to good management of these animals. We are in total support of an amendment that would protect the Alaska Natives' right to hunt sea mammals for use in traditional arts and crafts industries. Some people have suggested an amendment to the legislation that would allow continuation of the arts and crafts industry but prohibit sale of arts and crafts in interstate commerce. We feel this is not an adequate solution and might increase the number of animals taken rather than limit the kill. Generally, items sold out of state bring higher prices and elimination of this market would mean that Alaska Natives would have to kill more animals to make the same amount of money.

House Bill 10420 as presently written, might also bring an end to the hunting of the bowhead whale by Alaska Natives. The legislation as it is presently written would except any animal on the endangered species list from the subsistence hunting rights provided for in the bill. The bowhead whale is now on the endangered species list even though at this time we do not have a count as to the actual number of bowhead whales. A number of the experts with whom we have talked indicate that the herd is at least stabilized and some feel that it may be increasing. Almost every person with whom we have talked, and we surveyed practically every national authority on the bowhead whale, agreed that the subsistence hunting of bowhead whales would not significantly reduce the herd and should be allowed to continue. We would suggest that any sea mammal bill provide a section which would allow for the counting of the number of bowhead whale. This section would as we see it, permit Alaska Natives and wildlife management specialists to combine in an effort to count the whales. It would be a source of employment for Alaska Natives who have traditionally been very close to the bowhead whale. We also suggest a section that would allow for research to provide for more effective hunting techniques of the bowhead whale. There have been no significant improvements in whale hunting techniques since the early part of this century. Improved hunting techniques would reduce the loss which may take place when whales are hit but not captured.

In closing, I would like to stress very strongly that hunting of sea mammals is more than just a means for gathering food, although this in itself would be reason enough to allow continued subsistence hunting of sea mammals by Alaska Natives. The animals, particularly the bowhead whale, have a great cultural significance to the Natives of this state. Elimination of hunting of sea mammals would be a major step toward destroying the culture of the Alaska Native. A bill eliminating the hunting of sea mammals by Alaska Natives would have the same effect as the U. S. Cavalry, over-zealous missionaries and totally irrelevent education systems have had on the culture of the Alaska Native and American Indian in the past. The Alaska Native traditional hunting rights must be protected.

STATEMENT OF MORRIS THOMPSON, AREA DIRECTOR, BUREAU OF INDIAN AFFAIRS, JUNEAU, ALASKA

The seals, walrus and whales are to an Alaska Native what the buffalo was to the Plains Indians of 1860. For centuries the Eskimos and Aleuts have subs-

isted largely on sea mammals and fish. The white man came and commercialized the hunting of mammals which provided Native subsistence. He introduced technology in hunting. He fostered and encouraged a taste for new goods that often can be obtained only by barter or sale of skins and crafts for cash to purchase store goods.

At various times over the past 300 years, waves of commercial hunters from other parts of the world invaded the coastal waters of Alaska, killing and taking what they want of the marine life; then they leave. The Native people stay—and they survive—and their culture survives, at least it has up to this time.

Survival—the Natives of Alaska are used to fighting for it—their history and culture are complete and tell the stroy of survival. Now Native cultures are not only surviving, they are flourishing. They have found a strong voice in the Native associations, and the Native Claims Settlement Act is a reality. A new day is dawning! Education programs encourage Native people to speak their own language and be proud of their culture. Eskimo language is being taught in the schools. Classes are teaching youngsters the arts and crafts of their ancestors. Skin sewing is taught, using sea mammal hides to make mukluks, parkas, mittens, dolls and other skin-sewn items. People skilled in these arts and crafts teach children Native history and pride in their culture.

There has been a real cultural renaissance by communities encouraging and taking dance groups, craftsmen and storytellers. Ceremonies and feasts relating to the whale and walrus hunt are very much a part of the culture of the coastal people. These activities instill pride and a sense of dignity. Older people, who may have been considered ignorant and non-productive in the past, are now important members of the community because they know the old ways and show younger people how to keep traditions alive.

Paralleling this upsurge in Native culture and pride are dramatic changes in life style. It is in a state of rapid transition. As Americans, Alaska Natives are pulled along by the mainstream of American culture. The American way of life introduced a money economy where time and future plans are important. Guns, motor boats, radios, movies, phonographs, food purchased at the store, clothes ordered from the catalog, education, vocational training for a variety of jobs, the 8-hour work day and travel to far-off places are commonplace. Dogteams are vanishing, replaced by snow travelers. Soon everyone will have a television. Electricity has replaced the seal oil lamp. Fuel oil has done away with the driftwood and blubber fires.

All of these essential goods and services cost money. How do people living in a small, rural Native village, where there is no industry other than subsistence hunting and the making of arts and crafts for sale, earn their money? For example, let us take a village of 300 people with 50 households.

There may be steady year-round jobs for 10 men, and eight to 10 jobs for women. Twenty to 25 men may be employed seasonally. They leave the village for three to six months to fish, work in canneries, fight fires or work on construction. That leaves 10 to 15 men, heads of households with no other means of livelihood except subsistence hunting. This can mean that 150 people, or at least one-half of the village, is dependent on subsistence hunting for food, and arts and crafts to sell or exchange for necessary store items, with no other means of existence available except welfare. Usually, the men with steady year-round jobs supplement their income by hunting, too. You simply cannot live in the rural areas of Alaska on an average income of less than $10,000 to $15,000, work at an 8-hour job, eat out of the store, and wear ready-made clothes. It costs too much! Fresh meat is not available in the stores and who can eat canned cornbeef and spam as a steady diet? The seasonal workers must also hunt to make ends meet. Survival, existence, and food on the table, demand it.

Other important factors are in favor of subsistence hunting and culture and tradition. For centuries the people living along the coast of Alaska have made their living from the sea. In the past, every bit of a sea mammal caught was used. Skins were used for clothing, boots, flooring, tents and boats. Animal fats were used for fuel and light; ivory and bones were used for tools and hunting weapons, for frames to build boats and houses, and for decoration. Sinew was made into thread; special tanning methods were used to make intestines and stomach lining into raingear; and, finally, the meat and muktuk were eaten.

Today we Americans are suddenly very interested in conservation. Conservation means to use, but not waste or destroy. The Natives of Alaska have been conservation-minded for centuries. Hunting for ocean mammals on the open sea in small boats is an arduous and dangerous occupation; hunting on the ice pack is equally dangerous. When the hunter does kill an animal, it is utilized to the fullest; nothing is wasted. Take for instance now today in those villages that hunt whales. The meat and muktuk from the whale are eaten. Surpluses are stored in underground caches that keep the meat frozen to be used throughout the year. The blubber is rendered to make oil which is used for cooking, seasoning and as a preservative for berries, greens and meat. What is not fully utilized in one village, may be sold or given to Native people in another village. Sea mammal food is healthful, nutritious and good tasting, and usually the only fresh meat available in Alaskan coastal towns.

Today we Americans are very health-minded. We want all Americans to be healthy. In the past, the Native Americans of Alaska have suffered from killing epidemics of smallpox, venereal diseases, flue, and tuberculosis, all introduced by the non-Native. What will happen next if ocean hunting is outlawed or unduly restricted.

How does the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act relate to this subject? The Act is a future-oriented piece of legislation. In 18 months, enrollment will be complete; two years from now every Alaska Native may receive a small per capita payment of $500.00. In five years the land selections may be resolved; in 10 or more years the regional corporations may pay dividends. Basic to the Claims Settlement Act is LAND; the Marine Mammal Protection Act revolves around ocean—life. The Settlement Act may help insure a better future for the Native people of Alaska, but now, right now the Marine Mammal Act is endangering the life, economy, and culture of these people.

Have things changed so much from the past? No. The men still hunt to feed their families; the women still make parkas and mukluks and sew walrus skins together to cover the whale and walrus umiaks. A market for hand-made fur clothing, ivory carving and other Native-made items has been developed and well it should. The clothing is warm, and useful anywhere in the Arctic climate. The arts and crafts tell the culture—the beauty, imagination and spirit of a people can be seen in these works.

Today Americans are interested in culture, especially minority cultures. We are proud that our nation is made up of many diverse groups. People throughout the world are curious and interested in the Native culture of Alaska. They are interested in a way of life that is an integral part of its natural setting, surviving for thousands of years. If this culture is to continue, if a way of life that is challenged is to flourish, then it is mandatory and necessary that sea mammal hunting be allowed, as it is basic to survival for both a people and their way of life.

Introduced: April 17, 1972.

BOARD OF DIRECTORS RESOLUTION #2—72

RESOLUTION CONCERNING THE SEA MAMMAL ACT

Whereas, the Alaskan Natives have hunted and utilized the Sea Mammals for eons and has kept the balance of nature in check; and

Whereas, the cost of living in Alaska is high and the annual wage of the Alaskan Natives in the villages is very low; and

Whereas, the people who proposed the Sea Mammals Act do not know our way of life and if this bill is passed it would destory the life style of the majority of Alaska Natives; and

Whereas, the sea mammals used by the Alaska Natives contribute significantly to the diet of the Alaska Natives; therefore be it

Resolved that the United States House of Representatives and the United States Senate modify the Sea Mammal Act to allow the Alaska Natives to utilize sea mammals the existing subsistence patterns.

Adopted in Bethel, Alaska on the 17th day of April, 1972.

PHILLIP GUY,
President, Yukon Kuskokwim Health Corp.

Senator Gravel and Senator Stevens, fellow Village representatives representing the Village of Shishmaref, it is an honor for me to testify on the mammal bill hearing.

As you all know Shishmaref is located on the north coast of Seward Peninsula and on an Island.

As a year progresses, we hunt various kinds of sea animals for our own use first and if we have any extra we sell it to other native people in Northwestern Alaska. In last part of May and the whole month of June we hunt the oogruk, which is known as the bearded seal. The meat is dried and preserved in its oil for summer, fall and winter use, we eat the dried meat every day during the winter months. We cannot go without this oil. As adults we have to eat it once or twice a day. We also hunt seals in the spring and the fall time. We very seldom hunt seal during winter months. The seal skin is used various ways. When we have lots of north wind after ice break up, we have good chance of walrus hunting. When south wind blow all the time after ice break up, we con't get any walrus at all. Last year was good season for walrus hunting of Shishmaref.

The meat of the walrus and skin with blubber is cooked and preserved in oil for winter use. We also store some under ground and dry it and eat it. It is known Eskimo delicacy. Tusk of walrus is carried and exchanged at the two stores for everyday needs.

We started an Arts & Crafts Coop with a loan from SBA 24,000.00 in 1970. Soon we have to repay that loan of 20,000.00 dollars. Seal skins dried sold to local stores and sent to Seattle. Bleached and dyed red is in big demand throughout Northwest Alaska. Oogruk bottoms are also in big demand dyed red, bleached white or black soles. Dried oogruk meat in big demand all over Alaska.

Price of motor gas sell for $48.50 a barrel. Stove oil sells for $25.00.

Spring skins are used for pokes. We use these pikes to preserve dried oogruk meat in its own oil. This keeps the meet fresh in the dry storage. Fall and winter skins are also used in various ways. Seal skins are aged in blubber until the hair peels off. Then it is dyed red. The bleached and red skins are used for mukluk straps and strings. They are also used for dyed top base. The oogruk skins are dried and are used for mukluk bottoms or soles. They can also be bleached white and dyed red and are also used for mukluk soles.

Spotted seals we hunt mostly in the fall since the skins are in their prime stage at that itme. The skins are used for mukluks, slippers jackets and mittens. The sommon seal skins are also used for the items I just mentioned. Walrus we hunt only to Spring time. That is if they come by our area.

STATEMENT OF DAVIS MENADELOOK, REPRESENTATIVE FOR DIOMEDE, ALASKA

We the people of Diomede are very much opposed to the coming Bill to ban the killing of the sea mammals other than for subsistence only. If this Bill is passed the people of Diomede with the other Eskimos who live along the coast of Alaska will be hard put both in cash and our cultural heritage.

If we are unable to sell any of the products produced from the sea mammals the natives of Diomede will suffer for we rely on these animals of the sea to make our living. Also the cultural heritage will be lost which has been handed down through the ages. We rely especially on the skins of the seal and the sales of the carved ivory from the walrus for our cash income for we have no other means. There are only selected few who work at the Island for the BIA.

The average kill annually for the walrus is approximately 300 to 350 each year. And the average for the seals is about 100 to 150 each year. From these kill we use the skin of the walrus to put skin on our boats and also the skin is cooked and stored. The meat is dried and stored, the tusks are carved and is used also for hunting equipments, the bones are use for the same purpose.

From the seals, muckluks are made, raw-hide, and hunting cloths. Some of the skins are sold. From these mammals rain proof clothing are made. The clothing made from these are unsurpassable for warmth and wear. Many Eskimos rely on the sales of these products for their income. There are no other means at Diomede to make our living as you would find at the mainland, we have no other resourses. The sales from these mammals are not only to the tourist but, to other natives. Our store at the Island would not not operate if there were no carving to sell. We would not the means to buy the staples we rely so much on now.

If this Bill is passed, what little income we get will be stopped and we will forced to go on welfare or move to bigger towns where the temptations will force him down more deeply into the state of very lowly living. The only way for the coastal Eskimos and his family to support himself is to make full use of the sea mammals he kills. The only animal which through the years has been his main stay.

It is true that in the coarse of two years we will get settlement from the land claims but in the mean time how is the Eskimo live, who for years has relied on the sea mammals for his income? The compensation from the land-claims will not be enough to pay for his lose of occupation as ivory carver and skin sewer. This land clain settlement is not designed to give him jobs, it will only mean the loss of his cultural heritage he is so proud of. If this bill is passed we will not kill these animals of the seas for cammercial ventures. It will only mean that we will go on welfare for existence. The total income of the Village of Diomede is only $24,000.00 annually. Breaking that down to the 85 residents of Diomede it would only mean about $252.00 per person, which compared to a single white collared workers annual income. This we have live with to the best of our ability. We have to make the most of what we can from the catch of the sea mammals. To pass the bill would have disastrous results for our people.

Although many of our people have turned to modern ways the older generation will not attune to modern ways as easily as the younger set. For the older generation the cultural heritage is too deeply set in. With the passage of the Bill we the natives of Alaska will lose our sense of dignity, heritage and occupation.

We hold great faith in our Senators of Alaska to see that this Bill is not pass and I am sure I speak for all coastal Eskimos who rely on the sea mammals for existence.

Thank you

A Petition by the Eskimo Students of William E. Beltz High School
Nome, Alaska

To: The Congress of the United States.
Re: Marine Mammal Protection Act (now pending).

We, the students of Beltz Regional High School, believe that you should reconsider your position in regard to the Marine Mammal Protection Bill, specifically in those areas in which this bill concerns Native Alaskans. It has been a vital part of our culture for several thousand years to hunt sea mammals and to make efficient use of the products of the hunt. These animals have sustained us throughout our history. We are encouraged that this ancient subsistence cycle has not been terminated by this legislation. However, the products of the hunt, in addition to their obvious subsistence value, have also played a traditional and continuing role in Native commerce.

We are confused with the language of the bill as it relates to our way of life and to the ecology of our Arctic environment. It would appear that the bill is not sufficiently sensitive to either of these elements.

We recognize the fact that we must address ourselves to vast territorial responsibilities. Our Native culture is dependent upon the maintenance of unique conditions existing between the individual and his total environment. The fact that we are dependent upon the quality of the environment is similarly recognized. We are, however, struck by the amazing difference in environmental conditions exising between Northwestern Alaska, our home, and the remainder of the United States. Unchecked water pollution in the "Lower 48", to cite but one example, is responsible for the destruction of wildlife and the deterioration of the quality of life for most citizens. We believe that the particular marine mammals upon which we subsist have been maintained at healthy population levels. The bill being questioned, though directed toward the maintenance of these animals, advocates the closure of Native industries, an economic element upon which we are dependent during this time of transition. The fact that you and your associates have been slow in closing down industries in other parts of this country which have been proven to be highly destructive to the environment and quality of life and so decisive in your actions to terminate our traditional industries seems to indicate that you are insensitive to our needs as human beings and to the realities of life in the Arctic.

We have become quite aware of the political reality that we are "little people" compared to the power of various industrial interests elsewhere in this country. Have we, in fact, become a convenient and supposedly defenseless target for so-called responsible environmental legislation? The legislation now pending is most responsible in its basic structure and intent; yet you are threatening a portion of our lives which we believe need not be threatened. Your consideration would be most appreciated.

(90 signatures.)

STATEMENT OF ALLEN D. ALOWA OF SAVOONGA, ST. LAWRENCE ISLAND, ALASKA

Mr. Chairman and members of the Senate Commerce Subcommittee, my name is Allen D. Alowa from the village of Savoonga on the St. Lawrence Island off the West coast of Alaska. I am here in Washington, D.C. at the request of the people of St. Lawrence Island and particularly the villages of Gambell, Savoonga and Northeast Cape.

It is not by my wish that I am here, for I should be at home making preparations to insure that my children will be fed and warm the next winter. But even as my people prepare now to venture into the dangers of the Bering Sea to work for their only livelihood, there is activity in this Congress to take away the only living we know: the use of sea mammals for our food and our only means of trade.

The Eskimos of the St. Lawrence Island were shocked, as indeed all Alaska was, to find that the House of Representatives had passed a law prohibiting the use of sea mammals by the Eskimo people, except for what it terms subsistence; that is to say then, that if indeed we should chance to take a walrus, the bill prohibits our ever using the tusks and skins to make our arts and crafts. We would be forced to destroy those things which now bring us a living, however meager that may to you. We say that all too much of this kind of insensative activity is taking place here in the East by people who know nothing of our Eskimo people and our culture, much less our dependance upon the sea and nature's own conservation in our waters.

Mr. Chairman and Senators, my people have asked me to plead with you, to make you understand what we face in my home island, if you also agree with your colleagues in the House and pass a law with such limitations.

Mr. Chairman, the St. Lawrence Island is not the ideal place to live as American ideals go. It is an island some 104 miles long and twenty miles wide. It is over one hundred miles away from mainland Alaska and forty miles from Siberia in the frigid, ever windswept Bering Sea. There is precipitation three hundred days out of the year, the average temperature is twenty degrees above zero and it is almost always blowing, much of the time, very hard. Even for the Eskimo it is hard living; but nevertheless, it is home— and as some put it, it is wherew "God" placed us. Life is hard. Life is constant activity—not sports, not vacations, not dining and dancing, but hard work to maintain life —for one day of relaxation could mean starvation for a family.

We cannot afford the luxury of sitting at home and watching television so that we too could flood your rooms with letters because a camera has shown us the violent death of an animal, or in our case a sea mammal. Without watching television we know violent death, not of animals but of ourselves as we daily strive to just maintain the life of our people. All meat bearing foods which American place on their tables every day comes from animals, yes animals. Killed one way or another. We too kill animals and sea mammals because some how that's how it was meant to be—for it is our food and our livelihood. We don't waste for pleasure or for any other reason. We do not waste at all—our men die yearly trying to bring every bit of the sea mammal home to be used in some way in our life. To waste is to die.

And yet I read with dismay and heartbreak the report by Mr. Garmatz of the House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries in a report on the Marine Mammal Protection Act of 1971, (H.R. 10420) that Eskimos shoot "indiscriminately" at Walrus and bring home only the floaters. He further states that the real reason for shooting walrus is for the use of the ivory tusks. He states that rather than eating the walrus meat, Eskimos had fed the meat to the sled dogs, which have now been replaced by the snowmobile.

Mr. Chairman, I invite Mr. Garmatz or any other such thinking one-day tourist to live with my people on St. Lawrence Island for one year. Let him

leave his American Express card home and let him be poor, and let him be hungry so that no matter how afraid he may be of drowning or being killed by the elements, he must venture forth each day and each week to bring food home for his family and himself. And yes, let him bring his family too. We are not just men in Alaska, we are women and children. We have no less love for our family than the average American. If there is nothing else to life for others, for us it is to be allowed to exist and that to us is precious. Nature provided us that right with the food that comes to us on the St. Lawrence Island year after year.

But we are discovering that the experts are not those who have lived with and depended upon these mammals for centuries; the experts are those who have never seen our lands much less our lives and our homes for even a brief period of time. These wild statements about Eskimo waste of the mammal is prefaced in the report by this statement: "U.S. Knowledge and Research programs devoted to the rest of the seals including the sea lions and the walruses, is tiny". And so the Eskimos will be deprived of their livelihood and the scientists will receive their grants to study the mammal.

If we indeed do not live on the walrus now, then what are we living on? Beef, ham, and pork? Even rural Americans are concerned about the high prices of these foods. What few staples we buy are purchased at a dear price, not with mere barter, but with hard earned American dollars. One can of corned beef hash costs 70¢. A five pound box of Pilot Bread, a large round cracker which we use with our canned and native meats, runs $1.50. For the children, one can of evaporated milk is 50¢ and for the hunter who needs sugar on the sea, ten pounds of sugar is $1.75.

Let me tell you about Walrus hunts and how we supposedly waste our food products. Just about this time of year, the storms from the south begin to pound our island and the men of our villages stand-by with their skin boats for the smallest break in the weather. The warmer winds from the south break the ice from our shores and drive them north for tens of miles. The hunters, every able man in the village, then leave in skin boats 27 to 30 feet long and about six feet wide, on a twenty to forty mile ride out to sea to get their food, lhe Walrus and seal. The boats have crews of 5 or 6 men. We use outboards on our skin boats. They range from 25 to 40 horsepower. We have to buy our gas, at least enough to get us to the ice floes and back with our food. *Gas costs us 78¢ a gallon.*

When we reach our hunting area, we take only what each crew can safely handle and can safely transport back to the island. NOT A THING is wasted. The Eskimo uses every bit of the Walrus and transports all of his catch back to home. We must pay at least $5.00 for a box of shells, and they often run as high as $10.00—when every bit of Eskimo earned dollars are being expended for the hunt, you can be sure we do not shoot indiscriminately.

If there is as much as one walrus per hunter taken, both in the skin boat and in tow, you can be sure that a trip is not very swift. It often takes more than seven hours on the open frigid sea to bring the catch home. A lot of gasoline is used. If a storm should develop during this time, however mild, the crews are usually lost.

It is not sport, it is not pleasure that drives us to leave our homes and our loved ones; it is survival. Because we depend on the animal and sea mammal, we do not waste it.

When we reach our island, the crew members and family take part in the preparation of the catch. It is divided among the crew, first in meat and then in hide and ivory. Because if the ivory and hide are not made into beautiful objects that people on the mainland will buy—there will be no money to buy gas and ammunition for the next hunt. If there is not another hunt—there is no food. And though others may disapprove and wrinkle their noses, this is a food we enjoy.

Just because one hunts doesn't mean one brings something home to the table. So we must hunt all the time—and if not hunting then trapping. And as tired as we may be when we come home each day, there is still the ivory to carve or the skin to sew, because these bring cash and cash buys us the few staples that people claim have replaced walrus and seal in our diet.

The amount of cash my people make is not much. We consider ourselves lucky if we make over $3,000 in one year—gross money. It all has to come from a talent many of us have—the creation of art objects from the same animal that we have been blessed with as our food. There is no other income through jobs.

Out of that $3,000, we need to buy fuel oil and coal to get some warmth. There are no trees on St. Lawrence Island, just tundra, and the wind blows almost all the time. We are fortunate that driftwood collects on our shores in summer. The entire family collects wood all summer long for winter fuel. Fuel oil, Senators, costs us $2.50 for five gallons . . . and it lasts only a day and a half. Others use coal stoves for both cooking and heating because they can use wood with it. A 100 pound sack of coal costs *ten dollars* and a sack lasts only one day!

Did someone say we feed Walrus to our dogs and eat something else that we perhaps bought with cash? Did someone say we kill the sea mammals just for the ivory because ivory makes us a wealthy, happy people.

I say Mr. Chairman and respected Senators that we have been misrepresented, and shamefully so. We are not in Alaska for America to gawk at or play with, nor to be ploys of conservationists. We know better than any proclaimed conservationist what it means to conserve that which you depend upon. We're not a documentary to be talked about, we're for real. We live this life I have described. We love our Alaska. We live there, and too often we die very young there. But it is home. It feeds us.

Mr. Chairman and Senators, we cannot do any better than to try in this humble way to convince you of our heart-felt fears.

You live in a complicated world where many problems face you every day and you must make decisions. Our world is simple but life is difficult. But it is a life we know and one we respect.

If you pass a law prohibiting us from using the sea mammals as we have done for centuries and deprive us of the only income we have, you may never hear the mourning of my people as their life is taken from them. What shall you send us in replacement of a life we have known for hundreds of years—social workers and drugs to dull our days?

Or will you find some love in your hearts for my people just as you have for the animals and the sea mammals, and let us who live so near to nature and its temper, determine how we will live in balance. How much more evidence do you need than the hundreds of years we've made it work.

Honorable Senators, we are thankful for your time and your attention. We cannot tell you what to do. We can only tell you who we are. There are no charities to save us but ourselves, and the integrity of the United States.

To: Senate Commerce Committee.
From: John D. Van Winkle, Anchorage, Alaska.
Re: Ocean Mammals Bill.
State of Alaska
Third Judicial District, SS.

John D. Van Winkle, who resides at 1100 West 32nd Ave., Anchorage, Alaska 99503, being duly sworn, on oath states:

From September of 1969 to September of 1970 I served as the Vista Lawyer in Kotzebue, Alaska, and surrounding 11 villages (in the Point Hope-Kobuk-Deering triangle). During this period I had an opportunity to personally observe the intimate relationship that exists between the sea mammals of the area and the native (eskimo) Alaskans.

Both coastal and interior inhabitants derived a substantial portion of their food base, and to a lesser but still significant part their economic base, from the use of sea mammals.

Seals of many species; both black (right and bowhead) and white (beluga) whale, walrus, and polar bear (to a limited degree) provide food for the natives of this area. Seal are of particular importance to all concerned: Seal oil is as common a denominator as salt and pepper. The meat diet of the natives of this area consisted basically of caribou, fish, and sea mammals.

Although the extent of dependence varied from village to village, I believe it could be safely stated that sea mammals accounted for a minimum of 20% of the overall meat diet (this figure would be much higher for the coastal villages.)

The total integration of these mammals into the economy is so great that it is impossible to safely generalize. One can quickly focus on ivory carving, tourist trinkets, and guided hunts—but I consider the tourist and guided hunt aspects to be superficial considerations. There are more basic aspects involved. As indicated, the meat from these animals is vital; it is so vital that it is a

marketable commodity which is bought and sold, both through barter and cash transactions (e.g., trading caribou for seal—not an uncommon transaction between coastal and interior villages). Likewise, sea mammal by-products are tradable items, necessary as mukluk bottoms, rawhide, pokes, boat covers, and so forth. Everyone in the villages has a need for these items.

In addition I submit that Congress would do well to also consider nonmaterial considerations, such as native art and culture, which are an intrinsic part of what will be destroyed if the present bill be adopted.

I believe that the best interest of both the present and the future would be better served by adopting an amended form of the Sea Mammal Bill which would allow native Alaskans to continue to harvest sea mammals on a subsistence level and this I urge Alaska's Senators and Congressmen to support, and the Congress as a whole, to adopt such a law.

Respectfully submitted,

JOHN D. VAN WINKLE

Subscribed and sworn to me this 8th day of May, 1972.

[SEAL]

GAIL M. LEVESQUE,
Notary Public.

RESOLUTION OF ALASKA RURAL DEVELOPMENT COUNCIL

RESOLUTION CONCERNING PROTECTION AND USE OF MARINE MAMMALS

The members of the Alaska Rural Development Council, being representative of the Federal and State agencies and organizations concerned with improvement of the conditions of rural life in Alaska, are opposed to passage of House Bill 10420, in its present form, and any similar totally restrictive bills in the Senate regarding protection of marine mammals. Our primary opposition is to Section 107(a)(3); that such taking of marine mammals for subsistence purposes by Indian, Aleut, or Eskimo peoples "is not done for purposes of direct or indirect commercial sale".

First, we feel that this bill, which will have a major impact on a large part of the population of Alaska, should at least be subject to public hearings in rural and metropolitan areas of Alaska before being considered. Second, if this bill becomes law it immediately destroys the Native arts and crafts cottage-industry as it apparently precludes the sales of any parts of the sea mammals, or any items made from the tanned skins, or objects of art carved from the tusks or teeth. The cultures of these coastal Native peoples are firmly based on the full utilization of the sea mammals. To impose the dominant society's cultural norm of waste of a valuable resource is not only counter to their cultural beliefs, but is also contrary to present U.S. policy on waste pollution.

In addition, this arts and crafts trade is, in many villages, a major source of cash income for the village. Contrary to popular opinion, passage of the Alaska Native Land Claims Settlement Act will not solve the financial problems of these people for the near future. There is no money available to the Native people from this Act for the first two years, and total disbursements of cash over the first five years are estimated at $550 per person. The lands allotted under this Act have value only for subsistence use for a long time to come, as it has been estimated that it will take about 25 years to complete the surveying on the 40 million acres at the present level of funding. So it can be seen, that to destroy this Native arts and crafts industry by legislative fiat is to condemn these peoples to a poverty and welfare existence within an inflated cash economy. We, therefore, strongly urge the Marine Mammals Bill not be considered for passage until public hearings are held in Alaska, and until the bill is amended to allow the continuance of the Native arts and crafts industry.

PETITION FROM THE CITY OF TOGIAK

We, the people of Togiak, hereby, petition that the Sea Mammal Bill by Senator Harris of Oklahoma be repealed for the following reasons:

1. For years people have depended on sea-mammals for food, clothing, subsistence, etc. . . .

2. For years people have depended on the fur, ivory, and seal intestines for handicrafts which is their main means of support.

3. For years people have depended on the sea-mammals oil, especially, seal's for dressing, "akutaq", and medicine.

4. The people have used the sea-mammals without wasting any consumable part, however, the Caucasians from outside, quite frequently, have come, killed and taken only whatever is of value and wasted the carcass.

(125 signatures.)

STATEMENT OF FRANCES JOHNSON

I am the representative of the Board of Directors of the Northwest Skinsewers, and serve as its vice-president. Our organization has been in operation since 1969. We wish to provide information about the way Eskimos use every portion of the seals, walrus, an whales. From this you can see how dependent we are upon them, and how much they are a part of our daily life and our ways. It also shows how important they are to the way we can make a little money.

HARBOR, RING, AND SPOTTED SEAL:

Skins (Native tanned or commercially tanned): slippers, parkas, vests, gloves, mittens, hats, curios, rope, rawhide for snow-shoes, thongs, lacing, and string.

Blubber (Seal oil): Blubber is slowly rendered from the fatty layer through a natural process. Preservation and storage of winter greens, meat, and fish medicine—vitamin supplement and a cathartic used as accompaniment for every meal with meat or fish used as a base for deserts like aghutuk (Eskimo ice-cream) made with berries, meats, or fish—to waterproof both commercially made and Native-made boots for light in lamps—for heat for the home and for cooking (also in lamps).

Meat: The meat is eaten—boiled, dried, and half-dried. When stored away in cans or barrels it will keep meat a long time. In seal oil, the meat will keep a long time.

Intestines (two uses): When dried or fresh, it is eaten as a delicacy.

Flippers: When properly processed, eaten as a delicacy.

OOGRUK (BEARDED SEAL)

Skin: Mukluk soles, kayak and omiak covers, and leather. Young oogruk: Jackets, hats, rugs, purses, light leather, and strong string for omiak construction and repair.

Blubber: Exactly the same as listed above for other seals.

Meat: This meat is different from the meat of smaller seals. It can be eaten everyday without becoming tiresome. The animal lives on shell-fish, and meat is not fishy tasting.

Intestines: Small intestines are eaten; the large intestine is used to construct the rain parka or waterproof clothing.

Flipper: A delicacy as with the smaller seals.

WALRUS

Skin: Used to cover boats, kayaks, and omiak. When processed, "gouk" is a delicacy made from the skin.

Meat: Eaten dried or fresh, it lends itself to many recipes used for beef. The Unversity of Alaska distributes booklets including instructions for such dishes as corned walrus.

Tusks (Ivory): Used in arts and crafts to increase income, also used for sled runners and fish-hooks and other hunting implements.

Stomach: Used to cover the Eskimo drums.

WHALE

Skin: This is the delicacy called muktuk. It can be eaten dried, cooked, or fresh, as well as at a later time after being preserved in oil.

Meat: This is dried, stored in barrels in meat cellars, or frozen.

Sinew: Used for threat to sew various skins.

Intestines: Used to make waterproof parkas and other clothes. Stomach is used as a container to store foods.

I hope this will help people to understand that we need the sea-mammals in order to feed and clothe ourselves. There is nothing that can substitute for this right now. I think it will be a long time before there will be anything that we can really afford to buy that will work as well.

STATEMENT OF FRANCES JOHNSON

We thank you for coming from Washington to Alaska to hear Eskimo people. My name is Frances Johnson. My husband's name is Albert Johnson. Whenever my husband can go he goes hunting on weekends. Hunters can't catch all the time. Just once in awhile we have good luck. That good luck is scarce too. Sometimes you can't hunt on account of weather. Bad weather nobody can hunt —even get out of house. Snow storm—winter time. Spring time ice go out quick because of wind. That is where seals usually be—with ice. Alaska gets pretty windy too and stormy. You better know that. My husband works for state highways six days a week. When it storms he works overtime and no weekends, that means no hunt. When he hunt he catch seal. Maybe. Just once in awhile. We make use of every part of seal and blubber. And we make use of skin for mukluks and slippers. When we get real hungry we get our food at thd store when we can't catch. We like white and Eskimo food. Both good if you are raised on them. Sometimes we sell mukluks and water boots. Sometimes we sell mukluks and slippers to white people when they want to have a pair. What we were raised on is stuff that we can't very well change.

AFFIDAVIT

State of Alaska
Second District,SS.

May Williams, being first duly sworn, deposes and says:

1. That I am employed by the Alaska Federation of Natives as a Food Educator;

2. That sea mammals taken by the residents of Northwest Alaska are an important nutritional aid to their diets; that oil from said sea mammals and the meat therefrom are rich in protein, iron and vitamin A;

3. That the people of the inland villages, as well as the coastal villages rely on the oil and dried meat of sea mammals to provide them an adequate diet; that the only way the people in inland villages get said oil and dried meat is by purchasing or trading for it with the people of coastal villages;

4. That without the availability of cheap sea mammal products the diets of many inhabitants of the inland villages would be seriously lacking in important nutrients, especially in times of scare availability of other game;

5. That therefore, it is imperative, from a nutritional standpoint, that the trade in sea mammal products between the coastal and inland villages be allowed to continue.

MAY WILLIAMS

Subscribed and sworn to before me this 9th day of May 1972, at Kotzebue, Alaska.

[SEAL]

KATHLEEN M. LOCY,
Notary Public.

AFFIDAVIT

State of Alaska
Second District, SS.

I, Robert Newlin, being first duly sworn, depose and say:

1. That I am a resident of Noorvik, Alaska, a native village approximately 60 miles east of Kotzebue; that I have lived most of my life in Noorvik; that I am 48 years of age and am an Eskimo of Alaska and President of the Northwest Alaska Native Association;

2. That all the residents of Noorvik eat the oil rendered from sea mammals as regularly as they are able; that said sea mammal oil has been eaten by all the residents of Noorvik since birth; that said sea mammal oil is eaten with virtually all foods consumed by the residents of Noorvik, including berries; that, therefore, sea mammal oil is the most important part of the diet of the residents of Noorvik;

3. That sea mammal oil is available to the residents of Noorvik only by means of trade or purchase from the residents of villages on the coast;

4. That to make it illegal for the residents of Noorvik to obtain sea mammal oil would be like making it illegal for white Americans to obtain bread;

5. That the people of Noorvik utilize the skin of the bearded seal (oogruk) obtained from the people of the coastal villages in the manufacture of articles

of clothing necessary in winter; that to eliminate this source of clothing would work a great hardship on the people of Noorvik.

ROBERT NEWLIN.

Subscribed and sworn to before me this 9th day of May, 1972, at Kotzebue, Alaska.

KATHLEEN M. LACY,
Notary Public.

STATEMENT OF IRENE OTTON

We thank you for coming to hear us here in Alaska. I am Irene Otton. I am from Koyuk originally. I am married and my husband's name is David Otton. My husband hunts every year. He hunts weekends and work weeks. He hunts mostly in April and May. He gets oogruk and seal and white whale in summer time. We give away most of the meat to relatives and friends who are in need of meat. We also eat it ourselves. We eat it all year. We make Eskimo ice cream out of berries and seal oil. We also eat the seal oil with greens. Real Eskimo food. Also used with dried fish. We sell seal meat to stores. Most village stores do not have fresh white man's meat. We need our native foods. Can foods are not good for a long time. My husband sells meat from seal and oogruk to get gas and shells and groceries such as vegetables and fruit and flour. My boy, David, Jr., carves ivory. He sells his carvings in Anchorage. He wants to keep carving. It is hard to get ivory from town now as it is expensive. My boy helps my husband seal hunt. We use seal skins. We give them to relatives and sell them to stores who tan and sell them to other Eskimos who need tanned hides. We Eskimo people can't go without seal meat same as white man can't go without potatoes and flour. I have many friends who sew skins to make mukluks. Some people sell mukluks and slippers to tourists. They use the money from selling to get groceries. They buy mostly fruit and vegetables that we can't get here. Should we not be able to get our native foods it would rob native dignity and way of living. God gave those foods to us. Alaska is for Eskimo. Alaska sea mammals are for Eskimo.

STATEMENT OF AGNES KOGMAKHUK

We thank you for coming to hear Eskimo people here in Alaska. I am from White Mountain. I live in Nome now for 16 years. We came here just for work. We use to seal hunt on Golovin a long time ago. We use to sell skins and use meat as dog foods. We eat it too. We still eat seal meat, oogruk is best. We can't eat too much white man's food; only when we have nothing else. Eat mostly native foods. Seal oil is also a good thing to preserve food. My husband is not too well now. We have to buy seal meat from store. We buy walrus and muktuk also. We buy these because we want to eat it. Seal oil is good for fried fish. Good for dipping foods in. I make mukluks once in awhile. My husband gets skins. Use seal for top and oogruk for bottom. Sometime I sell mukluks. Sell to white people who come from somewhere else, tourists and other white men. My husband carves fishing hooks from walrus tusks and he gives them to his friends. We keep anything eatable that we can catch up here for food. We catch some seal and oogruk in fall in the river when they go up. Only time we inland people can get these foods ourselves. It would be real hard if we could not get seal meat in store. We want to eat Eskimo food. Eskimo food better for us anyway. We were born here in Alaska and this is food God made for us. We eat everything here, animals, greens and roots.

AFFIDAVIT

Second District, SS.

I, Dick A. Curtis, being first duly sworn, depose and say:

1. That I am 52 years old and have lived in Northwest Alaska all my life, except for four years in the U.S. Army; that I am an Eskimo;

2. That I am president of Kotzebue Area Fisheries, Co-op in Kotzebue, State of Alaska

3. That the Kotzebue Area Fisheries Co-op was formed in 1968 in order to provide the residents of the Kotzebue area a means of improving their living conditions both economically and otherwise;

4. That the people of the Northwest Alaska area have, for time immemorial, as perhaps the most important part of their diet, used the oil of sea mammals; that trade has gone on between the coastal and inland villages based on the desire of the inland people for sea mammal oil and the desire of the people on the coast for furs and other products produced inland, thereby aiding the economy of both coastal and inland villages:

5. That the Kotzebue Area Fisheries Co-op has recently begun a service whereby the co-op acts as a clearing house to facilitate the bringing of sea mammal oil to the inland villages; thereby eliminating as much waste as possible; that this service would have to be eliminated if sale of sea mammal by-products is made illegal;

6. That the demand for sea mammal oil is relatively constant because of the peculiar taste and buyers are almost exclusively Alaskan Eskimos;

7. That sea mammal oil is such a staple of the diet of the Eskimos of Northwest Alaska that, even if the sale or trade of said oil is made illegal, it is my opinion that such trade would continue, despite its illegality, and the nature of illegal operations are such that the waste the Co-op has been striving to eliminate would increase; and

8. That to take sea mammal oil from the diet of the Eskimo would be the same as taking bread and butter from the diet of the white American.

DICK A. CURTIS.

Subscribed and sworn to before me this 9th day of May, 1972, at Kotzebue, Alaska.

KATHLEEN M. LOCY,
Notary Public.

STATEMENT OF EDITH SAGOONICK

I thank you for coming here to hear us. To hear the story from Eskimos. I live in Nome, Alaska, and I came here in 1960 from the Village of Koyuk. I am a widow. I get seal oil from my brother, David Otton, and I also get seal oil from the store. I get seal, walrus, oogruk, muktuk from the store. I also use seal oil just like medicine. I was raised with seal and I eat them all the time when I was young. Year around we had seal oil and seal poke. We eat seal in any ol way. We eat them in different ways. We dry them in seal oil. I buy seal skin for sewing and I also sell some of the things I sew. I make slippers. I take orders and sell to just my friends from here and in Anchorage. Most of my friends buy seal meat, oogruk, muktuk and meat from all sea mammals from the stores. These meats are sold mostly in native stores. My father long ago was hunter and my brother hunts now. My brother hunts seal, white whale in Koyuk in Northern Bay. I always get seal and seal oil every year. My seal oil last practically the whole winter. The seal oil and greens from willows are the best food for us Eskimos. When God created the whole world he created the seal for Eskimo, all the other sea mammals and fish too. If I could not buy seal meat other other meat like muktuk and oogruk it would be really tough as we are not use to white man's food and get tired of it real quick.

STATEMENT OF LYNN CHAMBERS

Although interstate commerce is important to today's arts and crafts, it is going to become even more important in the future as fine arts are developed in the villages of Alaska using as raw materials primarily whale bone. Community Enterprise Development Corporation of Anchorage, an OEO funded development agency, has employed Gabriel Gely, a well-noted French artist who spent 17 years in the Canadian Arctic assisting in the development of the fine art work that is now coming out of Northern Canada. He is now residing in Shishmaref working with the people and developing fine art work such as you see here. To sell these in the Alaskan market alone would be quite tragic. The people in Shishmaref and in future similar village projects would not receive the dollar value for these products that could be generated in the fine arts markets in both the "lower 48" and internationally.

The project in Shishmaref, if it proves successful after market testing planned for November on the east coast will be expanded to include as many other villages as we can find artists and funds to support. In developing fine arts, we must, at the same time, locate fine arts markets which are willing to pay the much higher prices that these kinds of pieces will demand.

The Alaskan market for fine arts is quite small. Alaska is a very small state when you consider size by population, and there are very few people here who will appreciate the esthetic value of these prices as well as be willing and able to pay the higher fine arts prices. We have had these prices evaluated by Alaskans and they have appraised them at 40 to 60 percent less than we anticipate receiving at the first showing in November.

I believe that the Alaskan market can be cultivated, but only after the value has been placed on these items in a fine arts market such as you find in an Francisco, New York, Georgetown, London, Paris, etc. It would be exceedingly difficult to start and stay in Alaska.

And in Gab Gely's words, "the only exportable commodity of many Alaskan villages is the creativety of the people within them." Let's not squelch the beginning of something with as much potential as this promises by closing off the market before we even get there."

Enclosure.

Seal

Parts of animal	*Purpose*
Skin	Poke. Tanned for mukluks, mittens, parkas, seal pants. Made into leather; bleached and dyed for strings and around the soles of mukluks. Rope.
Meat	Food; dried, put underground to freeze; or cooked.
Blubber	Seal oil in a poke or barrel.
Stomach	Food in Shishmaref. Some old people dry it and heat it or use it like gum. King Islanders boil it with blubber inside and eat it and freeze it.
Intestine	Shishmaref half dry and half raw. Kept in seal oil for food. King Islanders braid it with seal blubber and cook it for food.
Flippers	Food fresh, cooked, or put in seal oil.
Brains	Food—boil about half a day and eat it.
Blood	King Islanders use to waterproof mukluks by rubbing the leather side of skin with the blood.

Walrus

Parts of animal	*Purpose*
Tusk and teeth	Craft work.
Hide	Skin boats, rope, blanket toss, blankets, and food.
Meat	Dried or cooked for food and dog feed.
Intestine	Clothes and food.
Flippers	Food.
Stomach	Food container and skin drums.
Jawbone	Harpoon weight at King Island and as a fish net sinker at Shishmaref.
Bone	Used in making fire (with wood used like charcoal) at King Island.
Blubber	Eaten with meats.
Oosuk	Craft work.
Baby walrus is used for	Food, ropes, and mukluk soles.

Oogruk

Parts of animal	*Purpose*
Skin	Mukluk soles, kayaks, skin boats, rope.
Meat	Main source of winter food and is used by the King Islanders for food.
Intestine	Rain gear.
Blubber	Oil, food.
Flippers	Delicacy food by people in Shishmaref and used for making toys by the King Islanders.
Bladder	Water or oil containers.
Blood	Waterproofer in the spring.
Bones	Making toys.

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
SUBCOMMITTEE OF OCEANS AND ATMOSPHERE

AFFIDAVIT

State of Alaska
Second District, SS.

I, Willie Goodwin, Sr., being first duly sworn, depose and say:

1. That I am 57 years old and that I have lived in Northwest Alaska all of my life; that I am an Eskimo;

2. That I have eaten seal oil all my life; that I consider it to be the most important staple in my diet; that the majority of people in the Northwest Alaska also consider seal oil to be an important part of their diets and prefer it over most other types of food, just as I do;

3. That the people of the villages which are not located on the coast, but are populated by Eskimos also have need for seal oil; that the only way these people can get seal oil is to trade for it with the people of the coastal villages; that trade of that nature has been going on for centuries;

4. That many old people who can no longer hunt for themselves need to be able to buy or trade for sea mammal oil;

5. That at this time the Kotzebue Area Fisheries Co-op is setting up an organization whereby this trade will be made easier and waste would be eliminated as much as possible; that any law prohibiting commercial use of sea mammals would eliminate the Co-op service;

6. That a bill flatly prohibiting commercial use of sea mammals would only encourage illegal taking of sea mammals and much waste would result;

7. That for the above reasons, no bill should be enacted that would prohibit the residents of Northwest Alaska from buying, selling or trading for the oil of sea mammals.

WILLIE GOODWIN, SR.

Subscribed and sworn to before me this 9th day of May, 1972, at Kotzebue, Alaska.

KATHLEEN M. LOCY
Notary Public in and for Alaska.
My commission expires: *November* 17, 1975.

SAVOONGA, ALASKA, *March 10, 1972.*

To: Ernest Hollings, Room 432 Old Senate, Office Building, Washington, D.C.
From: IRA Councils, Undersigned people of Savoonga.
Subject: Taking domestic animals as food from the Natives, Terminating The sales of the skins and Ivory and other resource from the animals.

We, the undersigned and the people of Savoonga are making this appeal to make fully known that we do not wish the Federal Government to Terminate the above subject to the Native people of Alaska under the Constitution of the United States for the following reasons. First, the main source of our food comes out of these animals. No full time employment available part of our major income comes from the sales of ivory carving and the sale of the skins of the animal. This short of small income provides us a year round mains of income. If this Act of Terminating the major resource of our income it would create more request for Federal Assistance in order to take the place of this income at the present time since the Land Claim Settlement will not come to effect for sometime or for many year before we largely depend on it.

Dear Allen,

First of all we wish to thank you for taking your time off for the people of Savoonga. Now, as you know the importance of the Island itself. First of all, we are doing all we can to obtain the whole Island, and to keep the resource of food & Ivory.

We are collecting for your fare and part erpense. The Village people are cooperating.

All the other things are in tape.

Pres. Vernon Waghiyi, Sr.
Tres. Alexander Chip
Sec. Abner Gabgergen

VILLAGE CHIEF

We are quite concerned and impressed and the other members of the Council and the villagers who wish to share a donation for the trip to Washington, D.C. We all fear that the passage of this marine mammal bill recently by the House of Representatives has some devastating ideas for the Bering Sea Eskimo areas and other coastal village hunters.

If you make this trip necessary to Washington, we have a message for Senator Hollings and perhaps for Senator Stevens and his colleagues that we are very thankful for what has been done to assist us previously in other matters regarding St. Lawrence Island and the Bering Sea area. Now we are depending that Senator Stevens can really work on this ocean mammal bill to block it off as much as he can. We understand how much he has worked already.

If the marine mammal bill becomes more complicated the people on St. Lawrence, especially the walrus hunters and other ocean mammal hunters wish to acquire some more evidence and information why this is happening, and who is the originator of the marine mammal bill. They know the Senator knows that the locality of St. Lawrence in the Bering Sea has a lot of mammals that have been used by Native people for many centuries. This is a heritage and cannot be interfered with by small groups of conservationists and various groups.

ANOTHER MEMBER OF COUNCIL

We have small herds of reindeer on St. Lawrence Island. We also use this as our livelihood. Speaking of ocean mammals the collecting of ivory and meats and other things from the mammals is very important to St. Lawrence. The most important section of this animal is the ivory tusk. This is used by every family and every person on St. Lawrence for a personal income source. There are numerous people who have lived on welfare and federal assistance on St. Lawrence. For those who have lived on welfare this is the most frustrating and difficult standard of living on St. Lawrence Island and any other area in Alaska. Ivory carving is of the most interest to the people on St. Lawrence young and old. When ivory bscomes scarce we have to seek one way or the other to find more ivory. We usually go to other parts of the island to find old ivories. This takes time and it is not easy to locate some of the sites.

When we harvest the seals we use the skins and just about everything that comes from seals. Women use them for skin sewing and market this variously to the outsiders. It helps for additional income to the families. And we have fish in rivers and lakes which is one of the most important foods for the Natives of St. Lawrence.

ANOTHER MEMBER OF COUNCIL

We are quite pleased that we sent you on behalf of the people here on St. Lawrence and other coastal villages in the Bering Sea this about marine mammals and their resources, ivory and skins. We are hopeful that you will carry through in Washington. If you meet with government officials, perhaps with the Senators do not hesitate if any political pressures block your intensive meeting with these various people. Do as much as you can. All the Bering Sea Native cultures do not coincide formally with social, economic and governmental views. For example, St. Lawrence Island gives the people an advance for the livelihood they will get from the ocean mammals and every animal which exist on St. Lawrence. It is a very important factor and cannot be banned. The people depend on the representative that has been elected by the people of that area to Washington and they strongly expect he will carry on his duties to fight for the necessary protections on behalf of St. Lawrence and the Bering Sea area.

Every concerned person, even the children, have contributed a sum of money for the expenses for the trip because of the devastating ideas that some of the people in Congress have developed. I hope that you will take your time in Washington and will make it when you represent this area about the marine mammals.

SECRETARY-TREASURER

We were trying to send a letter or telegram direct to Senator Stevens or Senator Hollings but I thought I could talk to Senator Stevens but it would not be possible with Senator Hollings or other members of the committee, so it was necessary that we made this tape so it can be translated about the ocean mammals. The people on St. Lawrence Island and other Bering Sea areas have been living on these marine mammals for years and years, and cannot be discontinued. The walrus, seal and all the mammals are major sources of income for people of this area. Every bit that you can use is used by the Eskimo people when harvesting. This you have seen when you have visited and observed this personally. The carcass is delivered over to the village and is divided by the hunters. Also the ivory, and the skins, etc. And also oil from the whales. The life of St. Lawrence Island is hard and a lot of people live on welfare and federal assistance and if this ocean mammal bill becomes effective it will be a total hardship for the St. Lawrence Island and Bering Sea area.

It is hard for everyone of us of this western Alaska to obtain enough funds or see enough funds to send representatives who understand the government picture of economy social living and also our culture but we are taking your efforts to help investigate and work on this bill. We wish to know if there is going to be a hearing and if this can be done in Alaska so that some of us can be there to exchange the important facts that we wish to present.

We would like to have Friends of the Earth people, Senators and others observe the harvest and our carving.

We are glad we have a strong representative from Alaska who will work hard for our good and we will hope this coming election we can give our efforts for him.

STATEMENT PREPARED BY MERLIN KOONOOKA OF GAMBALL, ALASKA ON BEHALF OF HIS PEOPLE Hearing, NOME, ALASKA.

For the natives of St. Lawrence Island, the only source of food, our very life, livelihood and existence depends on the sea mammal, and always will for our children and their children. For most of the natives, it is the only source of income.

What beef, cattle, farming is to all other people in this country, is the sea mammal to the Eskimo and other natives of Alaska.

Even if our people had steady jobs and income, they could not afford the extremely high cost of living without subsistence hunting. At this time when the average American is affected by the rising cost of meat, consider what it does to our people who depend on the sea mammal and where cost of living is many times more.

The Eskimo takes from the sea mammal, the meat and oil for food, the furs and ivory for his clothing and hunting equipment, and also turns it into beautiful arts and crafts which he must sell to pay for gasoline that costs up to a dollar a gallon, he must pay for expensive motors and many other needs for hunting.

We live where weather conditions are severe with prevailing cold winds blowing consistently. Many times conditions may permit us to hunt only a couple times a month. Many times we come home with empty skin boats and sleds.

The native subsistence hunter is nature's only true and natural conservation ist, and must continue to be so. The commercial aspect of the natives use marine mammals in no way affects conservation. But it is necessary to continue his subsistance hunting and his way of living. Why must we suffer for what others have done? It is your job as our country's lawmakers to see that justice and fairness is for all people's pursuit of happiness. We hope and pray that these hearings will result in that you will feel as we do that we do not intend to be victims of unfair legislation. We may be the farthest citizens from Washington, but we are a part of these United States, so others must learn not to ignore us.

Some people say that the land claims settlement money will compensate our losses. Certainly, congress passed the land claims money. Now must congress tell us how and what to spend it on? It is our money, we have enough problems to take care of without others telling us what to do.

Our way of existence with nature is the best way of conservation. Any other way has proven by civilization in our country a shortcut to pollution and ruin of the ecology and balance of nature.

STATEMENT OF EBEN HOPSON

Mr. Chairman, my name is Eben Hopson. With the exception of three and a half years which I spent in the U.S. Army during the second world war, I have lived in Barrow, Alaska, all my life. The last two years of employment saw me working in Anchorage and presently in Juneau, Alaska.

During those some 45 years I have carved out a living ranging from subsistence hunting, to government employment, high paid union construction work as an equipment operator, trapper, all the time participating in the city council activities, at times as president of the city council at Barrow, and serving in the Alaska National Guard which saw me advancing from the enlisted ranks to a company commander of one of the most colorful battaiions of the Army National Guard of the United States, the first eskimo scout battalion. I have also been in elective offices, having served in the last territorial legislature in 1957 and also served in the State Senate from 1959 through 1966. Mr. Chairman, I left the executive directorship of the Alaska Federation of Natives to accept a job in my present position as a special assistant to the governor of Alaska. I expect to try for another elective office as the chairman of the Troubled But Important Proposed North Slope Borough.

Mr. Chairman and committee members, S-3161 and similar bills introduced in the U.S. Senate, one of which has already been passed in the House of Representatives, unintentionally, perhaps, would very thoroughly destroy our Native culture in the state of Alaska. I specifically named S-3161 because I am under the impression that it was the last bill introduced in the U.S. Senate on this subject. The excepting amendment on page 23, line 1, is welcomed; however, its interpretation should be broad enough so that the status quo on the taking and utilization of such mammals or parts thereof should be maintained by the Alaskan Natives so long as the mammals are taken in the pursuit and continuance of subsistence hunting and fishing in the traditional manner.

Further interpretation of the utilization of mammals or parts thereof should also be broad enough to permit the carving of ivory, which is mandatory under state law, and the sewing of seal skins of the use of them as we see fit. The words "traditional customs" means the taking of such mammals and the utilization of or parts thereof for subsistence purposes, including the manufacture by such Natives for the arts and craft industry.

By the use of the words "commercial sale" within the language of the bill, the taking of marine mammals by Natives is diluted and conflicts with the words "for subsistence purposes."

I want to make two things absolutely clear. In the first instance, the taking of these marine mammals is *not for commercial purposes. The animal is taken for subsistence purposes* because it is vitally needed in the coastal Eskimo's diet. The meat is preserved either by drying in the sun or by freezing in an ice cellar. Because the Eskimo, as I have repeatedly said in the past, is a good conservationist, any waste of food, particularly that part of an animal caught for this purpose, is considered a sin by these people. There must be no waste whatsoever of any parts of animals. Therefore, the unedible parts of the animal or mammals are completely utilized. The ivory is carved with great skill into intricate objects and jewelry of all kinds. While this ivory in the past had been used to implement weaponry for the Eskimo, it has taken a place these days as a means of barter exchange for food items and trade. It is not a true commercial operation, in the strict sense of the word.

Because the initial taking is for subsistence purposes, I cannot be too emphatic—these animals are not being taken by Eskimo people for commercial purposes. Pursuing full utilization of the mammals or parts thereof makes the Native arts and craft manufacture a by-product of the taking to use as food.

The extent of monetary gain by persons who carve the ivory or those that sew seal skins for trade is an unknown factor which contributes to the full livelihood of the Native people.

When our statisticians compute the average wages earned in different parts of Alaska, or the whole country for that matter, the Department of Labor or other institutions will tell you that this much was earned by persons each month, or that so much was contributed by both the State Welfare and Federal share of the welfare load. Nothing is shown regarding the human welfare involved in the pursuit of subsistence hunting and/or fishing, although this is a major portion of the Eskimo economy, it is an unknown factor. Let me tell you, gentlemen, that an Eskimo could not survive on six hundred dollars a year anywhere were that

the only source for his survival. The unknown factor is perhaps sixty or even ninety percent of the total need gained from subsistence hunting and the full utilization of the mammals.

Getting back to the Bill in particular, S-3161 sec. (107) (A) has language in parenthesis saying: (other than a marine mammal classified as one belonging to an endangered species pursuant to the Endangered Spieces Conservation Act of 1969). Mr. Chairman, this language in parenthesis prohibits the taking of whale —specifically the Bowhead whale by the Eskimo. Any taking would be in violation of the Act subject to some unthinkable penalties imposed on a person in pursuit of hunting to feed and nourish his family. Traditionally, Mr. Chairman, the Eskimo has hunted whale seasonally. Were we to comply fully with the Endangered Species Act, which by reference is tied to prohibitive provisions of this Act, my village of Barrow, Alaska, would need 800 individual permits; the village of Wainwright would require 300 permits; and Pt. Hope would need another 250 permits.

The island villages of Savoonga and Gambel on St. Lawrence Island would also require several hundred permits. Without an adequate substitute for the whale, which you could not provide anyway, the people are given no choice but to violate the law in order to continue to take this staple food animal. There is nothing on the U.S. markets that might even come close to being a substitute for the muktuk that we eat, in addition to the meat taken from a whale. We Eskimos once had a pretty fair market and price for the baleen that we got from the bowhead whale. The market for it in the raw is no longer available and now it has to be manufactured into arts and crafts where a very minimal price is paid. The market in the raw was very effectively destroyed when plastics were discovered in America—Ialso want to point out that no law suits were filed by the Eskimos to compensate for this substantial loss of income due to the advent of the plastics technology.

No one at that time showed any concern for the welfare of the Eskimo, who suffered the loss of a badly needed industry. And now, Mr. Chairman, the Congress wants to take the meat right off my dinner table, too!!!

When the going gets tough for the Eskimo, Mr. Chairman, he is always willing to go a step further. That one step, if proved to be futile for his cause, will be the last one he will take to stay in bounds with the law. At this time, Mr. Chairman, I personally feel that we have already taken that one step.

To repeat what my people have already said, you would be forcing us to break the law, should such restrictive marine mammals legislation be passed.

Failure in the past to recognize the Eskimo's culture—or plain refusing to understand it and what it takes to perpetuate it—has caused situations like this to exist. It would be my guess that the committee members from different coastal states would feel very slighted and disturbed were their colleagues in the Congress to introduce legislation for passage of a Bill to ban the fishing of certain commercial fish now harvested within their state boundaries. Nor would the Chairman be in favor of someone's effort to cut off the harvest of other products if it would severely cut into his own livelihood. Well, Mr. Chairman, that situation would be a very mild treatment compared to what is being contemplated by this Bill.

We are simply asking you to recognize simple and honest justice which only involves the recognition of the everyday needs of these people. You simply must recognize subsistence hunting for what it is and permit the utilization of marine mammals, including the sale of Native arts and craft in the traditional manner. In the absence of proof that any of these species are being endangered by the limited take by Natives in the traditional manner, you are faced with the moral responsibility of recognizing these human needs.

Specifically, Mr. Chairman, I would like to make a couple of recommendations in the language of section 107 (A), within the language in parenthesis. The Bowhead whale, which is included as an endangered species, should be excepted, and permits issued to villages rather than individuals for these hunts.

In section 107 (A) (3), line 25, the words "or indirect" should be deleted. The proviso on page 23, line 1, should be amended to read "provided: that Alaska Native arts and craft and clothing may be individually manufactured, in further pursuit of full utilization of the marine mammals or parts thereof, from such taking."

As a supplement to my present statement I have decided to ask a few questions which might help to explain the Bill through legislative history for future reference.

First, am I correct in assuming that there is no prohibition by the Endangered Species Act of 1969 of the taking of marine mammals by the Alaska Natives or those persons who hunt for subsistance purposes.

Second, If this is the case, then would the committee be inclined to agree to delete the language in parenthesis in sec. 107(a) of this Bill.

Thirdly, in reference to the language in sec. 107(a) first sentence, "the provisions of this title shall not apply with respect to the taking of marine mammals. . . . Does this mean that the other provisions of the Act like the penalties, the permit system, and the enforcement section would be applicable in cases of violation of the Act?

I ask these questions because I understand that the Endangered Species Act deals only with mammals importation to the U.S. by foreign vessels and is in no way intended to hinder the subsistance hunting within. Secondly it appears to me that we are inserting language that is in no way a concern of the Endangered Species Act of 1969. Mr. Chairman if I might repeat myself again, without adequate provisions to take care of our needs, you are going to see two hundred repeats of the Barrow eider duck situation, where whole villages are involved and the first attempt to enforce these laws, everyone will plead guilty and turn themselves in. I say this again only to emphasize that the Bill with it's present language will not work within the Native community of Alaska.

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE,
SUBCOMMITTEE ON OCEANS AND ATMOSPHERE

In the matter of the Marine Mammal Protection Act.

MEMORANDUM

The purpose of this memorandum is to set forth more fully the implications of the words "interstate commerce" as used in Section 107(a)(2) and the word "subsistence" as used in Section 107(a)(1) of the Staff Working Draft No. 2 of the Marine Mammal Protection Act.

I

If the phrase "interstate commerce" as included in Section 107(a)(2) is enacted, the result will be, as a practical matter, to destroy the exception granted by that section. This is so because the majority of the sales of Native arts and crafts objects takes place in "interstate commerce", as that phrase has been interpreted by the courts. The leading case of *Carter v. Carter Coal Co.*, 298 U.S. 238, 56 S. Ct. 855, 80 L. Ed. 1160 has defined the phrase to include "transportation, purchase, sale and exchange of commodities between the citizens of different states." Thus, it would seem that sale to tourists from outside Alaska, the lion's share of arts and crafts sales, would be prohibited. At least, such an interpretation would be consistent with a great deal of judicial authority. Cf. *gibbons v. Ogden*, 9 Wheat. 1 (1824); *Cleveland v. United States*, 146 F.2d 730 (10th Cir., 1945); *Furst v. Brewster*, 282 U.S. 943, 75 L. Ed. 478, 51 S. Ct. 295 (1930); *Foster Mountain Packing Co. v. Haydel*, 278 U.S. 1, 73 L. Ed. 174, 49 S. Ct. 1 (1928); *United States v. Hill*, 248 U.S. 420, 63 L. Ed. 337, 39 S. Ct. 143 (1918); *Adair v. United States*, 208 U.S. 161, 52 L. Ed. 436, 28 S. Ct. 277 (1908).

It is true that the courts have often stated that the terms "interstate commerce" is not a technical legal concept, but is a matter of fact to be drawn from the circumstances of each case. However, the various transactions which have been held to be interstate commerce are so varied that the Supreme Court, in *Atlanta Motel v. United States*, 379 U.S. 241 (1964), summed the matter up by stating that interstate commerce is that which "concerns more States than one and has a real and substantial relation to the national interest." 379 U.S. at 255. Pursuant to that language a rational court *could* find that the buying of arts and crafts items by citizens of States other than Alaska concerns more States than one, and that the use of marine mammal by-products has a real and substantial relation to the national interest.

Moreover, the phrase "interstate commerce" as used in this bill could be construed to include the instrumentalities of interstate commerce. Cf. *The Daniel Ball*, 10 Wall. 557 (1871). Thus, transportation of arts and crafts items on an interstate carrier, such as Alaska Airlines, for sale in other parts of the

State of Alaska, could conceivably subject both the shipper and the carrier to prosecution.

Further, even should the language not be given such restrictive interpretations, shipping Native handicrafted items out of the state for sale to fine arts galleries and individual collectors—the only places where such items would be able to obtain the recognition and price they often deserve—would clearly be prohibited. Such a result would only do a disservice to the entire nation including present and future generations.

For the above reasons, the term "interstate commerce" should be stricken from Section 107(a)(2).

II

It is also important that the definition of "subsistence" as used in Section 107(a)(1) be made clear so as to plainly include trade among Natives of marine mammal food and by-products. Any other construction of that term would be plainly absurb in light of the available anthropological information and the testimony of many at the hearings held by this committee in Nome and Bethel, Alaska, on May 11 and 12, 1972. From those sources, it is plain that the Native subsistence economy could not exist and never has existed without a developed pattern of trade. The anthropologist, Wendell H. Oswalt, in his book *Alaskan Eskimos* (Chandler Publishing Co., 1967) has stated:

"The early historic trade items, apart from those of European origin, included both raw materials and finished artifacts. The intertribal exchanges were between established trading partners, with coastal products traded for inland goods. Materials offered by coastal peoples were bearded-seal skins for boat covers, strong ropes, and waterproof boot soles; walrus skins for umiak covers and rawhide ropes; and whalebone or walrus ivory for diverse small artifacts. Key materials from the interior were caribou and other skins for clothing and wolverine skins for parka ruffs and trim. The most important food product was sea-mammal oil or fat traded from the coast to the interior." (p. 133)

Oswalt continues on page 134:

"If trading patterns with northern coastal Eskimos were essential for the inland people to survive, the reverse also was true."

Oswalt is joined by Robert F. Spencer in his opinion of the importance of trade:

"An exchange of commodities took place yearly between the various groups of the coast and the peoples of the inland. From each village and from each inland section came family groups who proceeded to their customary trading place each summer. Here the men met their partners and effected an eschange of goods which were of value both as items affording prestige to the owner and trader and as elements important in the subsistence economy of both ecological settings. The primary contact between nuunamiut [inland] and tareumiut [coastal] was on the basis of such trade. The result was to create a balance and an economic interdependence between the two which lent a high degree of stability to the respective societies. Robert F. Spencer, *The North Alaskan Eskimo, A Study in Ecology and Society,* (Smithsonian Institution, Bureau of American Ethnology, Bulletin 171, U.S. Government Printing Office, 1959)" p. 193.

Spencer goes on to list the items traded:

"Trade goods may be listed as follows:

"1. From the inland to the sea Green caribou hides were the basic item, the tanned being worth considerably more. Pelts of all kinds including wolf, fox (in five varieties), wolverine, sheepsins, and more rarely, musk-ox hair. . . .

"2. From the coast to the interior: As stated, the basic item was oil, representing the greatest quantity of maritime goods. But in addition, there were numbers of seal and ugruk skins, used for books, and boat covers. Walrus skins too were traded in for this purposes . . ." (page 20) 4

The situation at present, despite the introduction of the modern cash economy, has not changed to a significant extent due to the economic underdevelopment of rural Alaska. Norman A. Chance, in his book, *The Eskimo of North Alaska* (Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1967) has stated, at page 35:

"The Eskimo, in contrast, have less control over their environment and are thus more dependent upon it. Increased opportunities for cash income are not universal and many Eskimos still spend much of their time in the traditional economic pursuits of hunting and fishing. Since these activities are seasonal in nature, the subsistence cycle of the modern Eskimo is very much like that which obtained in the past."

Therefore, it should be made plain that "subsistence" as used in Section 107(a)(1) includes trade of marine mammal foods of marine mammal foods and by-products among Native populations. Further, the bill should allow for Natives to ban together in Co-operatives so as to allow for the efficient operation of the traditional trading patterns so as to eliminate waste in the transportation and exchange of marine mammal foods and by-products.

Respectfully submitted,

ROBERT C. BUNDY.

Anchorage, Alaska. May 11, 1972.

Senator TED STEVENS: Care Bureau of Indian Affairs Office, 443-2284 Nome. Dr. Chuck Imig requested this be sent to Nome and Bethel to be read into mammal hearing record. Resolution of May 10, 1972, at meeting of Yukon Native Brotherhood in Whitehorse.

"Whereas the Alaskan Natives have subsisted on sea mammals as long as they have been on this continent, and

Whereas the Alaskan Natives have never killed indiscriminately but have harvested the sea only out of necessity with no waste or wanton destruction of their main source of food stuff, and

Whereas the Alaskan Natives utilize the by products such as ivory, skins, etc. to create art objects which they sell to purchase food, fuel, and other articles necessary to hunt and exist, and Natives of the Yukon territory a territories also depend upon sea mammals for subsistence and traditional utilization of the by products for clothing, arts and crafts and

Whereas all native peoples in circumpolar regions likewise depend on sea mammals for preservation of a unique and beautiful culture, now, therefore, be it

Resolved, that the Yukon Native Brotherhood, the Northwest Territories Indian Brotherhood, the National Indian Brotherhood and the Inuit Tapirasat respectfully request that the congress of the U.S. reconsider HR %420 now pending before the U.S. Senate committee on oceans and atmosphere and act in favor of the stated position of the Alaskan Natives regarding this sea mammal legislation, National Indian Brotherhood, Yukon Native Brotherhood, the Inuit Tapirasat the Northwest Territories Indian Brotherhood.

BARBARA ANDREWS, *Anchorage Office.*

Cordova, Alaska. May 10, 1972.

Senator TED STEVENS,
Bethel, Alaska.

Alaska marine animals are adequately protected already by state laws. I'm against bills 2579 and 1315.

Sincerely,

ROBERT H. LOHSE.

CORDOVA DISTRICT FISHERIES UNION,
Cordova, Alaska. May 11, 1972.

Senator TED STEVENS,
Sea Mammal Hearings, Nome, Alaska.

This organization opposes senate bills 1315 and 2579. Hair seal and sea lion are salmon preditors. It is necessary to stablize these sea mammal populations to preserve salmon fisheries and the livelihood of hundreds. The state of Alaska already controls seal and sea lion hunting. We feel our game department is well qualified to handle problems. Conservation of this area's ecolovy is necessary for maintenance of our economy and lifestyle. We respectfully request your aid in defeating these bills. Letter follows.

Secretary.

LITTLE RUSSIAN MISSION,
March 18, 1972.

DEAR SENATOR STEVENS: We the people of Little Russion Mission strongly oppose the Marine Mammal Protection Act of 1971. Ninety per-cent of the people of the Kuskokwim-Yukon area depend on marine mammals for food, and use their pelts for commercial arts and crafts. This bill will prevent the Eskimo

people from using the skins for their cash economy; their only source of income. This bill, if it passes, will force many of the people in this area into the welfare roles.

First of all, any action on anything pertaining to the Native people's livelihood, a public hearing should be held. I urge you that a public hearing be held in our Villages before you act on this legislation.

This legislation, if passes, will force many of the people into the welfare roles. It is not desirable to get handouts, but I guess we will be forced to enter into the system.

You are most welcome to come and stay with us in our Village any time you want to. We will provide you with housing and food. It may not be the most comfortable but it certainly will be friendly.

We trust you will act according to our favor!

Sincerely yours,

PAUL KELILA, *President.*

Village Council of Scammon Bay,
May 4, 1972.

Hon. TED STEVENS,
U.S. Senator,
Washington, D.C.

This letter is concerning about the sea mammals, how we catch them and how we use them and what for.

first of all trying to catch these seals are very hard during the winter months, due to closed up ice. we have to go way out, in oder to get to the open water. If and when we get than its the question if we will catch or not. Sometimes theres lucky days and theres days when we have to come home without any catch.

Secondly, the only time we can catch them fearly easily is in fall time and spring. We do not catch these sea mammals every day of the year.

For 50% of the catch strickly for our own use. either we dry the meat and store for our winter use. and the hide we use for Mukluks and parkas and lot of other uses. about 50% of the catch we use for subsisdence, woman make parkas, boots, ETC. they sell them and exchange with food and other things they need.

So you see there is much need for to have these seals and other sea mammals.

people not only kill these sea mammals, the ice in spring and fall also kills them. we need these sea mammals therefore we ask you to help us not to change what is being done now.

Sincerely,

ROY HENRY, *President.*
BEN UTTEREYAK, *Secretary.*

RURAL ALASKA COMMUNITY ACTION PROGRAM, INC.,
Anchorage, Alaska. May 5, 1972.

Hon. TED STEVENS,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR STEVENS: Enclosed please find the sea mammal information which you requested.

If you have any further questions dealing with this matter, please feel free to contact me. I will be looking forward to seeing you in Bethel next week.

Sincerely,

JOHN SHIVELY, *Executive Director.*

By: MIKE HARPER, *Acting Executive Director.*

Enclosure.

FINE ARTS AND CRAFT PRODUCTION

A provision to prohibit interstate sale of Native arts and craft products utilizing marine mammals would essentially eliminate the market for Native *fine art* work using marine mammal, at the same time, it would do little to inhibit, and perhaps it would even encourage, growth of the market for routinely crafted items.

At present, about 90% of the crafted items such as ivory jewelry and small carvings of repetitive designs are sold through gift shops within Alaska. Prohibi-

tion of interstate sales would encourage development of tourist sales within Alaska.

On the other hand, highly creative and individualized fine art ivory or whale bone carvings depend on fine art gallery sales. Since there are very few fine art galleries in Alaska, the fine art market is almost completely in the continental United States. Thus prohibition of interstate sales would eliminate the sales and frustrate the refinement of fine art objects using marine mammals. Some ivory carvers would be forced to abandon fine art work in order to produce a greater volume of less creative work for general gift shop sales in Alaska.

The Canadian Eskimo arts and craft trade emphasizes the importance of fine art galleries, many of which are located in the continental United States. Canadian Arctic Products, Inc. reports that of their Candian art and craft sales, approximately $400,000 or about 35% of all sales, are to fine art galleries in th United States. Over 90% of their sales are to fine art galleries. Presently, the "Master Work Exhibit" of the finest Eskimo art work over the past 20 years is on a two-year world tour to museums in cities such as New York, Paris and Moscow.

Alaskan Eskimo art and craft work is displayed at the University of Alaska museum and the Anchorage Historical and Fine Arts Museum. Some ivory carvings, such as the Inupik Madonna, are over 2,000 years old.

Canadian art work has been refined through artists workshop programs and in Alaska a demonstration workshop at Shishmaref on the Seward Peninsula has been started "to create an environment in which the Native artist can indulge his creativity, and suddenly discover that the product is worth a lot more in the market place than are his souvenir trinkets" (Smith, Community Enterprise Development Corporation).

This effort to refine handicraft work and develop fine art work can be frustrated by restricting sales to a local market, as Joseph Smith pointed out as director of CEDC in 1971:

"It is well know that the (Alaskan) village craftsman has been locked into the tourist/souvenir market and has not been able to express the creative energy he possesses. . . . Expanding the market for the present type of production is not suitable since a larger market will really encourage the intrusion of machine-made and cheap labor-made products to the detriment of the local craftsman. . . . The talents that Eskimo artists have exhibited in the past are not being exhibited now because of the market orientation . . ."

Smith also stressed that elevation of Eskimo art work depends on marketing "through such things as selected galleries and fine gift shops in urban areas in the Lower 48 (states), through museums in the Lower 48, through art auctions, etc."

To summarize, prohibition of interstate sale of Eskimo art and craft work using marine mammals would destroy the potential of such art work and encourage more mass produced souvenir items which would: (1) return less to the Native craftsman for his effort; (2) encourage machine and cheap labor made items; (3) build a demand for more ivory for more cheap products; (4) and, ultimately, create an incentive for Natives to kill many walruses just for their ivory. In contrast, allowing the sale of these items in interstate commerce would encourage the development of Eskimo fine art work which would: (1) return more to the Native Craftsman for his effort; (2) discourage mass produced items; (3) utilize less ivory to greater advantage; (4) and, ultimately, reduce the demand for volumes of ivory.

Wildlife Management

A prohibition against interstate sale is not a useful method of wildlife management. Presumably, this provision is designed to restrict the number of ocean mammals (mainly walrus and seal) killed by reducing the demand for their ivory and skin. In effect, it would have no direct control over the numbers taken. Indirectly, it could encourage a greater number of ocean mammals to be taken because it might lower the price of marine mammal products in Alaska (either by creating a surplus or by lowering the quality of work), thus create an incentive for more volume to be sold.

Management of wildlife should be directly related to the status of the wildlife population. Under an interstate commerce prohibition, Native hunters could conceivably harvest more of a certain species in a given year than a biologically oriented game management program would advise.

If Native Alaskans are expected to respect game management regulations, they must understand the relevancy and need for the policy. The relevancy and meaningfulness of an interstate commerce prohibition would be extremely difficult to communicate to Native Alaskans because, in fact, it is not a meaningful policy. If a management program is necessary, one directly related to the mammal populations and needs for harvesting them would be more relevant and thus more easily understood and perhaps accepted by Native people. It should be noted that enforcement of game regulations is so difficult in remote areas of Alaska that respect and acceptance of regulations is essential if frequent violations are to be avoided.

INTERNATIONAL TOASTMISTRESS,
COUNCIL No. 8,
April 15, 1972.

Senator TED STEVENS: Whereas it is necessary in some localities in Alaska for natives to subsist by the use of indigenous species whereas proposed legislation will preclude their use of the by-products for either resale or arts and crafts.

Resolved, that the legislature reconsider the proposed bill enabling natives the use of the by-products as well as the animal thus precluding the unnecessary waste of materials for arts and crafts of the Alaskan Native culture.

(30 signatures.)

SCAMMON, BAY ALASKA, *May 2, 1972.*

DEAR TED STEVENS: About Sea Mammals we usually catch about 1 mukluk we dry the meat and blow the stomach and dry for to store the oilin and cook the most all the insides after use clean it. Also the skin we use it for soles for mukluk. We catch this in spring of fall. Also spotted and fur-seal seam as above. But since we had freezer thsi fall I froqe most of them. The fur we use it for boats. If the inside spoil, we give it to our dogs. But not the meat and fur their to baluable to us. Hope you get this mail in time on spotted and fur-seal we catch 6 or 8.

From,

DAVID KAGUNOK and IRENE KAGUNOK.

ALASKA WILDLIFE FEDERATION
AND SPORTSMEN'S COUNCIL, INC.,
Juneau, Alaska. May 19, 1972.

Senator TED STEVENS,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR TED: Enclosed is copy of statement regarding marine mammals legislation directed to Senator Magnuson. I know we are late but hopefully some consideration can be given to at least some of the proposals and suggestions we have made.

We are very much opposed to any moratorium as such. This just doesn't make sense. Some species of wildlife are in jeopardy and some consideration should be given to protecting these animals, of course this would require international concurrence.

We appreciate vary much your assistance on this important piece of legislation. If we can be of further assistance, please let us know by telegram or otherwise.

Sincerely,

A. W. "BUD" BODDY, *Executive Director.*

P.S.—The Board of Directors of the Territorial Sportsmen, Inc. unanimously agree in principle with the statement set forth by the Alaska Wildlife Federation and Sportsmen's Council.

Enclosure.

ALASKA WILDLIFE FEDERATION
AND SPORTSMEN'S COUNCIL, INC.,
Juneau, Alaska. May 17, 1972.

Hon. Warren G. Magnuson
Chairman, Senate Committee on Commerce,
U.S. Senate
Washington, D.C.

HON. WARREN G. MAGNUSON
Re Marine Mammal Protection Act
Staff Working Draft No. 2.

DEAR SENATOR: The subject draft is not acceptable to our people on the basis of these general objections:

1. Enforcement of all of the provisions will be impracticable, unreasonable and impossible.
2. The administrative procedure for permit issuance and control places an impossible task on the Secretary and the Administrator.
3. The existing and proper management and conservation of marine mammals is obscured in the sense of unnecessary pure preservation.
4. Human needs for the reasonable use of marine animals by arctic coastal people is ignored.
5. The right of the States to manage its marine resources, when such management is consistent with the national interest, is abrogated.
6. The moratorium is an emotional substitution for proven scientific judgement and will threaten the hope of international agreements on marine mammal management.

More specifically, we make these comments:

Section 2—Findings and policy has our support and general agreement.

Section 3—We suggest definitions for "High Seas," General permits (page 20, line 24)," "native people," "Indian, Aleut or Eskimo," "State jurisdiction," and "residents."

Section 101 (c) (3) deletions render wording unclear.

Section 103—Permits. This section is useful for endangered or over-exploited marine mammals but otherwise unnecessary and prohibitively cumbersome.

Section 103(g)—The fifteen year moratorium is unnecessary and impracticable except for a few of the marine mammals in jeopardy. We suggest deleting "for purposes of display or scientific research "page 18, line 7, thus giving broader needed authority permit issuance.

Section 103(g)(13) Page 19, lines 1–8. This provision could theoretically require some 40æ50,000 permits—an impossible requirement.

Section 103(h) The establishment of a permit fee for mammals taken incidental to fishing will discourage applicants and encourage violations.

Section 103(i) Page 20, lines 22–24 and page 21, line 1–2. Presumably this provision will allow native people along the coast of Alaska to secure permits. The term general permit should be defined to include "residents of a prescribed area" thus eliminating the necessity for individual permits. Individual permits imposes an impossible requirement and will create violations for at least 15 years before many of these people understand the regulation.

Section 107—Exceptions for certain natives—We believe this section to be unconstitutional because of its racial separation. We support the section if definition of persons is by "residents of a defined area."

Section 108—We support the terms of (a) but (6) appears superfluous in the proven success of the fur seal management.

Section 109—The federal preemption in lines 16–23 (page 30) ignores the recognition, lines 3 (page 31), of "marine mammals subject to such state jurisdiction." We believe the federal preemption except for endangered species is unnecessary for marine mammals such as hair seals and sea otter which are almost entirely confined to coastal waters of state jurisdiction.

We are in general agreement and support the provisions for the "International Program" and Title II Marine Mammal Commission.

Very truly yours,

A. W. "BUD" BODDY, *Executive Director.*

HOOPER BAY, ALASKA,
May 1, 1972.

Senator TED STEVENS,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR TED STEVENS: Since my husband and I cannot attend the hearing on Sea Mammal bills in person, we would like to submit a statement concerning it.

These sea mammals we get from the Bering Sea are the main sourse of food and clothing, and without them many people would not be living today. Annually, we take about 2 to 3 seals. We use the meat for nourishment, seal oil for storing other food such as fish with—or else without the oil, storing would only spoil. Also we eat many other food with seal oil. The skin is used for clothing such as parka, water boats, and winter mukluks. The only part we do not use are the guts of the seal. But other families here even use the guts for making rain coats. The guts that we don't use serve as nourishing our dogs.

We have one question to ask. Why do you even consider taking away our food we depend on so much?

Sincerely yours,

MR. AND MRS. CHARLES BRUMLOW.

VILLAGE COUNCIL,
Goodnews Bay, Alaska. May 8, 1972.

DEAR SIR: We people of Goodnews Bay here in Goodnews Bay, Alaska explain how we use the whole animals and how important these animals are to we native way of life, here is our testimony.

We people here in Goodnews Bay, hunting some ocean animals like seals not to be sold, but to store up for the cold winter long. Meat dry up, and eat with the seal oil, the very important seal oil for our life we people store up a seal oil and eat with any kind of food like dry fish dry meat animals frozen fish any kind a fish and make a native ice-cream, or oil up our skin boats for make it water prove from the seal oil. We native people use the seal oil many many things we ate. and the skin making parka boats mittens and some other things that we use for our way of life. Some seal skin we dry up and store up for our any kind of boats for sole like under surface of the foot.

We native people use the seal oil and the skins for many things. But my testimony is a very points important to our native way of life here in Goodnews Bay, Alaska.

Sincerely,

FROM, CHRISTIAN SMALL, *president.*

UNIVERSITY OF ALASKA,
College, Alaska. May 8, 1972.

Senator ERNEST F. HOLLINGS,
Chairman, Oceans and Atmospheric Subcommittee, Senate Commerce Committee,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR HOLLINGS: We have reviewed a marine mammal bill entitled "Staff Working Draft No. 2" dated May 2, 1972 which revises Senator Stevens' S. 3161. These comments are offered for the record.

We find this draft meets, in several respects, the problems brought up earlier. Sec. 2(2), giving consideration to rookeries, mating grounds and areas of similar significance strengthens the bill considerably, as does the new definition of "depletion" in sec. 3(1). We believe that the provisions of sec. 109(b) for delegation to the states of responsibility for enforcement and administration of the Act gives better recognition of the basic responsibility and authority of the states than does S. 3161. We are concerned, however, with several aspects of the new bill. We are uncertain as to how the provision for a 15 year moratorium on the issuance of permits in Sec. 103(g)(1) relates to the provision in 103(i) for issuance of general permits to members of a class having common needs requiring them to take sea mammals. We believe that the concept of a moratorium is not in the interests of good management and that, in the absence of such a moratorium, regulations could be established that would deal with such special problems as are considered in this section.

Sec. 107 is much improved, in our view, by providing for sale of handmade arts, crafts and clothing by certain native groups. We believe, however, that the needs of these people would be better served if their products could be sold in inter-state commerce. For example, we know of people at Anchorage who have personal contact with some of the better artisans in the village and buy from them by mail. We suspect people outside of Alaska do the same. We believe also that such traffic serves to stimulate high quality production and should be encouraged.

We should like to comment also on sec. 111 providing for research, development, and loan guarantees to minimize losses to marine mammals. Research is needed, and some proposals have been made on problems other than the tuna-porpoise conflict. The relationship between salmon and sea lions in Bristol Bay is an example as is the problem of reducing waste in the harvest and use of walrus.

We believe this version of the bill is an advance over previous proposals we have seen.

Sincerely yours,

DAVID M. HICKOK, DIRECTOR.

TANANA-YUKON CHAPTER,
ALASKA CONSERVATION SOCIETY,
April 19, 1972.

Senator MIKE GRAVEL,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR GRAVEL: The Tanana-Yukon Chapter of the Alaska Conservation Society supports the concept of Marine Mammal Protection as outlined in HR 10420. However, this bill does not protect the vital interests of those persons living in Alaska who have traditionally used marine mammals as raw materials for arts and crafts industries.

HR 10420 does not strengthen the programs of the State of Alaska now in progress which protect marine mammals effectively.

Therefore, we would support amendments introduced in the Senate to these ends.

Sincerely,

TINA STONOROV, *Acting President.*

CITY COUNCIL,
Manokotak, Alaska. *April 2, 1972.*

Hon. TED STEVENS,
U.S. Senate,
Old Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

We understand there are some bills pending in Congress before the Subcommittee on Oceans and Atmospheres that would create hardship to the people of Alaska by prohibiting hunting and fishing of the Sea Mammals.

Do you know or can you believe, that whenever a person comes home with a Sea Mammal the villages of Alaska shares it among it's people.

We have faith that you will oppose to these bills that would create a severe hardship for the people of Alaska for whom hunting and fishing is a way of life.

We have assurance that there will be some action on this matter from you people.

Sincerely,

MICHAEL GLAK SR., *President.*
MATFIE S. PAT, Vice *President.*
WASSELLI LENGATULE, *Sec.-Treas.*

GODFRED AND ASSOCIATES,
Anchorage, Alaska. March 31, 1972.

DEAR SENATOR STEVENS: A Mr. Victor Reventlow has approached us regarding co-operating with Native Craftsmen in the arctic. We will be most pleased to work with these people along the lines as expressed by Mr. Reventlow in his letter to you dated March 29, 1972. In addition to sending precut kits for

slippers, purses and other items, we are prepared to send whole skins which are dressed by acceptable tanning methods back to the villages to be manufactured into assorted native style/design novelties.

Acceptable dressing is locally available in Anchorage. However, for business reasons it is mandatory that we are able to purchase the skins from the Natives. In this way only, we can establish a proper business relationship with the Natives and can guarantee immediate cash for their raw skins. This is extremely important to us as different grades of skins are used for different type merchandise.

We have to be able to be in controll of (a.) the dressing (b.) determination of assortment and (c.) quality.

To give you a brief background of our company. We are Alaska's largest wholesalers and retailers of souvenir and Native type merchandise.

We have been operating in Alaska for 23 years and are known throughout the state as being an unquestionably reputable firm. Being in the wholesale and retail business as well we can quarantee distribution of all Native crafts.

The most modern tools and techniques are available to us to give the Native crafts a finished look to accommodate Alaska's ever increasing tourist business.

Mr. Stevens, please feel free to contact me at any time. I hope to have the pleasure of meeting you in the not too distant future.

Sincerely,

GORDON O. GODFRED, *President.*

P.S.—All of us here in Alaska appreciate your continued support in fighting for this amendment to the marine mammal bill. This we all thank you for.

ALASKA COOPERATIVE WILDLIFE RESEARCH UNIT,
UNIVERSITY OF ALASKA,
College, Alaska. March 29, 1972.

Hon. TED STEVENS,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR STEVENS: Thank you for your recent letters and the copy of the Bill S-3161 introduced by yourself and dealing with marine mammals. I do have a few comments to make on this Bill which I hope will be of interest.

I certainly wish to express my feelings that this Bill is far superior to any previous one introduced in this session of Congress, on the subject of marine mammals and their conservation. However, there are in my opinion, some unsatisfactory aspects to the Bill. Most important I feel, is the undesirable division of responsibility between the Department of Commerce and the Department of Interior with regard to marine mammals, which carries over into this legislation. I am referring particularly to the Definition Section, page 5 where the term "Secretary" is defined. It appears that the Secretary of the Interior, as I read it, will have responsibility for only three species; polar bear, walrus and sea otter. The Secretary of Commerce will have responsibility then for all other species of marine mammal in the order cetecea and pinnepedia. In terms of efficiency of management, enforcement and research, such a division seems extremely undesirable. It will also certainly make the problems for the State of Alaska more difficult. It is clear that this legislation will require a great deal of effort on the part of the State Department of Fish and Game in order to coordinate their activities with the new activities and responsibilities of the federal government. In this case, they will have to coordinate with two seperate cabinet departments.

I also find lacking in the Definition Section a definition of "subsistence use". The term subsistence purposes is used in Section 107, page 22, volume 22, however, there is specifically excluded the commercial sale of marine mammal products. This seems therefore to make it more difficult for the Eskimo and Aleut people of Alaska to adapt their traditional methods of livelihood to the modern cash economy and thus makes them more dependent upon a welfare economy.

There is an excellent letter by an Alaskan guide on this subject, which appeared in the Fairbanks Daily News-Miner on March 27, on page 12. I hope you will have the opportunity to read this. I think it is an excellent summary of some of the problems.

If this Bill passes and its present provisions become law, it is clear that there will be a tremendous amount of new responsibility placed on both the Department of Commerce and the Department of Interior. Neither agency presently has the manpower to carry out these responsibilities. In order to do a good job of this, it will not only be required that the authorized funds be appropriated, but that the current stringent limitations on manpower in these agencies, notably the Department of Interior, be lifted. As I am sure you well know, the Department of Interior in Alaska is suffering very severely from these manpower restrictions at present, because of their many new responsibilities relating to land classification, pipeline related work and other urgent matters in the State.

Our Research Unit has been involved in marine mammal research and will continue to be so involved. We have recently started a major study of the behavior and ecology of walrus and presently have a student out on a U.S. Coast Guard Ice Breaker involved in this work. I certainly hope that if the funds are appropriated, which your Bill suggests, funds should be available for increased research involving marine mammals and that our Unit will be able to increase accordingly its efforts along these lines with additional funding from the government agencies involved.

Yours truly,

PETER C. LENT, *Acting Unit Leader.*

PACIFIC MARINE FISHERIES COMMISSION,
Portland, Oreg., April 3, 1972.

Hon. TED STEVENS,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR STEVENS: Enclosed is our letter to Chairman Hollings urging his support for language in pending marine mammal legislation which will enhance federal-state interaction in protection and management of marine mammals. We urge rejection of the federal pre-emption concept carried in H.R. 10420, (and presumably in the companion Senate bill). We believe the language in paragraph 109 of Senator Ted Stevens' S. 3112 bill more properly represents the constructive state-federal interaction that should be supported to serve our shared goals of marine mammal protection and wise management.

We urge your careful consideration of this vital aspect of governmental policy and your support of language that assures cooperation, not conflict, among the several jurisdictions involved.

Yours sincerely,

Enclosure.

JOHN P. HARVILLE, *Executive Director.*

PACIFIC MARINE FISHERIES COMMISSION,
Portland, Oreg., April 3, 1972.

As Senator from a PMFC Compact State, we know you will be interested in our enclosed letter to Chairman Ernest Hollings of the Oceans and Atmosphere Subcommittee. We believe it is imperative to future effective state-federal relations that marine mammal legislation not come out of Congress carrying destructive provisions for federal pre-emption of State jurisdiction within the three-mile territorial sea boundaries. You will recall that our five PMFC states in November unanimously adopted a resolution opposing federal pre-emption of state authority to manage marine mammals within state waters, citing the Submerged Lands Act of 1953 which confirmed State ownership of natural resources. including marine animals, within these territorial waters.

We believe that the language in Senator Stevens' S. 3112 bill seeks to preserve constructive state-federal relations toward cooperation rather than conflict in research and management of marine mammals. This approach is in striking contrast to the federal pre-emption concept of H. R. 10420, and presumably of Senate companion measures.

We respectfully request your support of this vital principle of partnership between our States and the federal government in the management of shared resources. We hope that your recommendations may help to influence favorable resolution of this issue in Subcommittee, where we understand Senator Stevens is working hard for the integrity of state jurisdiction within state waters.

Yours sincerely,

Enclosure.

JOHN P. HARVILLE, *Executive Director.*

PACIFIC MARINE FISHERIES COMMISSION,
Portland, Oreg., April 3, 1972.

HON. ERNEST F. HOLLINGS,
Chairman, Oceans & Atmospheric Subcommittee
of the Senate Commerce Sommittee,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR HOLLINGS: As your Subcommittee continues its deliberations on marine mammal legislation, we respectfully urge that full and favorable consideration be accorded the enhancement of effective federal-state interactions in management of these important marine resources. We believe that state-federal cooperative action is a cornerstone of the American govrnmental system, and that threats of federal pre-emption in areas of established state jurisdiction dangerously undermine the balanced responsibilities inherent in that system.

We emphasize further that pre-emption of State authority for research and management of marine mammals could only result in disruption and waste of the initiative, long-term effort, and considerable commitment of manpower and resources already invested by many of our states in on-going effective programs for marine mammal conservation and management. For example, the State of California presently assigns two biologists full-time to continuing researches on the California Sea Otter, a species brought back from near extinction by State initiative, and long under intensive study. California also invests some 12,000 man-hours yearly in patrol activities designed to protect marine mammals, near-shore game fish, and marine plants. Marine mammal protection accounts for about 15% of this total patrol effort. Clearly there are economies and major efficiencies in this kind of multi-purpose action by a State's organized patrol force. Your Subcommittee has heard similar testimony from the State of Alaska indicating the great investments by Alaska in marine mammal conservation and management.

We cannot believe that Congress would wish to dismantle existing strong State programs having obvious operational values and cost-effectiveness. Neither do we believe that federal pre-emption of all marine mammal management automatically will produce the enlightened long-range program the American people are demanding. For these reasons, we are opposed to the federal pre-emption concept articulated in H. R. 10420, and presumably in the Senate companion bill. We support instead the concept of separate jurisdiction but shared research and conservation concerns which are enunciated in paragraph 109 of Senator Ted Stevens' S. 3112 bill.

These specific comments are based upon earlier formal action by the Pacific Marine Fisheries Commission at its November 1971 annual meeting. At that time our five compact states unanimously adopted a resolution which stated that the Submerged Lands Act of 1953 had confirmed state title to and ownership of natural resources within the three-mile limit, and therefore that PMFC strongly opposed any federal intent to pre-empt state responsibilities for managing marine mammals within state waters (text of resolution attached).

We respectfully request your support and your leadership in assuring that the bill endorsed by your Subcommittee will enhance, not undermine, productive State-Federal interactions. The real goal for all concerned is the welfare of our priceless marine mammal resources. We believe this shared goal can best be served by a bill that sponsors and supports cooperation, not conflict, among responsible jurisdictions.

Yours sincerely,

JOHN P. HARVILLE, *Executive Director.*

Attachment.

PACIFIC MARINE FISHERIES COMMISSION
RESOLUTION NO 8—MARINE MAMMAL MANAGEMENT

Whereas, Federal legislation has been introduced that would place all marine mammals under federal jurisdiction; and

Whereas, the Submerged Lands Act of 1953 confirms state title to and ownership of natural resources, including marine animals; and

Whereas, the Pacific states are engaged in active management and research programs to protect and manage animal populations within state boundaries; and

Whereas, authority to manage resident marine mammal populations is essential for comprehensive planning and development of the coastal zone by the states; and

Whereas, sea otters, elephant seals, land breeding harbor seals and sea lions are normally within state boundaries and are properly under jurisdiction of the respective Pacific states; now be it therefore

Resolved, That the Pacific Marine Fisheries Commission recommends that sea otters, elephant seals, land breeding harbor seals and sea lions be excluded from the proposed federal legislation.

Adopted unanimously by the five Compact States of Alaska, California, Idaho, Oregon, and Washington at the annual meeting November 18, 1971, Seattle, Wash.

PACIFIC MARINE FISHERIES COMMISSION,
Portland, Oreg., March 30, 1972.

To: Executive Committee.
From: John P. Harville, Executive Director.
Re Federal Pre-emption of Marine Resources Management in State Waters—*an immediate threat that demands immediate action.*

Brief background notes

Ever since John McKean brought in his emergency proposal on marine mammal legislation and PMFC approved it unanimously as Resolution 8, this office has been busy pressing for modification of objectionable sections in pending legislation which would pre-empt state research and management inside the three-mile limit. I learned on my Washington visit that the Anderson-Dingell bill (H. R. 10420) had gone so far through the Congressional mill that it was not likely to be modified now, despite any impact by our arguments for states rights.

I was advised by both House and Senate staff to concentrate on influencing Senate attitudes—that if the final Senate-approved bill included proper State-Federal interaction in research and management, we then had a good chance that the Senate view would prevail in Conference Committee. (*We have good indications of support for our views on the House side too—as I see it, this is now a strategy matter, with good chance for success if the Senate goes our way.*

Subsequent events on the Senate side include introduction February 22 of a new bill (S. 3112) by Senator Ted Stevens of Alaska. This bill had been "drafted by a group of professional wildlife conservationists and environmentalists" (Stevens: Congr. Record) and includes language on state-federal relations which properly recognizes state authority within territorial waters (see attachment). The Subcommittee on Oceans and Atmospheric (of the Commerce Committee) has held a series of hearings on the *seven* marine mammal bills before it, and has heard testimony from Carl Crouse representing the Western Association of Game and Fish Commissioners, the National Association, and PMFC; also from Ben Hilliker representing the State of Alaska. Senator Packwood's testimony included insertion of our PMFC letter of February 9 into the hearing record. (Senator Stevens is a member of that Subcommittee.)

Recent developments

On February 16 I wrote Senator Stevens commending his action, and requesting his support of the PMFC position (cf. attachment). His two responses endorsed our stand, and requested our help in reaching other Senators of our delegations (copies of his letters attached).

Yesterday I called Washington, D.C. and learned that the Subcommittee still is deliberating on these bills. The word was that Ted Stevens was fighting hard within the Subcommittee for his positnio, and had a good chance of success, but that if he failed there, he probably would carry the issue to the floor of the Senate.

FEBRUARY 16, 1972.

Hon. TED STEVENS,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR STEVENS: I have read recently of your concern for the seal-hunting rights of Alaska's Aleuts in the face of Federal legislation which seeks to supplant the international treaties under which the fur seals are harvested. Since it is well established that this harvesting is consistent with good manage-

ment practices, and since it sustains an historic way of life for an important segment of our population, this championship of the Aleut cause seems both just and equitable.

We believe you also will be concerned about the language and intent of certain of these marine mammal protection bills to pre-empt State authority and responsibility to manage living resources within the three-mile limit of the territorial seas. You may recall that PMFC's Resolution 8 spoke strongly to this issue, pointing out that State ownership and responsibilities within the three-mile limit had been established by the Submerged Lands Act of 1953.

I recently prepared a letter to Senator Bob Packwood (copy enclosed) commenting on his bill S. 2639, which does not appear to contain the objectionable pre-emption concept and language of H. R. 10420, and presumably S. 3112. We commend to your consideration, and hopefully your support, the general rationale developed in this letter, and particularly the tentative alternative language we have suggested on page 3.

You will note that in Senator Packwood's letter I used examples from California to illustrate the magnitude of State investment which could be dismantled and wasted if Federal pre-emption of responsibility were to take place. I know that equivalent examples could be developed for Alaska. We feel confident that you will wish to exert your own influence as member of the key subcommittee on Oceans and Atmosphere to assure that Federal legislation does not needlessly undermine present State conservation policies and practices, particularly where these are demonstrably efficient, and are consonant with Federal goals and policies.

Your comments and reactions concerning our stand on this issue will be most welcome. We count on your influence and support to see that the language of these bills is modified so that they do not threaten dismantlement of our extensive State commitments of manpower and other resources to existing effective programs of marine mammal management within territorial seas.

Yours sincerely,

JOHN P. HARVILLE, *Executive Director.*

Enclosure.

NEEDED ACTION NOW

I cannot overemphasize how serious I consider this issue for *all our states*—not just in relation to marine mammals, but as a threat to state control of marine resources generally. Please refer to Ray Arnett's memo of March 21; he articulates some cogent reasons for this concern. Remember that if federal pre-emption can occur regarding marine mammals it can be initiated in other areas too! Therefore I strongly recommend the following steps:

1. Each state fisheries agency (including those with no jurisdiction over marine mammals) should write its Senators enlisting their influence to prevent federal pre-emption of state jurisdiction inside the three-mile territorial sea. (My attached letter to Stevens, and February 9 letter to Packwood, along with John McKean's earlier letters, may be of some help for background material.)

2. The PMFC office should take the following actions: (I will assume your approval unless I he ratelephoned objections by Tuesday, April 4.)

a. Direct a brief letter to members of the Oceans and Atmospheric Subcommittee (roster attached), opposing pre-emption and urging cooperative interaction as spelled out in the Stevens' Bill (and send copies of that letter to our ten Senators).

b. Send a copy of that letter along with supporting materials to the offices of the Gulf States Marine Fisheries Commission and Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission, requesting that they enlist support from their own compact states. (If this issue goes to the floor of the Senate, we can use all help available).

Two further thoughts—

1. We need quick action now in order to help win the battle in the Senate Subcommittee. However, there are significant long-term implications, as the issue will rise again. Therefore a broad-based effort seems desirable in the long view.

2. This pre-emption move came out of *Congress*, in response to voters who believe that nationalization of a problem automatically solves it. NOAA/NMFS do not favor this approach; in fact NOAA's Pollock took a real working-over at the Subcommittee hearings. We will not want to transfer our objections on this

Congressional initiative to "the Feds" generally, and particularly not to NOAA/NMFS, where the entire thrust so far has been for effective State-Federal interaction, with full State control inside the three-mile limit.

Attachments.

MEMBERSHIP OF OCEANS AND ATMOSPHERE SUBCOMMITTEE OF SENATE COMMERCE COMMITTEE

Ernest F. Hollings (D.S.C.), *Chairman*

DEMOCRATS	REPUBLICANS
John O. Pastore, Rhode Island	Ted Stevens, Alaska
Philip A. Hart, Michigan	Robert P. Griffin, Michigan
Russell B. Long, Louisiana	Marlow W. Cook, Kentucky
Daniel K. Inouye, Hawaii	(Mark Hatfield left this Committee
William B. Spong, Virginia	when appointed to Appropriations)

Text of Section 109 of Ted Stevens' S. 3161 Bill (the critical section) :

COOPERATION WITH STATES

Sec. 109. (a) The Secretary is atuhorized and directed to review from time to time the laws and regulations of States relating to protection and management of marine mammals which primarily inhabit waters or lands within the boundaries of a State. With respect to those States concerning which the Secretary is satisfied, as a result of such review, that State laws and regulations are consistent with the policies and purposes of this Act, the provisions of this Act relating to such marine mammals, except the provisions of this section, section 107, and section 110, shall not apply.

(b) The Secretary is authorized to make grants to each State whose laws and regulatoins relating to protection and management of marine mammals which primarily inhabit waters or lands within the boundaries of that State are found to be consistent with the purposes and policies of this Act. The purpose of such grants shall be to assist such States in developing and implementing State programs for the protection and management of such marine mammals. Such grants shall not exceed 50 per centum of the costs of particular program development and implementation. To be eligible for such grants, State programs shall include planning and such specific activities, including but not limited to research, censusing, habitat acquisition and improvement, or law enforcement as the Secretary finds contribute to the purposes and policies of this Act. The Secretary may also, as a condition of any such grant, provide that State agencies report at regular intervals on the status of species and populations which are the subject of such grants.

(c) The Secretary is authorized and directed to enter into cooperative agreements with the appropriate officials of any State for the protection and management of marine mammals; except that any such arrangement must be consistent with the purposes and policies of this title.

(d) There are authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year in which this section takes effect and for the next four fiscal years such sums as may be necessary to carry out this section.

Note.—The "excepted" sections, end of 1st paragraph concern the following matters, which would apply to qualifying states:

107: taking of marine mammals by native craftsmen are exempted from provisions of the bill.

110: refers to management of grants for research, etc.

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS,
Washington, D.C., March 7, 1972.

Mr. JOHN P. HARVILLE,
Executive Director, Pacific Marine Fisheries Commission,
Portland, Oreg.

DEAR JOHN: Thank you very much for your letter of March 3 on the ocean mammal legislation.

S. 3161 was introduced at the request of a number of groups that sponsored a concept of rational marine management. I introduced it specifically taking no

position on it. As a matter of fact, certain portions of that bill are of great concern to Alaska, particularly the native groups that must sell items made from ocean mammals in order to survive economically.

I am enclosing for your information a copy of S. 3161, as well as my recent speech on this subject on the Senate floor.

With best wishes,

Cordially,

TED STEVENS,
U.S. Senator.

Enclosures.

UNITED STATES SENATE
COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE,
Washington, D.C., March 13, 1972.

Mr. JOHN P. HARVILLE,
Executive Director, Pacific Marine Fisheries Commission,
Portland, Oreg.

DEAR MR. HARVILLE: Many thanks for your letter of February 16 concerning the federal-state relationship in the ocean mammal legislation. I totally agree with you. I think it is extremely important that the states be permitted to regulate animals within their jurisdiction. As you know, many states, such as Alaska, have extensive and excellent programs for marine mammal regulation and protection. These state agencies, staffed by knowledgeable and concerned biologists, are well-equipped to handle the various aspects of game management within the state jurisdictions.

Because your letter states so well this idea, I am going to include it in the hearing record.

Of course, when the record is printed, I shall be sure that you get a copy.

Again thank you very much for your interest and assistance in this matter.

With best wishes,

Cordially,

TED STEVENS, U.S. Senator

Alakanuk, Alaska, March 30, 1972.

Re Ocean Mammals—S. 1315, S. 2579.
Senator ERNEST F. HOLLINGS,
Senate Commerce Committee,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR HON. HOLLINGS: The passing # Bills 70 S. 1315 & S. 2579 will be a very bad mistake to the Coastal Villages of Alaska and can be very critical to the economy of the low income population of Alaska living along the coastal areas.

The availability of Ocean Mammals, especially along the Bering Sea Coast, is of vital importance to the people depending upon Walrus, Seal, and Whales for their food, clothing, and boats. The Ivory carving also provides a little income for the people.

The only income, besides welfare, food-stamps, etc., the coastal people have is from fishing during the summer (May to October) and hunting during the winter months (November to April) of which the meat is eaten, the fat is made into oil, ivory is carved for spears, harpoons, and as a small income, and the skins are made into boots, parkas, and skinboats. Even the intestines have their uses! Only a few skins are sold, such as; skins for boat coverings, mukluks or boots, parkas, etc.

Ocean Mammals are not being wasted, nor are they being abused by Alaskans that depend upon them for food and clothing. MORE WASTE WILL OCCUR IF THE SAID BILLS ARE PASSED. Using these mammals are about the only livelihood that the Coastal People have, and an abrupt change to this situation would be a crushing blow on the people dpending on the availability of Ocean Mammals as their way of life.

The Native Land Claims Bill is not providing any tangible income for these people and it looks like they won't have much for perhaps 10 years or so. This year's estimate is that each Alaskan Native may possibly receive around $24.00 per head count. That doesn't buy much food anywhere!

Most of the Coastal People are receiving some sort of aid to live on besides what they can hunt. If the Bills & S. 1315 & S. 2579 pass, it is very likely that

the amount of welfare and aid recipients in Western Alaska will be on the increase, accordingly.

Therefore, we feel that the passing of said bills would be contrary to the present administrations' policies and would also be a backward step for the United States Social Developments and economy plus Alaska's population. In short, the passing of Bills # S. 1315 & # S. 2579 would make the coastal people of Alaska more dependent upon the Federal Government for support.

In conclusion, we feel thet tha "Lower '48" has no right to do away with something that they have no immediate use for and of which Alaskans are dependant upon as a source of food, clothing, and income.

We wonder what would happen if someone from Alaska's Coastal Region was to introduce a bill banning the use of automobiles in the "Lower '48"? We wouldn't care one way or the other as we have no need for automobiles in Western Alaska where there are no roads. And just think of how such a bill would help the Air Pollution Problem!

Furthermore, we feel that Politicians should worry about their own environmental areas in-stead of playing games with other peoples' livelihood of which they know nothing or very little about!

The Council of Alakanuk, Alaska, on behalf of the people of Alakanuk and the Western Coastal Region population, hereby strongly opposes Bills # S. 1315 and # S. 2579.

Respectfully,

JOHN A. HANSON, *President.*

COVENANT HIGH SCHOOL,
Unalakleet, Alaska, April 10, 1972.

Senator ERNEST F. HOLLINGS,
Senate Commerce Committee,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR HOLLINGS: It has come to our attention that two bills, S. 1315 and S. 2579, would impose a very real hardship on a large group of the native people of western Alaska.

We hasten to preface any comments on these bills by stating that we, and all responsible people in our area, recognize the necessity of strict controls on the taking of ocean mammals. We have supported the state game management program as vital to the future of these resources and to the total ecology of the area.

As we understand these bills, however, they make no provision for the use of ocean mammals of the area except for "subsistence" purposes by the native people. This would eliminate the legitimate use of ivory, furs, etc. In producing items for sale—one of the very few means of income to many native people. To eliminate this income is simply another step toward killing incentive and encouraging welfare as a way of life.

We would like to go on record as approving the wise harvest of ocean mamals on a scientific basis. This leaves no room for irresponsible depletion, nor does it deprave responsible people of a legitimate resource.

Thank you for any consideration you can give to this viewpoint.

Sincerely,
ALFRED S. WHITE, *Principal.*

EMMONAH, ALASKA,
May 4, 1972.

MR .TED STEVENS
U.S. Senator.

DEAR MR. STEVENS: I've received your letter of April 17-72. of scheduled of the ocean mammals. Gee you peoples at the Senate, ask Eskimos on everything, now you ask for mammals, we use mukluk's, on boats bottoms and inside for food, and spotted and the one we catch in spring time for boots. and use the inside for food we never throw all the meats what we catch, on sea mammal's and white wales for food, the white skin is good food for everyone, meat's we dry them up. the oil's put them away for our oils, we use seal oil on dry fish dry meat, cooked meat, on ice cream, on boots, we use oil of the seals and skin on the things we use, so if we stay with out seals we'll have no boots for winter, our kids loves to use boots in winter time and love to eat the meat and seal oil. You can show this letter to Mr. Mike Gravel, we live with seal oil and meat,

from the time we are babies and grow and now our babies love seal oil and meat and skin for boots. So this is the first time I write to Senator's, I never write well and never talk good in English, but I can read and understand, but I don't understand the high words, we love to use boots and our kids loves to use boots in winter time, and meat to eat, dry, salted, or raw, but cooked seal oil's on everything. so gald to answer your letter.

With best wishes. Sincerely,

MRS. FLORA HOATCH.

P.S.—this short note will help you, I am an Alaskan Eskimo.

SHAKTOOLIK ALASKA,
May 7, 1972.

MY DEAR MYRTLE JOHNSON, When I hear By Redio your name so I start to write to you this morning yesterday I hear your name we got to write to you about minimum I understand that means seals We always need the seals for our to use them skin and seal oil to eat when the man's can't hunt them any more we will miss them at home there skin's and there seal oil so we dont need them to stop to hunt the seal's please tell them about that we alway's need them at home sometime's we need seal oil for Berries's when we eat you know it we use the skins for our boots even on winter and on summer or at spring when the weather is cold on spring or at Fall Time even us lady's cant use Rubber at Fall time when the weather getting cold we alway's need boots we need seal skin's boots even some nites man will need them when the Alaska getting cold sometime's on winter time it use to be very cold weather at Alaska that's why we can't miss the seal skin's at Alaska we can't use Shoe's on winter time when the weather cold even us lady's when our room cold our feet use to be cold at home that why we need skin boots. Even at home so we can't miss the skin's so please tell the Ted Steven's and Mike Gavel not to stop seal to hunt at Alaska and the fish at Alaska those we alway's need them at home so we try to make dry fish for winter at Summer time we don't need to hungered at Alaska with cold weather at winter time and we need warm parka at winter time. Well close with Love to you May God will help you with that mail

From your Loveing Friend,

BAAYIN ASICKSIK.

COLLEGE, ALASKA,
May 81, 1972.

SENATOR ERNEST HOLLINGS,
Chairman, Commerce Committee,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR HOLLINGS: I am writing to you concerning the proposed Sea Mammal legislation now being considered by your committee.

I am very interested in seeing that vanishing species are protected, but I am against this proposed legislation in its present form, for the following reasons:

1. The Eskimo villagers of western and northern Alaska not only obtain much of their food from sea mammals but they utilize extra by-products of these animals in the production of items for sale—for example:

a. Mukluks (boots—the best arctic footgear made)
b. Caps, mittens, purses, bags
c. Masks (of whale bone)
d. Baskets (of baleen)
e. Toys (stuffed toy animals, dolls, yoyos)
f. Ivory carvings
g. Seal hides (for rugs and wall hangings)
h. Model boats (baleen)
i. Many other miscellaneous items

In view of the limited income of most villagers, this legislation would cause great financial hardship among a group of people now existing on a marginal income. In other words, lots of them would have to go on welfare. Is this what the Senate wants??

2. This proposed legislation is discriminatory against whites, in saying that they would not be allowed to hunt sea mammals and that Natives would be allowed to do so. Not very many whites hunt seals and walrus now but they should be able to do so legally. Such a law would and could be challenged

under the Civil Rights Act. The whites who do hunt walrus must do so with a guide and quite a bit of money comes into a village with each white who uses that village as a hunting base. Under the proposed legislation, this source of income for the villagers would vanish.

3. It has not been proven to many peoples' satisfaction that ALL sea mammals are in danger of extinction. This proposed legislation is far too sweeping in banning the hunting of ALL sea mammals.

4. This legislation would only affect U.S. citizens, NOT the Russians and the Japanese who are the major harvesters of sea mammals at the present time. These people take whales WHICH ARE ENDANGERED but that are not hunted by the Eskimos.

5. This proposed legislation would be UNINFORCEABLE as law. Unless, of course, Federal Agents were stationed in every village, in every store, souvenir shop, bar, meeting place, etc., in Alaska. It would also create a brisk and illegal trade in souvenir items as the thousands of tourists who visit Alaska each year are NOT going to stop wanting sourvenirs. . . .

6. Many people from outside of Alaska are supporting this proposed legislation because they are laboring under the delusion that it will stop the killing of baby seals in the Gulf of St. Lawrence and off the coast of Labrador T.hey do not seem to be aware that these areas are located in CANADA, NOT in the United States.

I have been in Alaska for six years and in that time, I have visited many villages in northwestern Alaska (without an ax to grind). I have many friends who happen to be Eskimos, and having spent time in their homes, I am very much aware of how dependent they are upon sea mammals, both for food and for the production of craft items. The people who make these objects are men supporting families, women who suppliment the family's cash income, and elderly people who would find it impossible to earn cash in any other way.

Contrary to a belief held by some, the Eskimo do not prefer to live off welfare. Many are proud people who have struggled for years to remain independent of government handouts.

Where was all the interest in "saving sea mammals" when the United States had concerns that were actively engaged in commercial whaling??? I find current interest in passing such laws rather hypocritical now that 1) the U.S. is not engaged in commercial whaling and, 2) the whales concerned are practically extinct.

I find it especially sad to contemplate the current proposed legislation for I feel that it is an attempt by certain persons to jump on the ecological bandwagon during an election year at the expense of a small group of American citizens who happen to depend upon sea mammals for most of their food and much of their cash income.

If this proposed legislation passes into law as it now stands, the Eskimos will be the ones punished for a hundred years of commercial whaling and exploitation of sea resources carried on by outsiders. It is wonderful to see people waking up to the need for conserving natural resources, but the passage of this law would not improve matters.

I am sure that you and the committee want to be fair and I beg you to carefully consider the far-reaching effects of the current proposed Sea Mammal legislation on both the animals and the human beings that it would touch upon.

Sincerely,

(Mrs.) Sinah W. Larsen.

Ruby, Alaska,
May 10, 1972.

Senator Ted Stevens: It is with deep concern and sadness that I write this letter in relation to the upcoming Bill "Sea Mammal Act." While the people in the lower forty-eight states are searching out the lost arts and the interest is so widespread, you the people of the U.S. Senate and House of Representatives are considering destroying natural arts which are so beautiful and show such a differentiation in comparison to ivory carvings thru out the world. This fine trade is passed on from generation to generation and the handiwork is unique in design, and is Alaska, as the people see the beauty in the actions of the animals, they carve it. In Europe I had to pay a fine sum just for a pr. of ivory earrings with an ordinary design. It is time to realize that fine art is of interest to everyone and you won't find the intricate carvings done elsewhere so intricately

as in Alaska. A child starts out young learning to do the carving of polar bears, etc., out of Ivory. It is a natural and beautiful art that depicts Alaska. Don't destroy this beauty and then realize what a mistake was made in passing this bill, when there are no longer any carvings such as there is now and make it a lost art that people are looking for so desperately in other parts of the world. When you take away the arts of a people you may as well take away the Alaskan way. People I have talked to thru out the world speak highly of Alaska and it's peoples natural talents. If you pass this Bill you destroy much more than you realize.

I intend to have a story you'll forever remember hit the news media. It will depict many viewpoints of my life as an Alaskan and how I got a pr. of shoes and clothes to keep me warm. The Garments that kept me warm in my early childhood were handmade, tailormade and I wouldn't trade them for the cheap factory made garments ever. We don't destroy what is vital to our livelyhood as many people who have come to Alaska have done. It would be a degradation on anyones part in the interests of the original Alaskans to pass this Bill. "Sea Mammal Act." More and more the rapid changes taking place in Alaska by various groups show the destruction of a land so well loved by Alaskans and others alike. This puts a disruption in the book I am writing. I am an Alaskan at one time I interviewed Gov. Egan while I was in Sitka.

I am deeply concerned at the complete turnabout of viewpoints then in comparison to now. We were told so many times to hang on to our heritage and be proud of what we stand for. We were also told to keep up our natural talents in handiwork and not let it fade out. As I see it, the change disgusts me. Who is for the people of Alaska? Many people in the House of Representatives fail to realize until they've lived the hard life we've lived to survive, that they are showing disregard for the people themselves. I can shoot an ace in a card since I was fifteen, not merely for sport, but out of necessity to help our people make it thru a long cold winter, food, clothing, and an extra few dollars from carving and needlework. At a distance of 50 ft. Think before you destroy.

Sincerely,

PEARL BROWN SOUTHAM.

SCAMMON BAY, ALASKA,
May 3, 1972.

DEAR TED STEVENS: As you have have promised even it is a state that it would not change our way of Living so let the way of our hunting be. this fall I caught 1 seal we ate the meal and oil. the Inside I gave them to dogs. the skin boots.

FROM TOM and LULU TUNUTONOCK.

HOOPER BAY, ALASKA
May 1, 1972.

DEAR FRIEND, TED: Very glad to receive your letter today and good to hear too. Yes we use lots time ocean all kind of seal and seal oil too. and we Eskimo use seal oil like this in spring we hunt seal's then skin dry up. often dry we put a oil in seal skins then save it for winter then after season we fishing then fish dry then smoked after smoket we put dry fish in to the seal skin with seal oil and we save it for winter and all summer we not seal hunt and in September we start seal hunt again then we seal hunt all winter because we Eskimo like to eat all kind of from Ocean oil every time when we eat we take a seal oil better then other an d please, please help us we need help we don't want to stop seal hunt and when we eat something with out seal oil our stomachs kind of sick so.

Again please help us and please tell Mike he can help you and help us too so please help us both of you

thank you very much.

From your truly,

GUY MANN.

PERRYVILLE, ALASKA, *May 5, 1972.*

Senator TED STEVENS,
Old Senate Office Building
Washington D.C.

DEAR SENATOR STEVENS: Concerning the meetings May 11, and May 12, 1972, in Nome and Bethel, and the Sea Mammal Bill:

We regret to inform you that at this time we will be unable to send a representative to either meeting May 11, or May 12, due to financial limitations. Because of our concern in regards to this present bill we would like however to pass along the following information.

1) We use Spotted Seals and Sea Lions as a source of food for our families.

2) We utilize the entire seal and what is not used immediately is salted down for future use.

3) Following is a list of the utilized parts:

a. meat—Spare ribs, heart, liver, kidneys, tongue, neck, hind quarters, shoulders, and back. These are prepared by boiling, baking, or frying.

b. guts—intestines, eaten; stomach, used to store oil.

c. fat—Melted down into seal oil which is used to spice many dishes much the same as Mayonaise.

d. skin—clothing, footware, and rugs.

e. FLIPPERS—eat them.

f. nose—eat them.

g. whiskers—used for toothpicks.

4) Items not encluded in the above list are feed to the dogs.

We would oppose any Bill that would not be in the best interest of our future utilization of this food source.

We would encourage any legislation however, that would prohibit or limit the killing of seals by sportsman.

Boris R. Kosbruk, President; Harry O. Kosbruk, Vice President; Marvin Yagie, Executive Director; Moses Kosbruk, Council; John Kosbruk, Council; Andronic Kosbruk, Council; Thomas Phillips, Council; Ralph Phillips, Council.

Sincerely yours,

VILLAGE COUNCIL, *Native Village of Perryville.*

ST. PAUL ISLAND, ALASKA.

Hon. TED STEVENS, Hon. MIKE GRAVEL.

If the sea mammal Bill should pass, it would hurt both St. Paul and St. George as well as the Northwest region. As for the Pribilofs, it would mean no employment at all. The majority of the people depend on the annual fur seal harvest. It creates jobs for us during the 3 months of summer and part of the fall, which means the majority only works about 5 or 6 months of the year. The fur seal harvest is controlled by the government. It is done in a humane method. Just this year, Arts & Crafts was introduced to St. Paul which will be a help economically to the people in many ways. In stopping the harvest this will be taken away. It will also interfere with our newly won self-governing. Since we are now going in the 4th class city, we are more and more dependent on our share of money from the fur seal harvest in which we Need to maintain the city. The people either freeze or salt the seal meat and flippers during the harvest for winter use. The majority of them use these when their unemployment checks don't come in the mail and they are unable to buy groceries. What meat is left by the locals are taken and turned into mink or dog food. The fishing industries in Alaska would be harmed by this bill also. So in passing this bill, they will take away our only means of survival on the Pribilofs. If God didn't mean for man o use animals for food and clothing why did he make man better than animal? After all man cannot just sit and watch the animals over populate. In trying to control population explosion man made birth control, by the seal harvest, man controls the over population of the seals.

ALEXANDER GALANN

Senator Stevens, Senator Gravel, members of the Committee and my fellow Americans.

My name is Tikhon Stepetin. I am here to represent the Aleuts of the Pribilofs, as a proud Alaskan Native and American Citizen.

As an Aleut, and an Alaskan Native, I can appreciate the moral aspects of this Bill concerning conservation. When it comes down to protecting our natural resources, I don't believe that you'll find anyone more conservative-minded than the Alaskan Native. We have been living for centuries under laws of conservation that were already set down by Mother Nature.

It is my belief, that in submitting this Bill, certain segments of people in this great Union are attempting to ease their consciences concerning the rape of our natural resources, throughout the whole of our United States, throughout the many, many past years. This is all very good, I feel that it needs well be done; but I do not feel that it should be done at the expense of Alaska and Alaskan Natives.

I am dedicated to the fact that we have a moral obligation to our lower animal life. But I feel that we have higher moral obligations—that of Man to Mankind.

I am not sure if Congress is aware of it, but I want this on the conscience of every Senator on Capitol Hill, that if this Bill goes through in its present form, it passes as a death warrant for two large Alaskan Native Communities. These are the communities of St. Paul and St. George Islands, whose only means of existence is maintaining a conservation program designed to protect the North American Fur Seal. The irony of this Bill is that it may do away with the program and permit the possible extermination of a species of ocean-going mammal, the Alaskan Fur Seal. From that point of view, I feel that this Bill is defeating it's own purpose. It is not a question of conserving certain species of our ocean-going mammals. Congress is considering whether or not to preserve the Alaskan Native's unique way of life. Congress is questioning whether or not to preserve the unique culture of Alaska and Alaskan Natives. Congress is questioning whether or not to allow the Aleut people to survive as a species of the Human Race.

This all adds up to one big question. Will Congress vote against this Bill and by doing so, prevent another case of Man's Inhumanity to Man.

Thank you very much,

TIKHON G. STEPETIN.

My name is Jason Bourdukofsky, an Aleut, Chairman of the Aleut Community of St. Paul Island.

This proposed legislation is very injurious to the social and economic welfare of my people and other Alaskan Natives. My people are very scared and concerned. They feel about the future is being darkened.

We just incorporated as a fourth class city and were really looking forward to the future.

The Pribilof fur seal has through the years has increased in number from near extinction, do to conservation and proper management by my people and government biologists. When the fur seal is gone, during the winter, we eat sealion meat. All of the carcass is edible. We do not go and kill these mammals just for sport. When we need them, we hunt them.

If this bill passes, what are you planning to do for us natives? Have you all planned a new economy for us? Where are you going to move us? What of the elderly people, will they survive a longer life on beef, turkey, chicken and etc.? If so, who is going to buy this for them? Are they willing to teach our people a new way of life.

The land claims don't buy our food. IT WANTS US TO CHOOSE LAND AWAY FROM home, land that the state or federal Government don't want. 95% of our people haven't lived away from home.

If the Pribilof fur seal is not properly managed, they would multiple to a great extent and food would be scarce for them. There would not be enough breeding grounds. Foreign nations would kill them because they claim they eat fish. Disease would be great in the herd. Is this what Congress wants?

Is Congress willing to throw out one of the greatest conservation moves that the United States has been involved with, out the window? I would like to ask every member of congress to really study the Fur Seal program before they make a move on this act. Let it be on their conscience if the herd does not survive due to poor management and research.

Over the years thousands of foreign ships have been around the Bering Sea, and Pribilof Islands. We have been pushing for a harbor as a alternate move for economy, way before this act was introduced, but no action has been taken. Now if this bill passes, we will be left without any economy at all.

I would also like every member of congress to come to Alaska and see for themselves how the ocean mammals are being used by the native people, before they make any hasty decisions.

Rather than have to listen to various organizations there make false statements on ocean mammals.

I ask this committee and all others to please help us to defeat this unjust act. Don't darken our future, but brighten it for us Alaskan Natives.

Example, of over population of sea mammal. At St. George Is. The sealions get over populated and don't have enough food so they go out at sea and eat fur seal pups. It is a bloody sight to see.

NELSON ISLAND,
Tunundk Alaska, April 30, 1972.

DEAR SENATOR STEVENS: I would like to make myself clear not, only for myself this also goes with people. I have also heard complaints from people from different places here in Alaska. First of all this question has been asked. If they pass the Bills of ocean mammals, to stop selling mammals in fact some parts. How will we survive? Will money feed us for life? The Answer is no. If that Bill is passed we would all turn to dust, starve to death. Sea mammals are part of our life. We like to go on as we have been doing all our lives for centuries. Okey, I'll take my part in explaining about how we use them. first of all we use the skins for warmth of our feet for our children also for money for our children not only for ourselves. The fats for our oil, Seal oil for food. Meat, for our food so that we could survive and not go hungry or starve to death. the insides for raincoats and also livers for food and we feed our dogs with the insides that are of not fit for us our dogs have to survive like us. Like I said the mammals feeds us through out the whole year. It's part of our life. I wish I could really get this thru your head and really make you understand. It is really very important. And I can't fully explain because I don't have that much education. Thank you.

ELSIE HOOPER.

MAY 12, 1972.

MARINE MAMMAL RESOURCE BILL

Honorable Chairman, Distinguished Guests, Friends, Colleagues,

(1) My name is Carl W. Merculief, I am speaking for the people of St. Paul Island and St. George Island. I was born and raised on St. George Island I have lived my entire life on the Pribilof Islands, except for my 5½ years in the U.S. Army during which I spent 3½ years in Vietnam.

OUR USE OF THE MARINE MAMMALS FOR FOOD

(A) During the fur seal killing season June and July of each summer, after the skins are taken, my people take the meat, the meat is eaten during the summer and is frozen and put away for the long winter months, the meat is also salted for the winter. During the winter months my people and myself hunt sealion for meat, since the fur seals leave the Islands for the winter. None of the meat is wasted, the biproducts of the seals are made into Hamburger meat and frozen for mink feed, outside of the Islands.

JOBS

(B) For centuries my people have depended on the fur seal harvest, for work. If this bill is passed about 90 percent of my people will be unemployed, and we are afraid of this happening, how will we support our families, even our school children would have no way of earning any money for the school year.

(C) The harvest of the fur seals on the Pribilof Islands is controlled by the National Marine Fisheries Service, so there is never any mass slaughter of any kind of sea mammal.

(D) Under the fur seal act of 1966, Public Law 89–702 States in Section 104, The Secretary shall, take and cure fur sealskins on the Pribilof Islands and on lands, subject to the jurisdiction of the United States whenever he deems such taking and curing is necessary to carry out the provisions of the Convention or manage the fur seal herd, and to employ natives of the Pribilof Islands. Most of my people have worked the fur seal harvest all their lives, are you willing to train them for different jobs if the bill is passed?

(E) High seas Pelagic sealing, foreign vessels would be killing the sea mammals if the bill is passed, There would be mass slaughter and the fur seals would become exstinct as they almost did before. It would not matter what sex of sea mammal is taken or what age.

(F) Thru control we will have a continuing resource Without control we will have a wanton waste. We do have control with our present system of management. I am certain that there can be only one conclusion, Continuance of our present controlled harvest, I am asking you for my people and myself not to pass this bill. Thank you very much.

STATEMENT BY GREGORY FRATIS

Senator Stevens, Senator Gravel, Distinguished guests and Fellow Alaskans, my name is Gregory Fratis and I am an Aleut from St. Paul Island.

I want to thank you Senator Stevens and Senator Gravel for giving us the opportunity to testify to you and to the Congress of the United States. My deepest and sincere thanks will come to you when this bill is defeated and thrown in the waste paper basket where it rightfully belongs. I feel the animals, waterfowls and fishes of the lower 48 states should be the ones who should be getting all bills and acts pertaining to them instead of to our State and its native people. Reason I say this is because most of the wildlife in the lowers 48 are dying from pollution, in other words poisoned by waste materials drained in lakes and rivers by big industries which produce various chemicals and products. They should be the ones to be getting all the pressures instead of us natives of Alaska. I believe we harvest our wildlife in the most conservative humane way, none of the meat or other parts of animal is wasted, everything is put to good use.

Now about our Fur Seal Industry. The fur seal industry which we have now and hope and pray will continue on for the benefit of my people and the world is our only source of employment and income. Without the fur seal, I believe the Community of St. Paul and St. George would not exist today. The fur seal carcass is not wasted in any way. All that is not consumed by the people is processed into food for mink and that even includes the bones. The carcass of the seal is ground and made similar to the way ground beef is processed. The teeth of the seal is used for Arts & crafts items to be sold to the tourists which come to St. Paul every year to watch the harvesting of the seals. Now I would like to know how this bill will effect the Fur seal treaty we have with Russia, Japan and Canada? Also, I would like to mention that our Fur seals have been found to have large quantities of mercury in the meat, especially in the liver. So this makes me believe that pollution itself will cause the extinction of the fur seals instead of the method of which we harvest them each year.

Senator Stevens I need not say any more because this matter was discussed before when Bill S 1315 was introduced and defeated. I thought our problems were over then. Now this new Ocean Mammal Bill is similar to it. I feel the Congress of the United States is unfair and have been listening to false statements made by organizations and other parties about the harvesting of fur seals and also of all the Ocean Mammals which dwell in the Alaskan waters. I feel it would be of great importance to my people also for the native people of Alaska if all you Senators and Congressman would come to Alaska and see for yourselves instead of reading and hearing false statements of what is happening to our Ocean Mammals and all the other species of animals and waterfowls of our beautiful state.

I am thankful this bill will not effect us like it is effecting our fellow brothers, the Eskimoes. I feel this bill will bring them much harm to their culture their way of life and their diet of consuming food they get from the sea. I will fight this bill to protect my people and our fellow Alaskans throughout Alaska from being passed in the most democratic way, I know, without breaking any laws of the constitution of the United States.

NELSON ISLAND

Nightmute, Alaska, April 24, 1972.

RURALCAP,
Bethel, Alaska.

We came to our senses with the seas as valuable as our land. Food is often short for the long winter. When we heard of the bill we had nothing to look forward to. Everyone at Nightmute and the coast live with the sea. Some may not think of catching for sale, but we also have to think of our inland brothers who also desire this sea food and sea animal materials for use like Eskimo boots, parkas, and various other types of clothing.

This winter, especially, we are short on food. It is an unusually long winter; there is shortage of food, and since we survive on sea foods we would like to ask if you would please consider our needs before passing the bill taking away our life survival.

A year never goes by that we do not make use of the sea for food and survival. We get our catches in the Spring.

It is not only the meat and oil we use, we also make use of the skins for clothing. There is no waste in our catches. We do not catch our sea animals to waste away, like some of our white brothers do. We have very much respect for the catch of our own and our sons' and grandsons' catches.

During the Spring season the weather is not always clement for hunting. Some ofus who are too old to go hunting depend on the catches of our younger people. Sometimes the catch is not always plentiful.

There is no doubt that all of the peoples of the Kuskokwim and the Yukon Rivers make use of and need skins, meat and seal oil. We know that all of the people of Alaska would like to go on obtaining the sea animals for subsistence.

Our area is not an economically developed area. We depend on the sea for our food and clothing. There is much sharing in catches, as we realize the needs of our brothers, as they realize our needs. It is not joyful to see our children and grandchildren hungry.

If the bill prohibits hunting of sea animals at any time the people will listen to the hunger of their families and hunt even against the bill. The whole Alaskan western coast-line will be violating the law and the jails will be constantly filled if the law is strongly enforced. The hunters go to the sea to take care of the subsistance needs of their families, and not for sports. Even if they would not want to break the law they will do so because they do not receive bi-weekly salary checks, nor do they just open a refrigerator for meat before meal time. We do not want our children to break any laws, and we want you to know our feelings and beliefs to save any hardships between our children and the government in the future. If the bill passes and becomes law prohibiting any killing of sea animals there will be many times when our hunters will go against the government and its enforcing officials because they will go ahead and try to get the food for their families the only way they know how. We have always tried to follow all laws of the government. But if the people are prohibited to hunt for the sea animals we all know, and you all know, that there will be many of the coast people hunting against the law. The hunting will not be done in hiding, as this is not the way hunting takes place. Preparation for and arrival back from hunting takes place before the eyes of the whole village. So it cannot be said that one goes hunting in a sneaky manner.

Everyone of us is Eskimo around here. We all have to eat our own native food, and there is no question about it. We cannot possibly go without it. We all know that if the bill becomes law prohibiting hunting for subsistence many will be commiting crimes against the law. Please try to fathom the great desire to survive in a way somewhat different from yours, and thus see why the hunters will continue to go out. They will not sit around obeying a law when their families are starving.

We did not experience this ourselves but it has been told us that quite some years back during a great starvation people would be on the look out for any kind of animal. The hunters would have a night-watchman to keep watch for any appearance of animals during the night. The people in the villages also had night-watchmen to be on the look-out for any possible animals during the night. It is said that the inland Eskimos survived by eating the soles of their Eskimo boots—this is made from the seal skin. We see the great need to keep our right to continue hunting for our subsistence.

Please pass on all of this information to the proper authorities so that they can get a picture of our feelings. We are considered the elders of our village.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

SIPARY CHUKFAK
TIM AKAGTAK
DAN JOE

ISIDORE TULIK.

STATEMENT BY GABRIEL STEPETIN

Honorable Senator Stevens, Senator Gravel, members of the Committee and fellow Americans.

Thank you Mr. Chairman: My name is Gabriel Stepetin from St. Paul Island representing the Aleut PEOPLE OF THE Pribilof's on the Ocean Mammals Bill's.

We the Aleut's ask you to continue the harvesting of the North Pacific Fur Seal's. If the harvesting is termniated it will take away what we have been fighting for years, self-determination. We have been second class citizen's all our lives, now that we are finding ourselves and becoming first class citizens, if this Ocean Mammal Bill passes as it is, it will put us back to what we were years ago. You are telling us to use our ancient way of hunting after you have been telling us to civilize and live your way. All us natives, Aleuts, Eskimo's, and Indians have protected all mammals effectively and successfully without any waste. As you are aware the Fur Seal harvesting has been the most humane way of harvesting in the name of conservation. And every part of the seal carcass is processed and we freeze and salt and dry the meat for the winter, and the intestines are used for craft. We also make cheese from the flipper's, like you do with the pig's head, if Im ay the nuts are just like oyster's when fried. Let me assure you again nothing is wasted. It is also done to the Seal-lion, these are the only mammals we use on the Pribilof's for consumption.

By passing the Bill as it is, you are the ones that are going to endanger the Fur Seal's and the othar species. There was a comment made in the House of Representatives, that there were going to be instant millionaires in Alaska due to the land claim. I am making this statement because it is false, especially in the Pribilof's and the Aleutian chain.

We as Aleut species of the human race are fighting for our survival to have the Seal harvest continued, not only as our economy, but to keep the future Aleut's together and to be protected from distinction and losing their cultures.

STATEMENT BY MRS. MARY FRATIS

My name is Mrs. Mary Fratis. I am an Aleut from St. Paul Island, I am also the president of the Arts & Crafts industry on St. Paul Island. Like the rest of my fellow representatives mentioned we need the fur seal Harvest ot continue for our little industry to exist to make its various items to sell to the tourists. Without the fur seal we cannot make these things. We receive rejects skins from the Fur Seal Harvest. By rejects I mean skins which are torn or have been damages during their processing stage. From these skins we make items like gloves, slippers, hats and items like this bag I have here in front of me se you see we feel it is a must that this bill be abolished, not for the benefit of my people, but, for all the natives of Alaska. We hope and pray that in the near future which we have now could be manufactured in large quantities to be sold to private enterprize such as Sears Roebuck and Company. So you see why we want the fur seal Harvest to continue. I am representing all the women on St. Paul Island. I hope the wives of all you senators & congressmen understand our problem and try persuading your husbands in abolishing this bill.

Thank you.

KONGIGANAK, ALASKA,
April 30, 1972.

PHILLIP GUY,
A.U.C.P. President,
Bethel, Alaska

DEAR PHILLIP (this is the copy of Letter we send to Ted Stevens. We send this to you to read it.)

We are writing you of this sea mammal problem, we the womens from this place of Kongiganak are meeting here. To write this letter. All of us from this place don't agree of what is happening to this kind of living we are in. As we are living trying to get what we need; we do our best to work and do our best to do on working on things to sell on seal skins. When we are doing and work on them, it hard to work and clean them. When we work on them it takes long time to finish them. And when we finish them we sell them. But we don't get enough money from them to get things we need. When the mens get and bring them home after hunting. We don't throw away what we don't need. We take care of everything we are working on. And we always don't have seals all the time. And we don't have lots to work on even its in hunting season. Sometimes we don't have enough to hold to all through the winter. We are all worryed about this sea mammal Business. Cause we all the eskimo people live good only through the foods from the sea. And we don't like this to happen to us as are always counting on the food we eat from seals and rest of the foods we eat from land & sea. And as we are living here in this village. When a man gets a seal all the people share one seal to the whole village. All the people eat one seal when a man gets one. And that way you can see that all the mens can't go hunting. Some can't get to hunt as others. And as we do this, theres lots of family's that don't have men to hunt for them. And another thing we don't throw away the intestines away. We make rain coats out of them and they're the best we use during bad weather. And it takes long time to finish them. So I wish all of you who are helping us understand that all the people don't have jobs to work with. Most of them don't have jobs and don't have help in doing the things that are hard to do. We the womens here in this village are against this sea mammal law. And we will always be against this the laws that don't are right for the people We the Eskimo peoples. And we won't quit making things we usually work on. We will keep on working on Eskimo Crafts. This is all. We will write again soon. Thank you.

1. Mary Azean; 2. Julia Jimmy; 3. Mary Otto; 4. Ruth Igkurak; 5. Lilly A. Lewis; 6. Elizabeth David; 7. Olga Mute; 8. Katie Phillip; 9. Susie Chanigkak; 10. Julia P. Jimmy; 11. Edna S. Andrew; 12. Elena Phillip; 13. Fannie J. Otto; 14. Sarah A. David; 15. Carrie Daniel; 16. Minnie Mute; 17. Mary Black; 18. Molly Buzz; 19. Mary Warm; 20. Kay Neesa; 21. Polly C. Brown; 22. Julia A. Phillip; 23. Anni Mute.

STATEMENT BY MARGARET NICK COOKE

Hon. Senator Stevens, Senator Gravel, and member of the Committee, my name is Margaret Nick Cooke from Bethel. I am a housewife and a mother of a 15 month baby. I am presently on the City Council of Bethel.

I am in strong opposition of the Marine Mammal Protection Act of 1971. It is a bill, if passes, that would tell me and many others that we no longer can have seal meat and seal oil which I have been eating since I was my baby's age. Yes, you may say that we can use sea mammals for subsistence purposes but for many of us, we buy seal oil and meat. Like we buy bacon and eggs. Our immediate area does not have seals that is why we buy seal meat and seal oil from the coast. And believe me, my body must have seal oil. I eat it almost daily. It is necessary for us like you people have to have salad oil on your salad.

I am not familiar with statistics but there are no jobs in this area especially in the Villages other than Bethel. In the Villages there are usually 5 or 6 jobs. All of the others depend on seasonal jobs to support a number of usually ten people. Ninety per cent or more of our food is from the land and sea. The coast people hunt seals and the in-landers hunt for salmon fish. There are much exchange of fish for seal meat and seal oil. Many people buy seal oil if there is no exchange of food.

Native people do not hunt sea mammals to add to their collection of decorations on their walls like many people do in the lower 49 states. We use all parts of the animal. We, by no means, take just the tusks or the skin. We take it all and utilize every part of the animal.

I am young considering the other testifiers, but I have been told by many people especially my father to always use every part of any animal so that I would get more the next time I go hunting. That I should never waste any food or get more than what I can utilize. Which means I should not get any food that I will allow to sit and waste. My husband, who is a white man, says this is conservation, and that Natives are the real conservationists. We have had many heated discussions about this. I say its a means of our survival—of which it is.

If this bill is to be enacted, in order for our Congress to be fair to all, our Congress should initiate a bill which would ban some of the necessary jobs such as the existence of all airplane pilots. I would not like to see some people be discriminated of when we are being treated special. No, people should be treated equal. People should always respect other people's occupations.

I respect your job as a senator, I hope you give our job and occupation the same respect.

After you have heard our testimony, I know that you will kill this bill. I know that you all are sensitive to people's needs; that is why people vote for you. I thank you for your actions in our favor.

BETHEL, *May 13, 1972.*

Mr. Stevens, my grateful thanks for your coming to Bethel to hold some hearings about this Bill. I'm the mother of 2 boys and 4 girls, and I'm working hard in trying to take care of them all by myself. My two boys aren't old enough to hunt by this time, but I think they'll be in the near future. I'll keep praying and hoping that this Bill would not pass and for you to be strong on your speeches to get this mess straightened out because some day if my boys are old enough they might be going hunting seals for us to eat, for me to make arts & crafts also for many other uses.

Thank you again.

Yours truly,

ESTHER GREEN.

Senators Stevens and Gravel, members of the committee the people of the Southwestern Alaska are concerned about this legislation in regards to the sale of Native Arts & Crafts & clothing & part of the sea or all of the Marine Mammal.

In this area, approximately 98% of the village people are jobless. There are seasonal jobs in the summertime. This includes cannery work, some commercial fishing. And for the last 5 years fire fighting. Commercial fishing & Cannery work are for 2 months only. Fire fighting could be 2–6 weeks only.

In order to survive, the people in this area have used the sea or marine mammal for ages. Whether it be for food, clothing, and shelter and as a means of transportation, the way of living is the hardest way in this area (Alaska) compared to other parts of the country.

We are not a wasteful people. We do not sell and make money for the sake of making money or to "keep up with the Jones". We do with what we can do.

With the high cost of living in this country and especially in the Southwestern Alaska, it is impossible to live as near comfortably as we want to without the sale of Arts & Crafts and clothing.

I strongly feel and fully support to be included in this bill the sale of the maring mammal; whether it be in Arts & Crafts, dressed, undressed or otherwise.

I urge you the congressmen to be in fairness and to act wisely when this bill reaches the floor.

Respectfully

MARY MCGREGORY,
for the entire Southwestern, Alaska.

BETHEL, ALASKA, *May 12, 1972.*

To Senator Stevens, Mr. Stevens:

Let me be the first one to thank you for bringing about this subject matter to the attention of the nation. To me, you are the most qualified Senator to take

care of this matter. You are from Alaska, your home state is the home of DEOMCROCY and SEAL eating Eskimos.

If some other senator outside the state of Alaska would have brought this matter up before the congress, we the Alaskan Eskimos would not have been given this much consideration. I tell you, we would have gone into real trouble if some other Senator other than Senator Stevens would have brought this subject matter up before the Congress.

My derive toward continuation of our right to sell our arts and crafts out of seal mammal have to be explained this way. . . .

Let us, you, and I, think and go back 20 years. Twenty years back we utilized, the seal skin in two main ways.

The mukluks and kayak, which were fully utilized at that time. Today, the kayaks are no longer in use, due to the fact, they are being replaced by motor boats and today the modern technology has brought to us and to the world, the most prefected shoes and boots that are most competitive to the mukluks.

So regardless of the remarks which you have heard so far, we all want to thank you and wish you much luck, in the future.

Respectfully your,

JOSEPH L. CHIKOYAK.

May 12, 1972.

SEA MAMMAL HEARINGS

My name is Marva Melovidov. I was born on the Island of St. Paul in the Pribilof Group. I would like to talk about the present status of sea mammals on our island and the necessity to keep the good management that we have today.

Honorable chairman, committee members, friends and fellow petitioners. I have come today to talk of the Sea Mammal Bill that is presently being debated in the halls of Congress. I would like to point out for you some of the items that I believe need close scrutiny and thought before this bill is passed.

We on the Pribilofs use the meat of the sea lion, fur, and hair seal for our food. These have been traditional dishes that have been prepared by our parents and grandparents. This is the food to which we have become accustomed. If the Sea Mammal Bill is passed we will be denied the use of this traditional necessity. Another aspect of the bill is monetary. We will not be able to make a living. The entire economy of the Island where I have my home is dictated by the management of the fur seal herd. With it we have prospeity—without we have welfare.

If we stand by and do not use sound management principles we will jeopardize the entire northern fur seal herd. Without th sound management prctices that are now in force the taing of fur seal on the high sea—Pelagic Sealig—will once again start. This is a waste that is inexcusable. The taking of females, the loss of mammals as they slip beneath the surface of the cold waters and the taking of pups. Sound management will have gone for naught. The only thing that will stop the sealing will be a full hold in a ship.

The FUR Seal Treaty of 1911 has protected the Fur Seal from extinction. With the passage of the present Mammal Bill they will once again become an endangered specie.

Thank you for this opportunity.

Sincerely,

MARVA MELOVIDOV.

STATEMENT BY HEDY LESTENKOF

Senator Stevens, Senator Gravel, members of the Committee and my Fellow Americans, my name is Hedy Lestenkof, I am an Aleut of St. Paul Island, Alaska. I am here to represent my people on the Ocean Mammal Bill.

I wish all you Senators were able to take a trip to the Pribilof Island's and see exactly howthin gs are operated on the Fur Seal Harvesting. We do not harvest seals under the age of 3 years. I am ashamed that the people of the United States would believe what a few people have said about the seal pups being slaughtered, which isn't true. These people who stated this have only been on St. Paul Island for a few days. Our Fur Seal harvesting is done in the most humane way. All parts of the Fur Seals after harvesting are used by my people. For instance, the meat is usually salted or we freeze them for the winter. There

is nothing wasted, even the flippers are salted. In the past many other method's for harvesting the Fur Seals have been tried, but the only humane way of harvesting is being done today.

If this Ocean Mammal Bill should pass, we would be driven away from our homes because there would be no income on the Pribilof's.

If this should happen, what would become of my people since many of them have not had the opportunity to even get a high school education, because they were taken away from school to work for the Government at the age of 16. If they should be driven away from their homes, will they be able to get job's else where? We don't want to live under Welfare the rest of our lives, the same as anyone else doesn't in the United States.

If my people were to be separated to different parts of the world because of this Bill, will our children and grandchildren recognize our Aleut race? This is why we are fighting for our survival as Aleuts.

Listen and hear us Aleuts, Indians and Eskimos of Alaska and not only the few white men that have been here for a visit and think they have seen everything.

We the Aleuts ask you Senator's to think of the people of Alaska also and not only the Ocean Mammal's. If this Bill should pass, the Ocean Mammal's would take the place of the few Aleut's who exist today. So we ask you not to pass this Bill.

Thank you.

If you abolish the treaty, how will you go about protecting the Fur Seal? The United States has no conservational jurisdiction over the high seas. There would be no way of the United States protecting the Fur Seals and the other Ocean Mammals outside its own ocean boundaries. We have been negotiating with Red Russia a communist country for years on arms limitation. On that point, all we have been getting is promises. On the other hand, Red Russia and other nations had been honoring a national commitment on conservation. We would lose that by the passage of this bill. We as Aleuts, are fighting for survival as a human race. In this endeavor we feel that we are fighting for the survival of the Alaskan Northern Fur Seal and other Ocean going mammals.

I urge you Senator's to make a trip to the Pribilof Island's to see exactly how we will be situated if this Ocean Mammal Bill passes.

Thank you.

HOOPER BAY, ALASKA,
May 9, 1972.

Re Sea Mammals.

To: Hon. TED STEVENS, Hon. MIKE GRAVEL, All Present Officials, And all my fellow citizens.

I would like to be heard as each and everyone of you fellow Alaskans especially to those who inheritantly made their residence along the coast of Alaska.

I average a catch of five common seals, one or two spotted seals and two to three oogruks per year since I have become dependent on my own. From these catches and local subsistence living I have learned to use the whole seal as follows.

The skin—used for parka or jacket, mukluks, soles, cold winter cured for mukluk straps, rope, tying tools and sleds, skin for boat and kayak, food in case of emergencies, and arti-crafts to sell. Also clothing from skin is used to obtain money, what is very scarce in winter.

Oil, fat or blubber—to obtain money, seasoning for foods, cooking, preserving food such as fish, making akutuk (Eskimo ice cream), skin softener such as kayaks, boats, waterboots, and is a must to possess for all the people on the coast as well as the Interior. I also know a lot of White people who use seal oil in their food and the number is growing.

Meat—food, what is not used when fresh it is dried or aged to be preserved for future use. Also is used for money.

Seal Stomach—is dried if not eaten, used for preserving oil, back pack for picking berries, and bouy for nets.

Seal Intestines—food, most warmest rainparka in the world and can be used for window.

Muscles—used for sewing thread, fish nets, twine and is cooked and eaten in emergencies.

Bones—used for tools, hunting weapon parts, net sinkers, cooking and eating utinsils.

So in all common sense the Bill which we are gathered for does not make any sense, looking at it from different angles. Surely we are concerned in ecology and want to preserve the nature. But I do not see any harm in hunting for sea mammals for food and some income. From the papers I read once in a while, the oil and carelessness of disposals is more harmful to ecology than subsistance and small economic living.

In my village and area we seldomly catch walrus, so the ivory carver depends on other villages that do catch some, also dead walrus that washes in ashore averages once a season.

So therefore, I am hoping, as a voter, Alaskan, citizen, human, hunter, and father, for the law-making body for us reconsider as humanely as they can the Sea Mammal Bill because it is a still vital thing for most of us. I thank you for this very little time which to speak up, for it may be the most important few minutes of most of our lives.

I almost forgot about our future population who are now, through their teachers, are learning Bi-cultural education, such as utilizing some of the materials from the Sea Mammals. Learning to survive through the use of these and giving a chance to his teacher some kind of income from interesting party or parties.

If it passes through, I am going to hunt anyway for subsistance living and my kids will do the same.

AUGUAT SETON.

KAY, MILLER, LIBBEY, KELLY, CHRISTIE & FULD,
ANCHORAGE, ALASKA, *May 12, 1972.*

Re Marine Mammal Protection Act.
Hon. WARREN G. MAGNUSON,
Chairman, Committee on Commerce,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MAGNUSON: The Aleut League commends to your attention the need, and desirability, of excluding the Pribiloff Island fur seal harvest from the provisions of the Marine Mammal Protection Act. Not only is the fur seal harvest the sole economy of the islands of St. Paul and St. George, but the Interim Convention on the Conservation of the North Pacific Fur Seal has, since 1911, been heralded one of the best examples of international conservation.

Perhaps the best place to start is with the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act. The Congressional Record reflects that some members of the House believed that in passing the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act Congress had made "instant millionaires" out of Alaska's Native people, and had gratuitously given the Alaskan Natives a large benefit. A brief review of the history of the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act, and the land situation in Alaska, belies any such belief.

In 1867 when Russia ceded Alaska to the United States, civilized tribes like the Aleuts, were to be protected in the free enjoyment of their property. Later, by the Alaska Organic Act of 1884, the question of Native land titles was reserved for future Congressional action. Under the Alaska Statehood Act of 1958, as amended, the State of Alaska disclaimed all rights and title to lands or other property, the right and title to which may be held by any Indians, Eskimos or Aleuts. Contemporaneously with Statehood the Court of Claims held that Native rights of aboriginal use and occupancy were not extinguished by the Treaty of Cession and that the United States was obligated to compensate the Natives for a taking thereof. The United States Constitution, and the Alaska Constitution provide that property shall not be taken for public use, without just compensation. Therefore, it must be understood from the beginning that the Aleuts do not view the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act as a gigantic welfare payment, but the just compensation which they, as other American citizens, are entitled to under our state and national constitutions. Therefore, the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act should not be used as a lever to argue

that Congress has done enough for the Natives, and that the Pribiloff Islanders should look elsewhere for employment. We applaud the United States Congress, for living up to and meeting its responsibility, to its Native peoples by the passage of the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act. The world's history demonstrates that few governments have applied statutory or constitutional mandates like the Fifth Amendment to aboriginals or native peoples. But we ask that you, and your colleagues, recognize the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act for what it was—a land purchase.

There are six hundred Aleuts living on St. George and St. Paul. These Aleuts are not in semi-slavery, as the Senators from Alaska I'm sure can attest. They live on St. George and St. Paul, despite all the adversities, because that is their home and that is where they desire to live. They live on St. Paul because since the 1700's they have been engaged in harvesting the North Pacific fur seal, and that is their livelihood and their life. To deprive these Aleuts of their livelihood, in the light of all the evidence as to the benefit of the Pribiloff fur seal harvest, would be a great injustice. An injustice, not because these people are Natives, but because they would be deprived of their livelihood, despite the overwhelming existence of scientific, conservation, and other evidence that the Pribiloff Island fur seal harvest is beneficial conservationally and economically.

Since 1911 an international agreement between the United States, Great Britain (and later Canada), Japan and Russia has protected the North Pacific fur seal, and enabled the herd to grow. Pelagic sealing has been stopped, and the fur seal is harvested in a scientific and rational manner. The fur seal harvest must be viewed in the same light as the stock yards in Omaha, Denver, and Chicago. The evidence, which is already before your committee demonstrates that there has been a constant search for the most humane method of killing those seals which are to be taken. In addition, the evidence which is already before you, indicates the conservational aspects of the harvest.

We ask, that you analyze the data at your committee's disposal, that you and your committee, consider the adverse consequences to the North Pacific fur seal, if the Russians and the Japanese were to return to pelagic sealing. We ask, that you listen to those individuals who have spent their life studying, and working with the fur seal harvest, its problems, and its management. We ask, that you consider the six hundred Aleuts, the largest Aleut community in the world, who live on St. Paul and St. George, and are totally dependent on the fur seal harvest for their livelihood.

We are sure, that if all the evidence is analyzed, and if the economic situation in the Pribiloffs is analyzed, as the Senate of the United States would analyze the impact of any legislation on the economy of a locality, that your committee would exclude the Pribiloff Island fur seal harvest from the Marine Mammals Protection Act, and continue the scientific, international harvest of the North Pacific fur seal.

Very truly yours,

ILIODOR PHILEMONOF, *Second Vice-President.*

STATEMENT OF MARGARET NICK COOKE

Hon. Senator Stevens, Senator Gravel, and members of the committee, my name is Margaret Nick Cooke from Bethel. I am a housewife and a mother of a 15 month baby. I am presently on the City Council of Bethel.

I am in strong opposition of the Marine Mammal Protection Act of 1971. It is a bill, if passes, that would tell me and many others that we no longer can have seal meat and seal oil which I have been eating since I was my baby's age. Yes, you may say that we can use sea mammals for subsistence purposes but for many of us, we buy seal oil & meat. like we buy bacon and eggs. Our immediate area does not have seals that is why we buy seal meat and seal oil from the coast. And believe me, my body must have seal oil. I eat it almost daily. It is necessary for us like you people have to have salad oil on your salad.

I am not familiar with statistics but there are no jobs in this area especially in the villages other than Bethel. In the villages there are usually 5 or 6 jobs. All of the others depend on seasonal jobs to support a number of usually ten people. Ninety per-cent or more of our food is from the land and sea. The coast people hunt seals and the in-landers hunt for salmon fish. There are much

exchange of fish for seal meat & seal oil. Many people buy seal oil if there is no exchange of food.

Native people do not hunt sea mammals to add to their collection of decorations on their walls like many people do in the lower 49 states. We use all parts of the animal. We, by no means, take just the tusks or the skin. We take it all and utilize every part of the animal.

I am young considering the other testifiers, but I have been told by many people especially my father to always use every part of any animal so that I would get more the next time I go hunting. That I should never waste any food or get more than what I can utilize. Which means I should not get any food that I will allow to sit and waste. My husband, who is a white man, says this is conservation, and that natives are the real conservationists. We have had many heated discussions about this. I say its a means of our survival—of which it is.

If this bill is to be enacted, in order for our Congress to be fair to all, our Congress should initiate a bill which would ban some of the necessary jobs such as the existence of all airplane pilots. I would not like to see some people be discriminated of when we are being treated special. No, people should be treated equal. People should always respect other people's occupations. I respect your job as a Senator, I hope you give our job and occupation the same respect.

After you have heard our testimony, I know that you will kill this bill. I know that you all are sensitive to people's needs; that is why people vote for you. I thank you for your actions in our favor.

I have never been in jail or arrested in my life, but if this bill passes in its present form—I will become a criminal. My body is used to seal oil and must have seal oil, I will continue to buy seal oil no matter what comes out.

ST. GEORGE ISLAND, NASKA,
May 13, 1972.

Hon. TED STEVENS,
U.S. Senate,
Old Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

LADIES AND GENTLEMEN, members of this special hearing committee for this sea mammal legislation:

Fur seal annual harvesting is only means of employment for the Aleuts of the Pribilof Islands to provide for their families.

In this next short paragraph I will not only give my expression toward St. George Island concerning mammals (fur seals), I am purporting to say, I will also speak the language I am about to present before you; it will also pertain to our sister island—St. Paul and furthermore I and my fellow Pribilovians, also like to make this statement in regard to the sea mammals; to those Alaskan natives effected by this sea mammal legislation.

The Hearing Committee as this point asked so many questions in regard to sea mammals such as fur seals of the Pribilof Islands and whales and other sea mammals to the other Alaskan natives affected by this so called sea mammal bill introduced by the Friends of Animals.

Hearing Committee: Let me ask you a few questions? Who is the Friends of Animals Society? We never heard of them until two or three years ago. Member for this special hearing committee tell those animal friend society introducing this sea mammal legislation for enactment their purpose bill is unconstitutional in respect toward common law of our native culture.

Members of the Hearing Committee: Sea Mammals (fur seals) annual fur seal harvest is the only means of employment to provide for our family and also the seal meat is our native culture food which we have often and us Aleuts prefer sea mammal diets.

Why doesn't these people trying to enact this sea mammal legislation make a bill to prevent killing on our highways, stop riots at the universities, stop robberies and killings by our fellow citizens of the United States.

The St. George people, their prayers of this sea mammal bill to be dissolved in their expression in order that for coming future for their children and their children to live in the Alaskan native cultures; we the natives affected by this legislation never have any problems such as riots and killings such as they have in the lower 48 states.

This sea mammal legislation bill, if and when approved and put in enactment to our statute would only dissipate the Alaskan native communities and also our common law native cultures.

Let us have our only means of employment and our native culture.

The hunting of seal lion and hair seals and the annual fur seal harvest of the Pribilof Islands is the livelihood of our people. If the bill (Ban On All Ocean Mammal Harvesting) should go through it would be disastrous for the Alaska natives.

The fur seal industry, our only industry provides our people, the Aleuts with employment. Without jobs we would be unable to support our families with the necessities of life.

Hunting of sea mammals such as seal lions and hair seal gives our people the food, native which is part of our diet.

Who is Fred Harris and the Friends of Animals? Does he and his colleagues know or try to realize that we must rely on the ocean mammals for our way of life?

Thank you.

VICTOR MALAVANSKY, *Council President.*

COOK INLET REGION, INC.,
Anchorage, Alaska, May 12, 1972.

U.S. Senator,
Senator TED STEVENS,
U.S. Senator,
Subcommittee on Oceans and Atmospheres,
Bethel, Alaska.

DEAR SENATOR: I was to have appeared before your hearing committee in behalf of the Cook Inlet (Native) Region, Inc. and the Kenaitze Native Association at Bethel to testify against passage of the mammal bill in its present form.

Although I am the Deputy Director for the Rural Development Agency, State of Alaska, and my work gives much concern to the well being of the rural people, who are in the majority Native, my written presentations are primarily in the behalf of the people in the Cook Inlet Basin Area and Kenai Peninsula.

These people have long used the hair seal and Beluga whale for subsistence. The livers and oils were used for food and the seal hides were used for footwear and clothing. The hunting of seals for hides has become a good source of revenue for people of the villages and Seward.

The hunting of hair seals has also served a useful purpose in that it balances the ecological system. Both these species are predators on the salmon stocks which the state and federal government are trying so hard to preserve and propogate.

Ted, I wanted so much to make my presentations personally, but my time schedule does not allow me to be in Bethel today. Had the hearing been more extensive and included Anchorage where 9,000 Natives now reside, I would have made other arrangements.

I would be pleased that you note *for the record* during your formal hearings at Bethel that the Cook Inlet Region, Inc. and the Kenai Native Association will present written testimony.

Sincerely,

ALEX SHADURA.

STATE OF ALASKA,
RURAL DEVELOPMENT AGENCY,
Anchorage, Alaska, May 15, 1972.

Hon. TED STEVENS,
U.S. Senate,
Old Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR STEVENS: Herewith is enclosed the testimony against the passage of the Sea Mammal Bill in its present form from the native population of the Kenai-Salamatoff-Kasiloff-Cohoe-Nikiski-Soldotna and Ninilchik area.

I do hope your colleagues in the Senate will take heed in what the people of Alaska are saying. The people of the State of Alaska will be making great contributions to the future welfare of this nation and the voices that are being heard from Alaska today should not be muffled.

Sincerely,

ALEX SHADURA, *Deputy Director.*

Enclosures.

RESOLUTION

RESOLVED, by the Board of Directors of KENAI NATIVES ASSOCIATION, INC., and the governing Village Council of the KENAITZE INDIAN ASSOCIATION, INC. of the Cook Inlet Region of Alaska, as follows:

1. The Indians and other native peoples of the Cook Inlet Region of the State of Alaska have traditionally supported a policy of rational use of man's natural environment and of the deepest respect of the life of every species to survive and thrive on the face of our planet.

2. We support in principle and applaud the good intent of various proposed legislative acts now pending before the U.S. Congress to protect the environment and particularly those intended to preserve endangered species of animal life and to prevent their extinction.

3. We implore our good and respected friends in the U.S. Congress not to act hastily, however, in acting on pending bills intended to protect ocean mammals, such as H.R. 7556, H.R. 10420, S.J. Res. 115, S. 1315, S. 2639, S. 2871, and S. 3161, but rather to make certain that in enacting any legislation protecting marine mammals care be taken that it does not destroy the traditional way of life of many families of aboriginal natives, which have existed without harm to the environment and without endangering the survival of species of ocean mammals for hundreds and perhaps even thousands of years.

a. A reasonable harvest of various species of ocean mammals by natural predators, including man, is a necessary and beneficial part of the marine ecology and if disturbed by well-intentioned but heavy-handed legislation would cause detriment not only to the human harvesters, but cause overpopulation, starvation, disease and suffering among the many herds of marine mammals which have lived in a natural and healthy ecological balance with aboriginal native harvesters through the ages.

4. Contrary to popular belief, it will take many years before the economic benefits of the Alaska Native Land Claims Settlement Act will begin to make any appreciable impact upon the lives and welfare of native subsistence hunters and fishermen and native craftsmen who work in ivory, furs and skins. Any legislation which would substantially affect the abilities of these hunters, fishermen and craftsmen to continue their traditional way of life to harvest a reasonable crop of ocean mammals annually and to use the products derived from them for their subsistence and their native village industry would have a disastrous impact not only upon the economy, welfare and self-respect of these native Alaskan citizens of the United States, but would also be detrimental to the species intended to be protected for the reasons stated above.

5. Historically the impact of the white man's intrusion upon the native aboriginal culture of Alaska has been disastrous and the recent beneficial settlement legislation enacted by Congress was intended to cure some of the damage done in the past. However, to destroy the cultural and economic basis of native subsistence based upon a reasonable harvest of ocean mammals would be to commit a further wrong and would cause proud, self-reliant and valuable native citizens to be forced to turn to welfare and government handouts to the further destruction of native culture and identity in Alaska.

6. Here in the Cook Inlet Region, a substantial native village industry has been built around the harvest of the hair seal which has gone on for hundreds of years without detriment to the species and to the great economic and cultural benefit of native Alaskans and more recently their white fellow citizens.

7. Accordingly, we respectfully request and petition the U.S. Congress not to enact any of the pending bills for the protection of marine mammals without adequate safeguards allowing the undiminished continuance of the natural and healthy harvest of marine mammals by native subsistence hunters and fishermen and of the by-products of native artists and craftsmen in the traditional manner and we further urgently request that the members of Congress consult in this

regard with Alaska's own congressional delegation whose members have first hand knowledge of the matters recited above.

Dated at Kenai, Alaska, this _____ day of May, 1972.

Board of Directors of
Kenai Natives Association, Inc.

GEORGE MILLER JR., *President*
WARDEN C. SHOWALTIN III, *Treasurer.*

Village Council of the
Kenaitze Indian Association, Inc.

GEORGE MILLER JR., *President*
WARDEN C. SHOWALTIN III, *Treasurer.*

Attest:
ALEX SHADURA.

POINT HOPE, ALASKA,
May 1, 1972.

Senator TED STEVENS,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR STEVENS: I wish to submit the following statement for the hearing record of the Senate Commerce Committee on the Marine Mammals Bills.

Each ocean mammal that we hunt is purposely used for our food.

The major sea mammals in our area are,

bowhead whales and beluga whales
seals (bearded, ribbon, ringed and spotted)
walrus
polar bear

The above mentioned are mainly our special kind of food. What we take from each mammal is what we think is good for eating. The leftover food which is non-eatable is used for dog food. For instance, the seals—we use the eatable meat for ourselves, the blubber for stove fuel on some occasions, and the rest, the non-eatable, food is for the dogs. The skin is very useful to our own native people because it is mainly used for making mukluks, skin boat covers, rope, and parkas. We also sell the skins to the native store as a source of cash income.

The best part of the meat of the walrus is for our food and the rest for dog food. The walrus tusks are very valuable to the natives. We use them for carving tools and art, and we can sell them to the native store. This is an old tradition we have followed from our parents, grandparents, great-grandparents etc.

So, all mammals that we hunt are used for food and clothing or for some cash income. We depend on these things. What will we do if the Ocean Mammals Bill is passed contrary to our interests? We, the natives of Alaska, will still fight it.

Sincerely yours,

MORRIS B. OVIOK.

THE UNIVERSITY MUSEUM,
UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA,
Philadelphia, Pa., May 1, 1972.

Senator TED STEVENS,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR STEVENS, I wish to submit the following statement for the hearing record of the Senate Committee on Ocean Mammals Bills.

My concern with the Ocean Mammals Bills stems from my knowledge of the archaeology of the northwestern Alaska area. It seems to me that an unstated bias of several of the bills is that the commercial value of parts of various sea mammals (eg. walrus tusks, seal skins, and whale muktuk) has stimulated the over-hunting of several species. As a ten-year Arctic resident, I believe this is true only in restricted cases.

What is more important is the fact that the hunting of sea mammals for the purposes of trade is not an outgrowth of the commercial situation of the last

100 years; for in actuality it is a well-known archaeological fact that a trade between inland and coastal natives has existed for at least 1000 years. At inland archaeological sites one often finds evidence of this at surprizing distances from the sea. The reason for this commerce is, as early explorers have noted, that inland natives have depended on sea mammals as an important dietary supplement, and coastal peoples in return have sought the warm caribou skins in order to clothe themselves against the more severe winter-time coastal environment.

The significance of this is that the natives of northwestern Alaska hav depended on a trade in sea mammal products for a very long time, and across this span of time have, obviously, not done damage to the environment upon which they depend. Furthermore, in my opinion, the introduction of a cash economy to the area has not altered the pattern greatly.

Sincerely,

JOHN R. BOCKSTOCE,
Research Associate and Visiting Tutor.

CAPE SMYTHE,
WHALING & TRADING CO.,
Barrow, Alaska, May 3, 1972.

Hon. TED STEVENS,
U.S. Senate,
Old Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR STEVENS: As a Native of Barrow born here, I wish my testimony to be read at your hearing.

Before me, my father, Charles D. Brower, established the Cape Smythe Whaling & Trading Company for the purpose of buying baleen and also by what he could accumulate by hunting the Bowhead whale, which is the only type of whale reaching the Arctic Ocean by migratory movement. When he first came in the year 1884, he studied the way of the Eskimos in hunting these whales, first at Point Hope and then at Barrow, and saw that the Eskimo hunted other sea mammals: hair seal (nachik), bearded seal (oogruk), walrus (ivik), beluga (kilalogak), polar bear (nanook), including the Bowhead whale (akvik).

The Eskimo hunted for survival purposes because there is nothing he can grow in the Arctic region.

The Bowhead whale, being the largest, has to be hunted with a crew from 7 to 10 men and in a community like Barrow with a population of 2500 natives. There are 27 crews out this season; all the crews have a share from a whale caught, so all families will have meat and oil which is a very important part of their diet. The smaller mammal like walrus, beluga, hair seal, oogruk, and polar bear are hunted as needed. These are also put away in underground cold storage for later use.

Once the baleen had great value, up to $6.00 per pound. A large whale gave up to 2400 pounds. But now the baleen is used only as arts and craft material. Seal (nachik) skins are used to make water repellent garments, and as fancy jackets and parkas. Bearded seal hide (oogruk) is used to cover umiaks, with 5 to 7 hides being used. These are used over ice as it is the safest covering for hunting umiaks. Walrus was once the greatest in use for dog feed when dogs were the only means of transportation; in some areas in the Bering Sea, the walrus is still hunted for the ivory used in arts and crafts work.

With regard to the legislation concerning hunting of these mammals, I feel there should be an exception for the people who hunt them for subsistence use. If regulations will prohibit hunting, I feel the people will show resistance and much undercover hunting will go on. There is no fear that these animals are near extinction in the norhtern waters.

Very truly yours,

THOMAS P. BROWER.

May 8, 1972.

Mr. TED STEVENS,
U.S. Senator
Washington, D.C.

I, John Apongalook, a mayor of the city of Gambell on St. Lawrence Island have been selected by the City Council to attend this hearing and to give my testimony to the best of my ability and knowledge for the above bill.

If I have to give this in my own language it would give clear and much understanding, but for the lack of English, I have to omit some. I am sixty-one years old and lived on St. Lawrence Island, and have grown on nothing but sea mammals, I'm sure all the Eskimos of Alaska have the same, and I know my people on the island are. I would call the Bering Sea as a garden to all Eskimos, just like the people of lower states had their gardens, still the sea mammals don't grow on land but daily year round, men goes out to find seal, walrus, and don't come home with it always because animal goes here and there, and in account of weather condition there is disappointment to the families and neighbors as well.

I and the other people of my age grew up in homes not like we are living in now. I was grown in a home of walrus skins roof and with seal oil lamps, so the seal, walrus, whale fats were the most precious part of animals, because it gives each home heat, lights and to cook with. The hunting has been most important to Eskimos.

It was so important I and others have lacked English because we are needed by our fathers for hunting more than to be in school, but the white people come around 1900 and find the hardship of Eskimo living, and say, "Hey, we have better things than seal, walrus and whale oil, for your homes, to heat your homes, and to cook with and for etc."

The Eskimos say, "We have no money." The white people say, "Do not worry, we will take seal skins, walrus ivory and whale baleen." Then the time has come the Bering Sea with animals becomes more than a garden, but a farm also. It looked so benificial and the men, women learned to carve ivory and skin sewing and earn to buy good food for the growing children, as advised by Health Departments, and up to now ninety percent of Eskimos of St. Lawrence Island earns their living on sea animal as a culture.

In this case the sea mammal is only subsistence to all Eskimos, and it will be for long time, even there is education offered and yet our young people are not getting their education to a level to get a job.

Now, if the proposed marine mammal legislation comes into law, it will deal a crashing blow to the economy and culture of our area. I know and have faith in our congressmen, they won't make it so hard, but will let the Eskimos take the sea animal for food. But it will be one of the worst health hazard to our young people, because most families will not be able to get white people food for their children. Even a thirty-five year old will not stay healthy on sea animal meat, they grow on other food. And yet we do not kill walrus for their tusks and teeth when they are around, only time we get them is in month of May and still there is a rule to go by for the daily catch. Each hunter is allowed to kill four bulls and when hunting for female, each kills five with babies. The skins of mother walrus are checked to see if they are good for covering of boats, not all skins come out good, most have scars from fighting, which is not good. Baby skins are always used to make into ropes.

When a boat got to the shore, after unloading, one of the crewmen or boat captain takes the tusks home and chopped them out of head and take them to the store to get gas for next hunt or get what is needed most in the family. And yet this is only for a short period because there isn't animals around, only during the time when sea animals swim north for migration, and they are gone most of the year. Even the carvers don't have enough to carve and have to buy the raw ivory from the store and others.

So if this bill comes into law, which I am sure it will not, for the Eskimos of Alaska, but if it does, then what shall we do. All we will do is watch with heartaches someone else (those are Russian hunters) shooting all they want just beyond ten miles and somebody may wish and whisper, "Why did the United States buy Alaska." And then I have to look at myself and my children and others, to see if we can find a job and finds out they are ineligible because of education. We as parents now force our children for education, and when they need education for qualification, even we thought they would end up with more education, but they give up and depend more on carving ivory and skin sewing which is produced from Bering Sea animals.

Now, at this hearing, I am sorry to say this, but I must as it is true to the fact, that, "Why did our legislature try to make a law about the God made animals for one kind of His people to live with." I would say one who introduces the bill needs education of Eskimo way of living and is ineligible to make such a law without understanding the facts. I would call this hearing as a help to our legislature and in my cry of my testimony I have strong faith in our

good people in the Congress that after this hearing they will have serious consideration and will find this proposed marine mammal bill needs to be amended.

Signed,

Mr. JOHN APONGALOOK,
Mayor, City of Gambell.

MARCH 27, 1972.

DEAR SENATOR STEVENS: I understand there is a legislation there about Marine Mammal Protection Act of 1971. I strongly oppose this legislation because almost 100% of us in the Villages depend on sea mammals for survival. We use sea mammals not only for food but also for shelter and warmth. To many of us sea mammals are our only source of cash income. It is our job just like you as a Senator work each day not only as a public servant but also to support your family. We use sea mammals to support our families.

For many years our school system taught our children about how to survive in the dominant society, forgetting our way of life completely. Now in the last couple of years the system is talking about including our culture before the culture is completely lost. Now some schools are teaching the children about sewing arts & crafts. This has been long coming and now there is a legislation to ban sea mammals for commercial use. This is utterly ridiculous. Is our government prepared to take on everyone on welfare? You must know the results of welfare recipients. I do not want to go on welfare but I guess I will if I must. People must survive especially with nine dependents.

I suggest that you hold public hearings in our Villages. This must be done on every legislation, hold hearings in areas where such legislation will most affect. You may vote on any legislation on pets without asking them their view because they are incommunicado, also nobody seems to depend on them for livelihood.

Lastly I invite you to come live with us in our Village for couple of months. We will provide housing and food. After your stay in our home you can then determine and decide whether you want such legislation.

Thank you for your action in our favor!

Sincerely yours,

NICK O' NICK.

Enclosure.

We the under-signed support Nick O' Nick's eloquently written letter. We trust that you will act in our favor! Thank you!

Elena Nick, Chris Cooke, Marie Nick Blanchett, Susan Nick, Karen Cooke (by Margaret Cooke), Mary Ann Peter, Yako Brink, Japhet Anvil, Fanny Charles, Robert Nick, Margaret Nick Cooke, Barbara Nick, Joseph Nick, Roberta Nick (by Elena W. Nick), Wilson E. Simon, Carrie Anvil, John K. Phillips, Elena W. Nick, Michael Nick, Nastasia Nick Hoffman, Nick O'Nick, Jr., Jeff Hoffman (by Nastasia Hoffman), Grace Moochin, Esther Green, Roger Wassilie.

KIPNUK VILLAGE COUNCIL,
Kipnuk, Alaska, April 10, 1972.

Senator ERNEST F. HOLLINGS,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Oceans and Atmospheres,
U.S. Senate
Washington, D.C.

Hon. HOLLINGS: We are very hurt on our feelings after we heard the statemen through the radio station that you people are working on the Marine Naval Protection Act. We are writing you of what is true to our knowlidge. From our ancestor up to this date we have hunted such animals as Seals, Walrus, geese etc., for our own food. Since we don't have any firm of company of such to work and earn money to buy canned foods meat etc., As you white people do. For the Hides, Furs, Tusk etc., Of these we trade them to the inland people who can't hunt such foods as we hunt. We always trade to them for the foods that we can't get at our areas.

We sell them to earn money to buy such groceries as sugar, flour, clothes, stove oil, gas etc., That we can't get free of money with our own hands. But, of you people do willfully want to have this. Act passed we urge you strongly to

first close or limit what you people sell such as chicken, turkey, eat etc., Before you first think of closing what we poor Eskimo hunt for food and for very small amount of earning for money.

This is a very bad news for all the Alaskan Eskimos. If it is your number (1) Priority and will willfully have it passed. We will not followed and obeyed the other Bills that have been passed before this. We will be against this bill even it is passed the House or Senate.

Sincerely,

JIMMY J. ANAVER, *Pres.*

STATEMENT OF ABNER GOLOGERGEN

Senator Stevens, Members of the Committee, Ladies and Gentlemen, my name is Abner Gologergen. I am speaking on behalf of the people) of Savoonga, a village of 400 people on St. Lawrence Island.

The animals that are most important to our people include walrus, seal, and the baleen whale. During the period from October 1, 1971 to September 30, 1972 we took 551 walrus and 375 seal. We do not have a breakdown of seals by species, but the hair, ribbon, spotted, and bearded seal are all important in our way of life.

I would like to discuss four main ways that these animals are of value to us: as food, as a source of cash income, as raw materials for the manufacture of essential items, and, in all of these, as the base of our cultural life.

1) At the present time 90% of our diet comes from these animals. The walrus provides the bulk of our food. Seal is of equal importance in our diet and is available at times when walrus are scarce. Beyond this we can not say that one animal is more important than another because they are obtained on a seasonal basis and the number of animals taken depends on weather and ice conditions. The following breakdown details how each animal is used as food:

Walrus: All of the animal is eaten except the lungs, and the bones.

Seal: All of the animal is eaten except the skin and the bones.

Whale: The skin and red meat are eaten. The internal organs are not eaten.

Although store-bought foods supplement our diet, our basic food is walrus and seal. Native people have grown up with this food and prefer it to other kinds of food and to meat from other animals. We send some of the food to our children at boarding school and to Native people living in other parts of the state.

If we are not allowed to hunt these animals we would lose our basic food supply. This would create much hardship for our people. Not only would we miss our preferred food, we would not be able to afford as healthy a diet as we now have if we turn to packaged foods. As you will see, our basic source of cash income also comes from sea mammals and many people would not be able to afford store-bought foods. This would lead to a very great increase in the need for welfare assistance for our people.

2) Ivory, animal skins, and baleen are used as a source of cash income. This income makes it possible to supply the materials and equipment needed for subsistence hunting. Without this income we could not afford to hunt the animals for food. In addition cash is needed for clothing and heat suitable for this climate.

Walrus: Ivory is carved by members of every family in the village. The carvings are either sold for cash or exchanged at the store for goods. Raw ivory can be sold to the store for cash. The skins of bull walrus are sent out to be processed as buffing material for silver.

Seal: All seal skins have commercial value. Commercially processed skins are the base of an active village industry of skin sewing. The skin of the bearded seal is processed and bleached in the village for use as drawing material, trims, laces, and many other applications in skin sewing.

Whale: Baleen is used as a base and as trim in ivory carving and as material for craft work.

3) These animals also provide the raw materials for many things needed in the village.

Walrus: Ivory strips from tusks are used on the keels of our winter boats. The boats themselves are made from split female hides. Ropes, lines, packs, guncases, and many other things are made from the

skin of walrus. Walrus stomach is split and scraped and the middle surface is used for drums in Eskimo dancing.

Seal: Skin from the bearded seal is used for boat soles. Hair seal and spotted seal skins are used for parkas, pants, boots, and socks. There is no better clothing for our winter conditions.

Whale: Whale bone is used as protective strips on the keel of our boats. Baleen is used for freight sleds in early winter.

It is impossible to put an economic value on these materials. Their loss would cause a very great increase in the needs of our people and the on ylsource for assistance would be increased government help and thus increased dependence on government welfare.

4) Hunting and its role in our life and our diet and its relationship to our raw materials and skills, is at the center of our culture. The real issue at stake in the Sea Mammal Bills is not merely subsistence hunting and use of its by-products, but the survival of our village and the survival of our culture.

Senator Stevens and members of the Committee. These are very important questions for my people and I would like to try to answer any questions you may have.

WAINWRIGHT CITY COUNCIL,
Wainwright, Alaska, May 2, 1972.

DEAR SENATOR STEVENS: Enclosed find three statements of testimony by three Eskimos from Wainwright village.

These copies are being sent in possible lieu of opportunity to appear in person. Should someone from Wainwright appear in Nome at the time of the hearing, he will be authorized to read these statements.

If no representatives from our village makes it to Nome, we will authorize one of the Barrow delegates to represent us by reading these testimonies for us.

Respectfully yours,

BILLY BLAIR PATKOTAK, *Mayor.*

Enclosure:

WAINWRIGHT VILLAGE,
April 18, 1972.

To Whom It May Concern:

My name is Blair Patkotak, and I am known by the name of "Billy". I'm a native Eskimo from the arctic coastal village of Wainwright, Alaska. I represent the Wainwright city council, a fourth-class city of which I am the mayor. The population of Wainwright village is 330 people.

I would like to thank everyone for the opportunity to voice my concern about the proposed House bill called "The Marine Mammal Preservation Act". I fear this bill, as proposed, will be very damaging to our native economy which, as you know, is marginal as it is. Our economy at Wainwright is based primarily on the seasonal availability of the marine mammals such as seals, walrus, whale, and polar bear. These mammals are harvested in season. When they are plentiful, our economy improves; when they are scarce, our economy declines.

I would like to describe how we utilize each of these mammals. Seals, usually quite numerous, are taken for meat for the village people and for the dogs, which we use for transportation on the winter ice in search of food and clothing. The seal skin has many uses, some of which are mukluks (boots), waterproof bags, rawhide ropes, and kayak coverings. With or without the fur, the skin is valuable to the natives and is one of the few sources of income when sold to the outside fur companies.

Walrus is harvtsted each season, generally in July and August. The meat is edible, and the hide is used for rope and skin-boat covering. The ivory is another small source of income, and brings about $2.50 to $3.00 per pound. The natives who carve are able to sell trinkets which are in good demand statewide, which assists the village economy. The walrus is harvested carefully, and is always taken for food as well as ivory.

Polar bear is harvested each season, and generally a total of 12 to 15 are taken each year by the village of Wainwright. We kill the animal for food, and generally sell the hide, which brings in $30. per linear foot, or more, and is a major assistance to the village economy.

The whale, especially the Wright bowhead species, is hunted only in the later part of April and during May. This mammal is considered a highly-prized catch

among the native whalers and the entire village. Almost ninety-nine per cent of the whale is edible, and the muktuk is considered a delicacy among the natives. The baleen is kept for use by the native artisans and craftsman to be made into artifacts which, when sold, assist the village economy.

Any bill or legislation which would limit or prohibit a native from utilizing his only source of food, clothing, and small income would certainly result in more of my people on the welfare roll, and would impose a severe hardship on my people.

Jobs are non-existant for the most part in our area, and living is meager even in good years. Better than ninety-five per cent of the food we consume at Wainwright comes from the land and sea, as well as most of our clothing. Hunting and fishing provide our only source of income. My people are extremely conscious of the bounty from the sea, and are aware of their obligation to protect that bounty. For centuries the unwritten law, passed on from generation to generation among the Eskimos, is "Harvest only what you cannot waste . . . only what you can use." I could not support any bill or legislation which could deprive my people of their main source of food, clothing, and living necessities . . . in fact, for most, the only source.

Very truly yours,

B. BLAIR PATKOTAK, *Mayor.*

DEAR HONORABLE SENATORS: I am happy to bring testimony before you distinguished gentlemen concerning the importance of sea mammals in my life and that of my people. I am a 69 year old Eskimo man who was born at Teller Mission, Alaska. I have lived along the Arctic Coast all my life, and have lived in Wainwright, the village I represent, for the past 54 years. As is true of almost all of 330 people of Wainwright, I throughout my life have depended upon hunting for the main part of my subsistence.

Hunting of sea mammals is very important for the people of my village. We must hunt for food because we have little monetary income and the prices of outside meats are extremely high. For example,

	Per pound
Beef tongue	$1.30
Weiners	1.30
Hamburger	1.39
Chicken	1.00
Pork chops	1.90

Approximately 5% of our meat comes from the above, but 95% of the meat we consume is acquired from hunting. We do hunt caribou and other land animals however, our diet is greatly dependent upon sea mammals-whales, seals, oogruk, walrus, beluga, and polar bear. Most every part of the sea mammals we kill are used for food, for either ourselves or our dogs.

Although the main purpose of our hunting sea mammals is that of food, the skins and by-products which we cannot eat are used for many purposes. Sealskins have traditionally been used by many people for jackets, pants, slippers, and mukluks. They also are used for gun cases, cartridge pouches, sled bags, rope, and other purposes. Oogruk skins provide soles for our mukluks, lines and rope, and covers for our canoes. Walrus hide is also used for rope. Ivory from walrus is important too. It is used in many implements—fish hooks, seal hook handles, tool for making fish net, drum handles etc.! Baleen from whale is used for lashings and sled runners. The walrus stomach lining and linings of whale organs are used for drum heads. These are a few of the personal uses we make of the by-products of sea mammal hunting.

But the most important use of the by-products of our sea mammal hunting is that for arts and crafts and other commercial purposes. Much of the monetary income of my village comes from the sale of items made from these sea mammals. Seal skins are sold to be used in making various items of clothing. My wife and the other ladies of Wainwright also make and sell jackets, mukluks, slippers, mittens, jewelry, purses, hats, gun cases, and other items from seal skins. The soles of the mukluks they sell are oogruk skin. Craftsmen of Wainwright also make and sell many items from the baleen of the whale and ivory from the walrus. Baleen is made into baskets, boats, wolf scarers, letter

openers, bracelets, headbands, and ornamentations on other art objects. I am sure you are familiar with the many beautiful ivory carvings and etchings that are made from walrus teeth and tusks. The hides of the polar bear are mainly sold to outsiders.

As you can see, in order to fulfill the needs of my people any legislation concerning the controlling and restricting of the killing of sea mammals must allow us first to continue subsistence hunting of these animals for food and other personal purposes; and second to use the by-products of the animals, which we kill for subsistence, for arts and crafts and other commercial uses. Although the Marine Mammal Preservation Act as passed in the House of Representatives does allow for subsistence hunting, it does not allow us to use these by-products for arts and crafts and other commercial purposes. We appeal to the use of the by-products for arts and crafts and other commercial purposes of my village. If the House bill is passed as is, it would put many more people on the welfare rolls, as it would deprive them of their monetary income from these commercial uses.

We are as concerned or more concerned than many people are of the preservation of sea mammals, for this is a basis of our livelihood. Our killing of these animals is limited by nature as whales, beluga, oogruk, walrus, and polar bear are in our waters only seasonally. When they are present in our waters, we must kill enough to provide us with food throughout the year. Much of our meat is stored in underground cellers to use in other seasons.

As the father of 12 children, all but two who still live off the land and sea, I thank you for the opportunity to voice my concern in this legislation that could greatly affect or alter the way of life of my people. I appreciate having a voice in this important matter.

Submitted by:

WALDO BODFISH.

WAINWRIGHT, ALASKA,
April 26, 1972.

To Whom It May Concern:

My name is Weir Negovanna, an Eskimo, living at Wainwright, Alaska I am 65 years old and a member of United Presbyterian Church. I represent the people of Wainwright, whose population is about 335 people. I live in Alaska all my life, mainly along the arctic coast.

In my younger days I make my living by hunting, fishing, and trapping. And for last six years I support my family by carving bones of sea-mammals which I sell to buy food and other necessities. My wife also is an Eskimo, a wonderful housewife and a skin sewer for our use and also for sale. She makes waterproof boots out of seal skin and oogrook-skin.

Not too long ago I have heard that there is a law about to be passed concerning the hunting of sea-mammals. It is true that there is an exception that would allow natives to hunt for subsistance (which is good for this is our life) but the thing that will hurt me and my fellow natives is the prevention of salable items from sea-mammal hunt. For we, who do not depend on jobs will be deprived of our ability to buy and sell from local stores, and therefore forced into welfare recipients against our will.

Once a year our whaling season opens, and only if we are lucky a whale or two would be caught for our years supply of meat. Which is then stored into our underground cellars, and every edible part of a whale is not wasted. And as far as we are concerned and as we observe the bow-head whales we hunt are numerous as ever.

As for walrus, who says they are decreasing! certainly not us, because as we observe them they are numerous as ever. And besides, we don't hunt as many as we use to in order to supply our dog-team. Our major means of travel are Snow-Machines now, and they don't need meats of mammals to keep them running. Therefore what mammals we caught are used mainly for our own meat supply.

One of the happiest moments in the life of an Eskimo is the report of a whale catch, because in such a catch every native shares. And yet this very thing is threatened, and the joy of being an Eskimo will be another notch lower if the bill passes.

Submitted by:

WEIR NEGOVANNA.

SHISHMAREF STATE SCHOOL,
Shishmaref, Alaska, May 9, 1972.

U. S. SENATE COMMITTEE,
Sea Mammals Hearing,
Nome, Alaska.

GENTLEMEN: We are writing concerning the sea mammal bill, which we oppose as it is presently written. We regret not being able to attend the hearing, but we cannot because of pressing end-of-the-year business at our school.

We have lived in at least 15 communities on the West Coast of North America, and we have never lived in a community with the artistic creativity found among the people of Shishmaref. Shishmaref is presently in what might be called the upheaval of a cultural renaissance centering around the arts. It would seem reasonable to assume that other Eskimo villages in this area have a similar potential if the opportunity and the stimulation generating Shishmaref's growth in art takes place elsewhere. Arts and crafts are the main ways the Eskimos in this changing world have a chance to hold onto their identities as Eskimos. We assume in the United States that everyone has the right, and should be given the opportunity, to hold onto his traditional culture in the ways that are important to him rather than to be lost in the depressive anonymity of the modern city. There are not many Eskimos in the world, yet they have made and are making an unique contribution to the world's art. Ways must be found to encourage, not discourage, this contribution.

It is important to understand that the essential component of the artistically active Native community is its inexpensive source of raw material. It is the raw material, such as bone, skin, ivory, wood, stone, and the like which gives the craft its distinct character, that makes it attractive to the over-civilized world. Freight rates prohibit shipping in foreign materials in large quantities, even if this procedure were a solution, which it could not wholly be, since the attractiveness of the Native arts and crafts is born in the use of native raw materials. The present threat to the use of such raw materials is the subject of the present hearing. The subject also concerns, as well it should, the survival of sea mammal life. We feel this subject also concerns a condition which surely cannot be given enough weight: Shall we actively support an unique culture, or through our actions (which may be hasty and ill-advised in our reacting to other exigencies) set forth measures which very nearly ensure that culture's death?

Although there are many good people sponsoring and backing the Bill, they surely have not carefully studied its probable effects. We feel that the Bill must be re-written with more knowledge of the economy and life-style of the Eskimo in the Arctic, with knowledge of the thousand uses the Native can get from the natural products around him. It is unnecessary for the Eskimo culture to be destroyed, for instance, to save the walrus; neither is it necessary for the walrus to be destroyed to save the Eskimo. Both concepts are backward and short-sighted. No industry is simply closed down because of pollution or conservation problems. These are all very real problems today and must be carefully studied and acted upon—but in full wisdom, not in haste. In the matter at hand, surely there are measures of *control* which can be taken which would more sensibly and equitably resolve the problem. We abhor the reckless killing of the sea mammals. We equally abhor restrictions which, intentionally or not, tamper with the life and pride of a culture.

The people of Shishmaref are industrious and talented. They do not want to be forced to drift further into a welfare economy. They are excited about their new prospective markets opening up in the fine arts. Yes, we have oil, but the most important resource in the Arctic is the human one, and the most important exportable commodity derives from its people's talents. What a blow to these fine people to find at the very onset of their renaissance that they are to be wiped out through short-sighted actions taken by people who, however well-intentioned, are really only coming up with easy answers to complicated questions. We ask that our Congress give the fair attention to the Arctic people's problems that it give any other interest group who could probably make themselves better heard.

Writing legislation which would save both the sea mammals and the people who need them would be conservation legislation worthy of its name. It could then truly be called a conservation measure, and not a human sacrifice bill.

We thank you very much for the consideration of our remarks.

NANCY MCFARLAND.
JACK MCFARLAND.

NORTHWESTERN ALASKA CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
Nome, Alaska, May 11, 1972.

Senator TED STEVENS,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C. 20510

DEAR SENATOR STEVENS: The Nome Chamber of Commerce is extremely concerned about the sea mammal legislation pending before the Senate. We realize, from reading the arguments of the House in the *Congressional Record*, that a great deal of pressure is being applied by various conservation-oriented groups in the lower "48". Concerns expressed from Alaskans were passed off quickly and without a great deal of understanding. Yet, it is Alaskans who stand to lose most in this issue.

We, too, are concerned for the preservation of sea animals. Whereas they are *animals of interest* to others, they are the livelihood for many of us. We are distressed by head-hunting of walrus, even more by the illegal taking of polar bear. But we feel that the proposed legislation does very little to help the situation and a great deal to hurt people that depend on sea animals for a livelihood.

First, the 5 year ban on hunting sea mammals robs Eskimo carvers and sewers of their primary source of income in the years *before* the Native Land Claims will have any real economic effect in the area. At the present time-and for the forseeable future—there is no realistic economic base for the villages apart from their arts and crafts skills.

Second, let us talk about arts and crafts. We are not interested in the large volume of trinketry already imported from Japan and Seattle. The low cost of plastic imitations has already made trinket work by Alaskan Natives unprofitable. What we are trying to preserve are the legitimate arts and crafts which are a natural part of the history and present life of these people.

Third, the species of mammals being used as materials sources for arts and crafts are not the species in danger. Management of the walrus herd, for example, has resulted in growth of the herd rather than its depletion.

Fourth, when managed herds are left on their own all of a sudden, the birth rate and population controls are left unchecked. The resultant harm is often more severe than the harm done by human hunting. Cases in point are the former great reindeer herds of the Seward Penninsula and the moose population of the Yakutat region.

An artificially maintained balance, is still a balance, and removal of game management needs to be as carefully handled as institution thereof.

Fifth, It is difficult to see how an exception to the sea mammal bill, providing for the needs of Native craftsmen, would work harm on the purpose of the bill.

Sixth, the system of ivory and polar bear permits, now in effect, could be upgraded to limit "head hunting". The problem here is money for enforcement. Perhaps monies could be placed in the state coffers to provide for enforcement. This would help the situation tremendously even if no other legislation passed. We hope that Senator Ernest F. Hollings will consider the needs of Alaska's craftsmen and the other industries that rely on their skills-tourism, education, arctic clothing.

Let's provide more funds to enforce the laws we now have, and, let's not forget this, additional monies for heat sink-freezers and transportation could also mean that all animals now killed for commercial interests only could also be utilized for food throughout the year by Native peoples.

Sincerely,

RAUL O. CALVILLO, *President.*

NOME, ALASKA,
May 11, 1972.

U.S. SENATE,
Committee on Commerce.

DEAR SIR: I'm writing to you and Thank you for asking us Native of Alaska to write to you about Sea Mammal.

I am the mother of nine children seven grandchildren Mother who is quite old and reletive's friend's all of who raised on Native food of Sea Mammal.

Their are so many sea mammal from smallest smelts or clams to biggest black whale what we eat and used for clothings.

As for now we put them in deep freezer for winter use, or we dry them what we could dry.

And for those who can't hunt always buy them from store's or we buy them from our Native people who could hunt and those who sold them use the money for family used.

If I would put all how we used our sea mammal would cover dozen of pages. So this is all Thank you.

Sincerely,

DINA EVAN, *Native.*

SHISHMAREF, ALASKA,
May 4, 1972.

DEAR TED STEVEN: Receive your letter in reference of mammal. Sea mammals are very useful to all Eskimo. Seal and oogruks and walrus are food. We dry oogruk meat then store them in seal poke with oil for winter same way with walrus meat. Skin use for clothes, mukluks, those who don't have much income it help all the Eskimos when they sell their carving and sewing, and Eskimo; help many white people by selling mukluks and jackets and parkas for their income. Eskimos live on sea mammals like their forefathers did. We Eskimos can't be without sea mammals. We Eskimos will just stay suffer from hunger if they ston killing sea mammals. They're not like white peoples that have everything. How will the Eskimos live without sea mammals. That's our food and clothing that can't be without it. Natives sell carving. Mukluks and others so they can be healthy. Natives who can't work they live or help their children by their own hands from sea mammals they make. Sea mammals and earth animals are made by God for all the peoples food and clothing. And why they want us to suffer forever. Hope the President will understand how Natives will suffer if they stop sea mammal from killing.

From ARNOLD & KATHERINE OLANNA.

SHISHMAREF, ALASKA,
May 9, 1972.

Older folk need oil of seals using a lot.
We been using seal product many ways using lot of seal oil with dried.
Seal poke is mostly needed for berries—pack for oil or meat.
Seal skin make bleached in winter.
Seal Skin red bark willow dyed.
Making water mukluk.
Making slippers eals skin sox.
Raw hide seal skin using for sled many ways.
Out of oogruk hide for mukluk bottom with crimp.
Thanks you all

MR. & MRS. ALFRED OLANNA.

SHISHMAREF, ALASKA,
May 9, 1972.

This is Alex Weyiouanna at Shishmaref, writing a short Statement about sea mammals. We Eskimoes eat mostly Eskimo food after hunting for them.

Most of Native are live on Native food. Also we don't have enough income a month. And why they wanted to put limit on sea food for us.

And womans up here are using the skins for clothing.

And the sping hunts try to make supplies for coming winters. I hope to peoples make it free for us.

Also women make many things all of seals skins.

ALEX WEYIOUANNU.

SHISHMAREF, ALASKA,
May 9, 1972.

DEAR SIR: Ocean Mammal starting writing. We can't live without the meats and we hunt one a year and it don't be enough for year. Nobody could control on the living creature. Only one God is counting the animals. We just can't live without the meats. If you were Eskimo you wouldn't live without the food. Only hunter are trying hard on their hunting.

Sincerely,

CLARE KOKEOK.

MAY 5, 1972.

DEAR SIR: Would like to testify about the Ocean Mammal. As being one of the Eskimos I strongly believe that the Natives of Alaska can't go without the foods they had ever since they are born with it and can't go without it. Some old peoples always started to craved to eat what they used to eat long ago. I don't see any reason at all some people try to make a living harder for someone else. I hope you guys help to to better living by not stopping us to hunt the foods we like.

A friend,

SUSIE WEYAUVANNA.

SHISHMAREF, ALASKA,
April, 1972.

DEAR SIR: This is my reply about the sea mammals what we have since we are live on. I feel that our living should be continue as before on our foods. I know the Natives live on mostly on meats. All the Natives don't have jobs. But they try hard to live better living some way. Some on hunting, sewing, carving, and etc.

I stop and think since I understand when they have news on radio about the sea animal. I wonder why the white peoples wants to control us Natives on which we live on. I wonder who does take care of the sea mammal who provide foods for them and who counts them?

Us Natives we vote for the Senators who can help us on our better living. Hope you can help us some way to carry on our better living.

Yours truly,

IDA WEYAUVANNA.

MAY 9, 1972.

I Hubert Nayokpuk of Shismaref one of the Hunter here in our village.

I'd like to write few things what I have in mind concerning about mammals bill, which I understand Congress in our Government are making law. That will have to cut our hunting on Seals & Walrus which native people only live on in our Land.

I feel that I think is all wrong if that bill becomes Law. Because all natives in Alaska are live on all those Sea Animals.

Also half of our population move out to different villages & Cities all those people still live on to those animals even their away from their homes.

HUBERT NAYOKPUK.

SHISMAREF, ALASKA,
May 9, 1972.

DEAR SENATOR STEVENS: About the Sea Mammal on Seal and ogrooks our main sea mammal here in Shismaref, has been existed so many hundreds of years—and we Eskimos here would like to be going on another hundreds of years to come.

Now is the time of this year—the ogrook hunting season is nearing—the ogrook hunting is when we hunt for seal oil & dried meat put together in a poke & store it all winter & preserve it, under the surface ground, our main lively hood depends on this oil & meat year around—Sometime when the season isn't favorable for hunting, we are short of seal oil & we experienced how it is to go with out it.

Good season I myself get 10–12 ogrooks in a Spring time & last all winter long—the hides are stretched on the ground & dried—this is used for mukluk sole's (crimped). Also it can use for dog harness & collars—nothing is wasted on hide, oil blubber, & meat.

This oil with meat from the poke is also very popular all over the surrounding places, like Nome, Kotzebue, Anchorage, Deering, Teller, etc. When ever we have spare we sold the seal oil & meat in 5 gal. cans—& use the money for family the sole (crimped) sells very good all over the place's all the mukluks & some slippers use this hide for soles, whether it be for "fancy or water or every day use.

Its same thing on seal & spotted.

Many people toward Kobuk way—preferred seal blubber than ogrook blubber —therefore the seal blubber & ogrook blubber are our main "Eskimo butter"

Senator Stevens I know you will work hard for us for your great help.

This is my testimony for sea mammals.

Yours truly,

VINCENT TOCKTOO SR.

SENATOR STEVENS: We feel that the hunting should continue since that is what we use to eat. It helps a great deal for our income also.

We get about 40 seals a year. (bearded, spotted & fur). The seal skins we use for bleached seal skins. We also sell the seal skin by itself. A lot we use for seal oil. It is a major part of our diet. We also make seal pokes which we use for storage for seal oil and berries also used to stor eskimo food.

We use a great deal for our mukluks since it is long lasting. The seal skin is used for strings. It is long lasting in use with water items as harpoons and boats.

We use the bearded seal skin for crimp soles. It is long lasting and can keep its shape.

The seal skins are also used for seal skin jackets which most white men ordered.

We use everything of the seal and nothing is wasted.

Sincerely,

HARRY KOKEAK.
SIGNA KOKEAK.

MAY 9, 1972.

DEAR HON. TED STEVENS: Writing a statement about our Ocean Mammals about Seal, oogruk, walrus etc. These are what us Eskimo live on and cant go without them. Such as Dry Meat & oil walrus meat, etc. The Eskimo cant live them these sorts of food, like the white men cant go without Butter and Seal oil is like Butter to all Eskimo.

Also their lots of use on the seal skins also oogruk & walrus. We wouldn't have mukluck slippers, crimp soles, etc. without the skins that they got. We can't only live on can's stuff as well as white man cant get use to native food. Some of them cant even taste them. That the way the Eskimos are on white man food.

Hope you get some Ideal on Eskimos.

Best regard.

MR. & MRS. STEVEN KEYUTELLUK.

Senator TED STEVENS;

8 oogruks & 4 young oogruks

70 seals skins

7 pokes seal oil with dry meat & blubber. Mostly seal skins were used pokes for seal oil and Berries. Also for Bleached white seal skins & for red dyed skins to use for muckluck trim & for strings als for tops & bead tops for mucklucks skins were most used for muckluck in winter & water mucklucks for summers.

Also were used for (Horn dolls) parka pants & muclucks; Also for men pants in winter. & mittens for men.

ANDREW TOCKTOO,

Kill about 75 seal's in a year. Out of these we use some of them for seal pokes for storing seal oil and dried meat. Also use the pokes for berries during the summer.

Also use seal skin for mukluks and bleached white skin and red dyed skins to use for all kinds sewing.

And on bleached seal we Eskimos cannot live without oil and meat. We used the hide for rope, crimp sole's.

We dried the meat and preserve the meat in poke's for winter use.

ESAU WEYOIUANNA.

SHISHMAREF, ALASKA,
May 8, 1972.

Senator TED STEVENS,
U.S. Senator,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR STEVENS: We (Native Alaskans) deeply appose the "Ocean Mammal Bill" since we depend largely on the income and food we get from the seals and walrus.

I get about 35 seals a year (bearded, spotted & fur seals).

The skins are used for;

1. Seal pokes—used as floats and storage for seal oil and berries for future use.

2. Seal skins—we hand tan or send for tanning. These are used for various items as mukluks, slippers, purses, designs, clothing, etc.

3. Belached skins—used for trimmings, bases for beaded work, designs, strings on mukluks, etc.

4. Seal skin ropes and strings—the skin is uct into long thin strips used for strapping. (example; tieing a sled together since it is long lasting)

5. Crimp soles—soles for mukluks

6. Skins to sell or trade with. There is a lot more uses but too numerous to list them all here.

The meat is dried for later use. The blubber is made into seal oil used as dip for meat as some people use sauce or gravy on their meals.

Walrus uses are: 1. The skin is used for cover of skin boats 2. The tusk is made into items for sale. It is major part of the family income. 3. Walrus penis is also sold for show pieses 4. Bones (some) are made into items to seil.

There is very little wasted on anything we catch. Anything we do not used is stored for later use or sold to persons without it.

Sincerely,

JOHN SINNOK.

SHISHMAREF, ALASKA,
May 8, 1972.

Senator TED STEVENS,
U.S. Senator,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR STEVENS: The Ocean Mammal are real important to us, natives. We use it for food, clothing and to sell varies items of Arts & Craft.

The Ocean Mammal they kill annually all vary to different person. The average for seal & oogruk are used for meat and clothing. The seal oil and meat are, our whole year's supply for us to eat. This is also used for us to sell (due to low income). The seal skin, crimp soles, etc. This dyed seal skin, crimp soles, etc, This is mostly use for our own used for *food* and *clothing* also to sell.

The walrus average about 10 or less each year. We use it mostly for food & the tusk for carving to sell and the walrus bone. We make varies figurines from the walrus tusk.

Most of our income comes from sewing seal skin & oogruk to make mukluks, parka's, slippers, purse, yo-yo and etc. The ivory tusk to make, bear, seal, walrus, bracelet, swam, billikens, watchband, rings, and many types of figurines.

We all don't have jobs so we use the seal skin materials to make our clothing and to sell. Even sometimes, we have to buy some seal & oogruk to have meat for the year. All the families don't have hunters, so we have to buy some seal & oogruk. Even, if we have little income to buy the meat.

This Arts and Craft takes skill and talent.

Thank you for taking your time & consideration in this Ocean Mammal. I appreciate it very much.

RACHEL SINNOK.

SHISHMAREF, ALASKA,
May 5, 1972.

Senator TED STEVENS

DEAR SIR: I have lived in Kotzebue Sound area for 55 years and I am a full blooded Eskimo. Born and raised on Native food mostly on sea mammal food, such as seal, oogruk, walrus and even when ever dead whale is drifted ashore fresh enough we put it for our winter food, because we can't afford to pay for beef and other meat ship in from lower 48 state at the price of $2.00 to $3.00 a pound.

And besides we had a very strong use for the seal hides such as mukluks, mittens, pants, parka and they are water and wind proff too, oogruks we had a strong use for hides such as for mukluk bottoms as black soles, white soles and also dyed with older willows red soles. Such strong uses as seal and oogruk hide ropes, we even use seal hides such as for seal nets. Meat we dried and store with oil for our winter use in seal hide pokes. Walrus hide we had a very strong use for skin boats and for kayuks for extra strong raw hide rope used mostly for seal nets. And whatever we had for spare in line of hides, meat dried

and oil, skins seal and oogruk and raw hide ropes we *trade them off* for inland Native peoples such as Kobuk River and Selawik area for such as dried fish or frozen fish, because they are Eskimos like us dying and craving for seal oil 12 months out of year. To tell you the truth 80% of Native food we eat comes from sea mammal, 20% white man food.

Look what our Congressman is doing to us now, trying to cut off our main food for ourselves and for Kobuk area peoples.

We the Natives will just be helpless if our trading is completely cut out.

For instance if beef was cut out for commercial use in lower 48 states peoples would sure be hurt for meat and the hide for making shoes too.

And thats the way we feel about our food and for clothing too.

GIDEON BARR, SR.

SHISHMAREF, ALASKA,
May 9, 1972.

Hon. TED STEVENS,
U.S. Senator

DEAR TED: Thank you for working hard in on behalf on the mammal bill, having worked in Shishmaref Native store I know that we can't go without the sea animals. They are our only way of making living. The Shishmaref Native Store annually do 10 to $15,000.00 business on Native products such as sewing to ivory carving all this material as you know come from sea animals. Now there is another 2 stores which I don't know how much they bought these material or rather products. Hopefully, they write you a letter.

Mail thing about this deal we most important part is that we can not go with the meat of sea mammals it is our main food. Lunch and supper the seal oil and dried meat is on the table. We are as you know were raise mainly on meat diet so we keep on eating as we were raise by our parents.

I would like to invite this Senator that introduce this bill to stay with an Eskimo family without his checkbook without money and see our way of living.

We are proud Americans, our boys serve in arm forces. Some have never return from Viet Nam just the bodies. I hope this bill won't dim our view of citizenship of our Great Nation. Thank you and keep punching.

Sincerely,

AMOS KIYUTELLUK.

SHISMAREF, ALASKA,
May 9, 1972.

Hon. TED STEVENS: In the village of Shishmaref we hunt seals, oogrook, walrus, spotted seals in the spring season. The seals we hunt for bounty at $3.00 per scalp and save the skins for mukluks for family use or to sell in local stores in change for other canned goods we need at home. We eat the meat and I'll name all parts of the body we eat, not only meat, but intestine, liver, kidney, heart, lung, head, eyes, tongue, brain, flipper, blubber. Same goes for oogruk. Without oogruk, there is no possibility of living through the winter because that is the main menu for winter use. If the seals are hunted only for scalp and hide, the meat is given to the dogs, as there are still dogs yet. There are many ways to prepare a seal hide and put to many uses. The most oogruk my husband ever caught was 3 (three) in one spring. None was wasted. Very seldom we get walrus here, but for the past 3 or so years, they have come around here. If anything should be cut off according to law, we still must have these animals for our home use, in order that we may live out here in the cold Arctic, like some people put it. This is like, we're trying to stop the pollution of air and water down in the lower 48 but we're way up here, and can't do much about it. It still happens anyway. There are many people that are interested here in the village but I know that many won't take enough time to write a letter to people like you who are trying to help us to continue hunting sea mammals for a source of living. Time is short now, and the time of hunting is here again, and we *will* hunt these animals for food, as before. People who are trying to put an end to hunting these animals, do not know, and will not know how much we depend on these animals until they see for themselves, live here with us, hunt with us, etc. etc. We are thankful too, that we know our limit in catching these animals. Last year was a plentiful year in walrus and some of us have freezers to keep out meat from spoiling. The plane is on its way and this must go. Goodbye and good luck to all of us.

Sincerely yours,

ARDITH WEYIOUANNA.

ST. MICHAEL, ALASKA,
May 11, 1972.

Hello, I'm Victor Joe, and I represent the Village of St. Michael.

For thousands of years the Eskimo has been dependant on the sea mamals, for his living, he did not depend on welfare checks, as he will when the law on the sea mamals comes into effect. The Eskimo does not want welfare, he wants to depend on himself.

The Eskimo needs the sea mamals for his food, clothing, also to sell the products he has made from the sea mamals, like parkas, boots, also the carvings from bones and the tusks, and the oil he uses for food. He also needs it to trade with the other villages that might have different foods they might have, where there are no sea mamals hunted, as in the interior of Alaska.

If the law should come into effect and the Eskimo is deprived, of the sea mamals, he will not automatically learn other trades, as he learned to make his living out of carving, parkas, boots, or other items he might make.

Even though the Eskimo may kill the sea mamals, it will not effect the population of the sea mamals, for he does not kill more than he needs. The Eskimo does not kill for sport, he hunts for his clothing and for food.

The estimated seals killed the area of St. Michael was one hundred to one hundred fifty, last year.

The seal is the main sea mamal that is hunted in the area of St. Michael, and it is hunted for food.

The walrus is not hunted very much because they rarely appear in the area of St. Michael. When the walrus is killed the meat is preserved and the tusks are usually sold to other villages where they are carved.

When sea mamals are killed, nothing much is wasted. The meat is usually hung to dry, oil put away in containers for future use. The skin is stretched to dry to be used for parkas, boots. The skin products are used for clothing personally or sold or traded for other materials.

Very few people have freezers at St. Michael in their homes, and the meat of the sea mamals are frozen for future us for food.

VICTOR JOE.

NOME, ALASKA.

Congressman STEVENS,
Chairman of Mammal Bill hearing.

DEAR MR. STEVENS: Since I am unable to be heard in person I would like to write up few things about the mammal protection bill.

No. 1. We hunted for centuries and never have we seen the number of these ocean mammals decrease. Before the whaling ships were around these waters the only thing left from walruses were the tusks. Only choice ivory were saved for tools and charms. Nowadays the people hunted with the subsistence hunting in their minds. Never have we hunted for commercial purposes. When we get these animals, the ivory, skin or the baleen automatically become the source of cash income. Otherwise we have a limit of catch, four walrus per boat in any hunting trip as the boat can only take that many. Whenever a boat accidently take five, the fifth pair of tusks were given to the community, as the penalty for over harvest. It works real good for local hunters.

The skins were made into garments and sold raw to the furriers for cash. Ivory from the walrus is carved into many beautiful trinkets, bracelets, earings and many more and sold to the tourists and gift shops. These brings in good cash income.

About 95% of the Alaska coastel residences depends on these and make a good living without a burden to the government. Bowhead whales are unusually increasing in quantity. Four times as much passes thru the St. Lawrence Is. waters at present days than ten or 15 years ago.

If this bill passes the senate, it will be understood as cruelty to human nature and blocking the very limited success of proud self dependent Americans. It will affect all native stores and gift shops accross the country. And worst of all the very culture of Eskimos will be banished.

Besides according to my understanding, this is being done, because of the land claims settlement, which has nothing to do with self supporting and limited successful living of these people. Therefore, we will be forced to make another big settlement to protect ourselves from being cut off from our only source of living. No-one that means nothing will stand in the way of success.

We must be allowed to remain to be the proud citizens of the United States of America, as we alway are.

Sincerely,

ROGER SILOOK.

STATEMENT OF EDWARD SAULNIER, PRODUCTION MANAGER, PRODUCTS DEVELOPMENT CHAIRMAN, ANCHORAGE ADVISORY COMMITTEE, ALASKA BOARD OF FISH AND GAME

ALASKA HAIR SEAL

Present population is approximately one million animals, including harbor seal, ringed seal, ribbon seal, and bearded seal. The approximate harvest is 20,000 in the Arctic and 10,000 south of the Arctic, for a total yearly harvest of 30,000, or about 3% of the total population. It has been determined that from 3% to 6% is a good harvest figure for the fur seal program.

By allowing 30,000 animals to be harvested we still have a nominal increase in total population. In South Central Alaska the summer harvest of subadults is monitored by the Alaska Department of Fish and Game. A biologist from the Department is stationed in the major rookery areas to insure against an overharvest.

It is our opinion that the herds will not increase very much either with or without a controlled harvest, due to natural conditions, such as food availability, etc.

We cannot believe that stopping this harvest has any benefit to the resource.

We must also realize that Alaska regulations permit commercial fishermen to take nuisance seal involved in fishery operations. We are convinced that fishermen will kill seal whether it is legal or not, because seals will scatter a salmon run and, therefore, make fishing on a commercial level much more difficult.

The hair seal is very desirable on the European market, and we feel that if Alaskans are forbidden to harvest these animals, the Russians will institute a larger seal harvest on the open sea to satisfy this market.

SEA LION

The present population in Alaska is between 175,000 and 225,000. The annual harvest since 1964 averages approximately 4,000. More specific figures of these harvest are 1971, 4,300; 1970, 6,057; 1969, 5,208; 1968, 4,118; 1967, 4,855; 1966, 3,050; 1965, 3,029; 1964, 1,500. Prior to 1964 there was not any commercial harvest of this animal. This animal is found only from the Seward Peninsula on the north, and the Aleutian Islands on the south. At this time the adult animals have no value for commercial purpose. Permits are issued for the taking of sea lion in specific areas, starting on an exact day. In this way the biologist can completely monitor the harvest to insure against the taking of more than half of the sub-adults in any area. In 1972 no permits will be issued in areas which have small numbers of sub-adults.

We feel that a harvest of 10,000 sea lions would not harm this resource. Although there is not a market for more that 5,000 or 6,000, we are still not harvesting more that 3% of the total population.

GENERAL INFORMATION

We know that seals and seal lions move around the state in a very erratic manner, so it is extremely difficult to get exact count of total populations. However, during pupping and breeding times both species have a tendency to group together in certain rookeries. A good example of this would be Tugidak Island, which is located southwest of Kodiak Island. Approximately 3,000 seal pups are born here each year, putting around 8,000 or 9,000 animals on and around the island at one time. At other times of the year only small numbers of seals are found here at one time.

The feeding habits of these animals can only be guessed at. During the pupping season there is a fasting time, and during a salmon run they will gorge themselves. Estimates range from 5 pounds per day up to 100 pounds per day of food. If we consider the seal only and take the low estimate we can assume that the Alaskan hair seal eats 5 million pounds of fish each day.

It is also known that seal carry some parasites, such as the cod worm, which can be harmful to the fish population.

SEA OTTER

The present population of the sea otter is about 50,000. In 1970 the Alaska Department of Fish and Game harvested 955 animals from the Aleutian Islands. By harvesting selected animals, such as mostly males, we believe a limited harvest could have continued. During the last atomic blast on Amchitka Island something in excess of 1,000 animals were killed. At the time of the blast the wind was blowing off the island and the carcasses were blown out to sea. Due to limited accomodations on the island at the t ime of the blast, the biologist from the Alaska Department of Fish and Game was sent t o Adak and therefore could not monitor the problem with the sea otter immediately after the blast. There will be no harvest of the sea otter this year (1972), or until such t ime as the herd breeding stock is re-established in this area.

MANAGEMENT

We strongly believe that the State of Alaska is fully capable of managing its wild animals without Federal interference. Before statehood the Federal Fish and Wildlife Service had a wolf control program which was poison which killed many other animals as well. As soon as we were allowed to take over the control of our game, we did away with this hazardous program.

On Nunivak Island the state has attempted to have a controlled Musk Ox harvest, only old bulls which have no benefit to the herd. The Department of the Interior will not allow land access for their hunt, therefore we have had a substantial winter kill this spring as the State of Alaska had predicted. In a survey conducted in late March and early April ten (10) dead Musk Oxen were found. It is possible that as many as 40 to 50 other dead animals were not found. In Alaskw our worst winter kills occur in usually late April, because the snow thaws and freezes creating a hard crust making it very difficult for the already weakened animals to move around.

ECONOMICS

If only Native *Handmade* items are legal for sale, many Natives and non-natives alike will suffer because of automation. My educated guess is that their is between 25 and 50 electric fur machines owned by natives in the state of Alaska.

The only tannery in Alaska, a two man operation grosses about $50,000 per year. Approximately 85% to 90% of their business is derived from Marine Mammals.

We at Products Development Co. spend approximately $100,000 each year for raw seal and raw sea lion. Most of this amount goes to low income areas, such as Kodiak Island and the Alaska Peninsula.

Products Development Co. has been working with the Alaska Retarded Children Association since early this year. We now have two projects in their shop. We do not feel that we can invest any more in this program until we get some exemption from the marine mammal legislation.

In conclusion I would like to say that I strongly believe that all Alaskans should be allowed to earn a living such as the tuna industry in California, and the fur seal processing in South Carolina.

NOME, ALASKA,
May 10th, 1972.

Senator TED STEVENS,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR STEVENS: This Ocean Mammal legislation has hit our people right where it hurts the most. If it should be executed as Senator Hollingsworth wrote out the Bill, we, the people of Alaska will have not more stamina to go on.

Seals: this animal played its role as life preserving mammal from the time immemorial. It was taken and utilized as food, fuel, and clothing. If restriction should be enforced against its being taken as it is needed, it will increase in number and became a threat to the salmon that we need very much in the Alaskan waters. It is taken for food and other uses and no part of it has ever been wasted.

Oogruks: this is also a fish eater. Its skin properly cared for yields nine pairs of mukluk soles. Each pair costing from four to eight dollars. At an average cost the owner could net fifty four dollars from one single skin. Many steps are taken from the time of killing the oogruk to the marketing time. Only those that are experts on the care and utilization can tell you how much time and effort it takes to get a little income from it. Its meat and oil always the best grade to those that know how to eat it. Saving also the table of a hunter with many mouths to feed. The skin can, also, be made into raw hide rope that is used in sled and snow shoe industry. Even the guts can be made into rain parkas.

Whales: This is my favorate animal when it comes to admeration and respect. The largest animal existing, the blue whale is not tempermental. When pursued it is timmid this allowing men to catch it. To me the hunters that go out in pursuit of this mammal are mightiest of all hunters in the world. They face not only the mercy of the prey but the severest atmosphere as we know it. There are ice floes, storms, and temperatures to reckon with. As we knew it even the blood was preserved at one time. Underground storages were built, as the meat and muktuk aged the flavor became more apitizing. Its bones within its mouth had many uses. This went into the fish hook connections, baskets, and at one time were made into warriors' vests to protect the lung cavity from sharp arrows. Today a pound of its muktuk is three dollars a pound. People are told lower 48 learning to eat it and shipping it out so we do not see very much of it here. At three dollars a pound only wealthy can afford to eat it.

Baluga whale: This is a small white whale easier to catch and can be taken all along the west coast of Alaska. Fish eater. Delicious when it is preserved in its own oil. This is usually put away in barrels and the meat dried and we call it "black meat". No part of this mammal is ever wasted. Many families from inland villages all along the Noatak, Kobuk, Selawik, and Buckland Rivers move to the coast line to harvest this tasty and necessary item in the Eskimo diet. Taking away mammal oils from Eskimos would be like taking away butter and bacon from white people.

Walrus: played its part in many ways. There was a time when the natives lived closely with wild birds and animals. Living close to nature as a cave man did. They studied and watched the habits in the natural habituts of all kinds of animals. To the on the sea hunters the walrus was an animal to be respected. Many beliefs created by mideival dwellers carried on from generation to generation, could really affects chills up and down the stiff spines of or today's super men. Our people were taught by older and wiser people never to waste food that had been harvested. Never take more than what was needed, or else, or else—this of course one could class as superstition or voo doo practice at this late date.

Recently I noticed reports, people slaughtering this animal just to get the ivory what the white traders needed. I had a feeling that some one would notice this killing and object. Couldn't it be arranged so there could be a limit to an intake on this animal?

From the true facts I have learned that walrus can be dangerous when enormous in number. There were times when the distance between Diomede Islands was choked. Eskimos of the two Islands did not dare kill any even they were very hungry. They just watched the animals migrate into the Arctic Ocean. Those that dared took bulls that crawled away from the main herds on rocks with spears. A gun shot would have been dessasterous. A stampede in the water would have drowned many animals.

We are now told natives will be allowed subsistance. This meaning that they take just enough for their own use. Where will the people from the lower 48 find like mukluks and parkas to wear? Natives need to be allowed marketing the hand made items.

Just the other day I visited one of our Beringvue Homebuyers, a young woman with four children, no husband, sitting on the floor of her nice clean home fashioning six pairs of beaded seal skin slippers. I asked her if she had in mind as to who the buyer will be. She told me they (items) will be ready when a buyer comes along. She is trying to suppliment her meager income by sewing.

If Senator Hollingsworth pass a Bill that has a clause saying, " . . . shall have not more than one pig within eight square miles of land." I am sure the people who had elected him become their Senator would not allow the Bill to pass. Could any Senator of the United States, in his right mind, draft a Bill declaring cattle be taken away from Texas?

Senator Stevens, as I sit here with a troubled mind I have much to think about. Ever since I can remember I have never spend a day without seeing or knowing what it was like to be without the use of what was taken out of this country. From day to day I have, also, made use of what I have adopted from my white sisters and brothers. We all know that one can be stripped of all possessions but one can never be robbed of what he has learned to do. Must the technique in preserving and utilizing that had been in its existance for thousands of years be halted now?

I am thanking you for your hard work.

Sincerely yours,

LELA KIANA OMAN.

INUPIAK DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION, INC.,
Nome, Alaska, May 10, 1972.

Hon. TED STEVENS,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR STEVENS: I would like to express my views on the "Marine Mammal Protection Act of 1972" (Staff Working Draft #2) as referred to the Senate Commerce Committee on May 2, 1972.

Section 107, Title I, provides exceptions to Native Alakans in taking of any marine mammal.

Subsection (a) (1), Section 107 provides for the taking of marine mammals for "subsistence purposes and in accordance with traditional customs". In order to be realistic as to the true meaning of subsistence purposes as pertaining to Native use, this statement should be expanded on. Undoubtedly, administrative interpretation of this statement will limit taking of marine mammals to personal consumption. Subsistence, as applied to Natives, goes beyond food utilization. For example, sales of meats locally to those who cannot hunt for themselves (widows, disabled, etc.) constitutes one means of cash income for the hunter, as well as providing an inexpensive source of food for those who need it. Sales of hides, clothing, tools, artifacts, etc., further supplement family incomes; in many communities such sales are the sole cash economy, enabling residents to provide the basic necessities for themselves and their families. Loss of this income would place an extreme hardship not only on those directly affected, but would prove detrimental to the entire State in that provisions would have to be made to support those who can no longer support themselves —in effect, the creation of a welfare state through Federal legislation at worst.

Subsection (a) (2), Section 107 prohibits sales through interstate commerce. This is not a realistic method of wildlife management, as stated in the material transmitted to your office on 5 May 72 from John Shively, Executive Director of the Rural Alaska Community Action Program. Wildlife management should be based on scientific methods of control directly related to wildlife population. Secondly, prohibition of interstate sales of Native arts & crafts eliminates the fine arts market; it eliminates the sales of hides to out-of-state buyers and foreign buyers; it would effectively eliminate the major segment of the present market for marine mammal products depending on the legal interpretation of interstate commerce. If the interpretation is such that it prohibits sales to visitors and tourists, this could conceivably cut off virtually all sales within the State, therefore making the provision meaningless. Subsection (b), Section 107 adequately provides for management without the necessity of including a meaningless prohibition on interstate sales.

Sincerely,

JAMES B. BELL, *Director.*

NOME, ALASKA.

We Alaska Native Eskimos, all the coast lines, always depends on ocean mammals, during the short times of migration of animals which pass by our coastlines for centuries.

We then hunt for these mammals for food to store or presurves to dried the meat and skins for clothing.

And at present times, lots of our people have only chance to earn cash by selling the skins and making them into parkas, mukluks, and other things, also the Walrus ivory by the men learns to carve to pay for other food items. Also clothing, ammunations, motors.

Even some may gets Welfare Assistance, unless a person have a year round job. We have no other way to earn cash, unless we try to make skins and Ivory carvings into cash.

If the situation is change from our present time and free well to sell the skins and Ivory, it will turn us into hardship, instead of improvements, to better way of living.

DWIGHT TEVUK.
Nome, Alaska.

NOME, ALASKA.

I wrote a letter March 10, 1972 to Sen. Ernest Hollings, Senate Commerce Committee, Wash. D.C., and copy to Sen Ted Stevens, U.S. Senate.

In that letter is to express my opinion, after what I heard through our local Radio Broadcast Stations.

In that letter is to express my opinion, after what I heard news of ocean mammals bills, I myself feel this is going to be sad for all the people of Alaska.

After our creator, gives and plans of these all kinds of ocean mammals to Alaska natives, all along the Alaska waters for food and clothing.

I wish to express my views, this is absolutely necessity, and will never be forgotten yet unless the climate is change suddenly.

Besides there are lots of people that have no education to have year rounds jobs. Just depends on mostly what they gets from hunting.

I cannot understand if proposed bills be passed in short notice.

DWIGHT TEVUK.

NOME, ALASKA,
May 3, 1972.

Senator TED STEVENS,

GENTLEMEN: I am not a speaker nor writer yet I would to say and try to show, about people living in the Villages. This is a good big land and ocean and its people living by its animals mostly mamals thats on a coastline only.

Now see this real close these older people have learn to live by hunting and carving women learn to sew skins and preserve meat. Please do not take away by force what they do in living. Its their way no one up here will try and change living outside why they do want to that. If this go on and change what will there be to fill what they been doing in carving and sewing.

The young people are taking education and will keep on. Which means anyone can see clearly there will be no hunting and sewing, when they finish up because they will be teachers what they want to be. What then may be after that they have to adjust the number of animals out there will be so some may be too many and clean the feed.

Its true that they kill too many walrus now but they could cut out the killing not too hard. If Gov. William Egan could see and understand what behind he would say leave everything alone with Eskimo people. Because many of them vote for him thinking he is there best choice to help them living. I would leave everything alone because its too long and hard work for a man to gather his hunting gear. He is to be able man with a good mind to go through weather ice to keep his crew safe. A woman has to learn to sew with skill and cut a walrus hide to make skin boot skins. If you don't learn to hunt or sew, many times you will come home with nothing. I am 63 years old I have only very little time left for hunting.

Please this very important for village people they just talk with no base right now like me they afraid to speak or write because they not good enough their English or write.

If you wish to say some of what I try to say you have adjust them to correct way.

Thank you for asking me to testify or write.

WILLIE SENUNGETUK.

UNIVERSITY OF ALASKA,
Fairbanks, Alaska, May 8, 1972.

My name is Joseph Senungetuk and I represent the Village Art, Upgrade Program, Division of Statewide Services, University of Alaska. Under this program, I am one of two instructors who cover the state of Alaska on matters concerning Native arts and crafts. I began working in this capacity on February 1, 1972.

The goals of this program are to look into the villages and meet with the producers of Native arts and crafts and to seek out those willing to participate in training programs either on the local level or through the Public Service division of the University. At the present time we are limited to the age groups generally applicable for adult vocational training programs because of funding sources. And because of funding limitations, this program has yet to grow from its original plans to encompass all of the villages that have asked for our services on upgrading village art.

I am here now because of the close relationships the Village Art Upgrade Program has to the village artists and craftsmen insofar as raw materials, production techniques, and marketing practices are concerned.

During the early periods of Native and non-Native contacts in Northwest Alaska, there began a movement of arts and crafts out of Alaska to places as far away as Europe. In turn, the whalers, traders, missionaries, and school teachers imported such commodities as beads, money, whiskey, coffee, sugar, rifles and ideas contrary to the ideas of the non-wasteful Native. Today, the Eskimo has little to account for his tradings away of his cultural works of art. Some of the early works done by Native masters are in the hands of museums and collectors thousands of miles away. Their going prices often reach the price of one snowmobile.

Today the raw materials are much the same as they were then, a period of some two hundred years ago. Art forms do not remain static; life styles, if given a chance, do change and art in any culture reflects many facets of how these changes affect the general trends and relationships with other cultures. So the changes in art forms, even if legislated for or against by various means, are still very much a part of man no matter who he is, where he is, what he is up against, or when it was that he encountered this drive to create.

If this bill had been passed during the times of the rifle's introduction, the Alaskan Native would have had a chance to realize what he was up against. But right now the emotions are so intermixed with so many other do's and don't that it will be a while before the authors of this bill will realize what they have added to the chapters of ignorant handling of Native affairs in the United States.

We are all quite aware of the present educational, health and occupational shortcomings of the Native American. In Northwest Alaska, it is hard to imagine the hardships endured by those reliant on a hunting and fishing subsistance. For some people, it is just plain impossible to comprehend "primitive" situations in this day and age. Still the textbooks of too many schools conjure an image of the smiling, happy and carefree Eskimo. Or else we suddenly are confronted with a picture of all Alaskan Natives instantly benefiting from the recently passed Land Claims Bill. The reality is that the cost of living is not decreasing in Northwest Alaska. There is no immediate answer to the terrifying statistics of unemployment, suicide and drop-out rates from schools. In spite of broken homes, broken promises and poverty, the Native hunter is still here and he has children to be concerned about. His expenses are many: The cost of hunting equipment, his boat, motors, fuel, rifle, campsites and their cost of maintenance.

From the United States East Coast to California the wave of conservationism has engulfed the public's feelings. First there was the publicity on seal pups of Eastern Canada. Then the polar bear kills entered the scene through film strips showing light plane usage. Then the Pribilof fur seal appeared in television screens with hardly any kind words for the Native whose livelihood centered in this annual harvest. The wolf question never really got answered, although much was said by the hunter and the conservationist. All of this publicity has made many instant experts on wildlife and wilderness. They used the ever-ready audiovisual material, often with no qualms about using research films spliced together to fit other situations.

The rest of the Native Americans will find it hard to identify with the areas affected by this bill. The Indian reservations have had their problems all along. But this is an age where quiescence is no longer the only recourse for many tribes who are finding it more and more viable to keep abreast of the events concerning their affairs in light of stronger recognition of their rights as people.

Today we see American Indians fighting for their land and water rights with the earnestness of a life and death matter. Because it has come to just that—Life and death. Indians in Arizona, Nevada, New Mexico and California are gathering up their strengths in their own lawyers and leaders who are

saying the same things their ancestors said. But with legal attachments to the voices.

The rights of Alaskan Natives in the near future will be respected only if we are kept informed and respect shown to people who have fought for their existence long and hard without the shrill voice of extremism nor with cries of unfairness without basis in facts. Let us hope that the arts contingent on matters in this bill will not have to reflect these stages in the future.

JOSEPH E. SENUNGETUK,
Village Art, Upgrade Program.

KOTZEBUE, ALASKA, *May 3, 1972.*

On the evening of May 2, 1972, 21 Senior Citizens of Kotzebue, meeting in the Senior Center, made the enclosed tape recording (in both Eskimo and English), to express their feeling about the Sea Mammal legislation currently under debate in the U.S. Congress.

The sentiment among this group of old people was that unrestricted hunting of sea mammals should be permitted for Eskimos, not only because these mammals provide the food the people are accustomed to, but also because the hides, bone and ivory are utilized.

Of interest is the fact that a well-established, centuries old trade exists currently between the inland villages of the Kobuk and Noatak Rivers, and the coastal communities. The trade is small, but constant. Muktuk (skin and blubber) of bowhead whales taken at Kivalina and Point Hope is carried to these inland villages, often by dog team or snow-machine and sled, and there sold, or traded. Seal oil from the coast is much in demand at all the inland villages. Sealskins are traded, and oogruk skins (a variety of seal) for making the hard, waterproof bottoms of mukluks (skin boots) which are still in wide use.

In return, sheefish, trout and grayling taken up river are sold in the coastal villages, as well as caribou meat, skins and some moose hides and meat. There is a lively trade in ivory, taken from walrus at St. Lawrence Island and Little Diomede.

Beluga are taken in all the coastal villages, and strips of this are dried, and sold upriver.

The trade, it must be repeated, is very small, but it is of great local importance. It is not reasonable to restrict the use of sea mammals to subsistence *eating* only, confined to the individuals who take the animal. Most of the animal is utilized in one way or another—mostly locally, but also for the production of tourist items, which provides some cash income for the artisans and the old people.

JANE PENDER.
Board Member, Kotzebue Senior Center.

Among those who taped:

Jack Jones, Amy Jones, John Evak, Annie Mitchell, John Mitchell, Abraham Howarth, Bessie Shy, Emily Barr, Benjamin Towksjhea, Charlie Jensen, Lucy Allen, Bessie Kowunna, Jacob Stalker, Fletcher Gregg.

DILEMMA: ESKIMOS, BOWHEAD WHALES

(By Jane Pender)

KOTZEBUE—It was a sad thing to read sometime ago that the great black Bowhead whale is on the list of endangered species, and this because of factory ship whaling activity which, with sophisticated equipment, transforms these great beasts into petfood, cold cream and other commodities for which ample substitutes exist.

It is particuraly distressing here in this part of the world, for the few remaining remnants of the proud old maritime culture of the Eskimos are still linked to the pursuit of the Bowhead whale; all the village ceremonials, dating back to who knows when, are still related to these great beasts of the sea; and, as an aside to these remarks, the annual Eskimo harvest of the Bowheads is never more than about 30. Under normal conditions (i.e., without the factory ships) this would be sufficient to ensure that the species would remain alive.

This problem poses again, one of those insoluble dilemmas which have been afflicting the Eskimos ever since their isolation was pierced back in the 19th century.

For, what is involved here is the whole elaborate structure of the hunt—an honorable one, since it is pursued to this day in those tiny skin boats; and the earthy honoring of the animals which provide the year's food, and in former days, the houses of the people, too. The culture of Point Hope, like that of Barrow, is inextricably entwined with the whale; it is this annual hunt which gives the people their character; and the ceremonials which attend his capture are carried on throughout the year. The Nulligatuk is the greatest of these, a three day festival at Point Hope, in June of the years when whales are taken, they are shared out among the villagers and the visitors in a symbolic and actual expression of the Eskimo ethos.

But other ceremonials follow throughout the year: muktuk is a staple of the Thanksgiving and Christmas feasting. Just a short time ago, the last of the muktuk was shared again at a feast during which Elijah, son of umailik (captain) Allen Rock, accepted the harpoon of the fallen one. Rock died last summer.

So here is the essence of the dilemma; whale oil for cold cream, or whale oil for a whole way of life? Anachronistic it may be, to live in Point Hope, and to celebrate the whale. But is cold cream really more important?

This is not the only such question which has been raised in the north. It is only the last in a long series which sometimes seem to me the products of simple mischief.

2 Bowhead Whales Taken At Pt. Hope

Kotzebue—Word has been received here that two Bowhead whales have been taken by whaling crews at Point Hope. Umailik (captain) Joe Frankson and crew, took one about 1:30 p.m. Wednesday, the other by Umailik Amos Lane and crew was taken about 9 p.m. Thursday.

Crews have been hunting for several weeks now, with the degree of hunt dependent upon the opening and closing of the leads of open water near Point Hope. One whale was taken just last week by Umailik Billy Weber and his crew, but the animal was lost as it slid under the ice.

These catches assure the winter food for the village of Point Hope (about 300 people) who rely heavily on whale for their subsistence diet.

Native Trade

(By Jane Pender, Chronicle Correspondent)

Jimmy Hawley Sr., an Eskimo from Kivalina, a coastal whaling village north of here, mushed into town the other day on his iron dog. That's the local term for a snow machine, which has largely supplanted the traditional dogteams of the north.

Behind his iron dog, Jimmy pulled a wooden freight sled which was loaded with blubber from a whale caught last spring, and seal oil in sealskin pokes.

He was headed for the Kobuk River village of Noorvik, where he had eager customers for his wares. Blubber, which has been stored in ice cellars over the winter, is at this time of year ripe, and delicious, though it has a hefty odor.

On the return trip, he will bring a sledload of sheefish, which is taken in the Kobuk, but not in Kivalina. Dried, this fish is dipped in seal oil to make an Eskimo finger food—much prized.

There is a very heavy traffic in what are called "native foods" as well as in other native produced or gathered commodities among villages in Alaska.

Dolly Varden trout, taken up the Kobuk or Noatak Rivers, comes down usually by sled; sometimes in summer by boat.

Reindeer from the few remaining herds around Kotzebue and Nome is sold in all the local stores; it is transported by bush plane to outlying villages.

Shishmareff, on the Seward Peninsula, is renowned for its hair seals and the quality of its Arctic fox. These skins travel north and into the interior. They are usually scraped and dried, rolled into big tubes and the finish tanning is done elsewhere.

* * * * * * * *

Wolf and wolverine, prized for frostfree ruffs, come from the Noatak and Kobuk valleys, but can be found in every native village and trimming every native parka. They are shipped by bush plane and by sled.

Walrus ivory from St. Lawrence Island; whalebone from Point Hope both find their way to carvers in the most remote villages.

Spruce and willow bark, which are used for dye on ruffs and trim, come from trees on the river bottoms, but every Eskimo home even in the treeless areas has a supply. There is even a trade between traditional enemies—the Eskimos and other Indians—in beadwork, not done by Eskimos, but prized for boot trim; and in moose skins, which make a heavier boot. These come from the Indians of the interior rivers, as do beaver skins for mittens and boots.

* * * * * * * *

And everywhere in the Arctic can be found the all-purpose caribou. Its meat is a staple of diet; leg skin makes skin boot legs; body hide makes mattresses, sleeping robes, tents, even boats in an emergency.

Summer berries, which do not grow everywhere, are as likely to be put up in Wesson oil as the traditional seal oil, and they are a staple of Eskimo feasts in every remote village, as is "masoo" . . . the Eskimo potato which can be found only in the boggy flats of the lower rivers.

By informal means—boat, sled, backpack, bush plane—Eskimos everywhere in the Arctic share in these traditional fruits of land and sea.

NOME, ALASKA, *April 19, 1972.*

U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR STEVENS: I am very pleased to know that hearings on the proposed mammal bill are going to be held in Alaska, and particularly in Nome which is my home community.

I was very disappointed however to hear your statement that testimony would be limited to Alaskan natives. And by that I assume you meant Eskimos, Indians, and Aleuts. It is rather common place these days to declare discrimination, but in this case itse ems clear that that is the case. Does this mean that Alaskan Fish and Game personnel who are non-natives, but who are obviously in a position to have relevant information, are disqualified from testimony? I also think of non-natives who own arts and crafts businesses, and specificly of one local who invested a good deal of his life savings two years ago into a business. He must feel somewhat irritated that the U.S. Government won't allow him to express his views on this subject which dramatically effects his livelihood.

Every time a law or a policy comes into existence which is based upon race, certain problems inevitably follow. Your proposed amendment, for example, which would allow Alaskan natives the priviledge of subsistence hunting for certain sea mammals is blatantly discriminatory. First of all the notion of "subsistence" hunting is in many cases a misnomer. The Eskimos that I have had the unique pleasure of hunting with have had regular jobs and don't "subsist" any more than anybody else around here. They hunt seal, oogrook and walrus because they like the food, they use and sell the by products, and they enjoy hunting. Unless there is clear cut evidence that hunting these animals is significantly endangering their numbers (and local Fish and Game authorities deny this) the United States Government should not interfere in this life style. And most assurredly if they do interfere because of misled public opinion, it should not be on the basis of race.

I doubt that there are twenty non-natives between Bethel and Barrow who participate in sea mammal hunts. Your amendment should not exclude them. I suggest the term "native" be replaced with "local resident" or some like phrase. The twenty or so non-natives between Bethel and Barrow will be highly appreciative of this detail.

If it is decided that non-natives have a right to present testimony on this issue, please classify this as such. If not, please consider its content anyhow. Thank you.

Sincerely,

KENNETH E. BROWN.

DEPARTMENT OF ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT,
OFFICE OF THE COMMISSIONER,
Anchorage, Alaska, April 10, 1972.

Hon. TED STEVENS,
U.S. Senate,
304 Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR STEVENS: I am enclosing a list of the coastal villages affected by the marine mammal bills, with their population and dollar amount of sales estimated for ivory and skin products of the major producing villages. Those villages which do not have a dollar estimate use marine mammal skins for their personal clothing and utensils but sell very little if any by-products. Most of these villages do art work, but with driftwood, grass for baskets, and beadwork.

St. Paul and St. George Islands, although now doing a very small business in arts and crafts from skin products and ivory which washes up on the beach, have a great potential for sales from products made from the rejected fur sealskins from the annual harvest. Currently, input into St. Paul and St. George in development of this small reject fur sealskin industry comes from the University of Alaska Statewide Services, the Bureau of Indian Affairs, Industrial Development, and the National Marine Fisheries Service of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration of the U.S. Department of Commerce. The possibilities include a tannery at St. Paul Island for tanning the rejected skins as well as reindeer and fox, plus skin sewing. The women are interested in learning more about skin sewing; although they do a little sewing now, they require further training for development of a marketable product.

The women in the White Mountain-Golovin-Elim area have expressed an interest in marketing their fur products, and I am currently working on a proposal to hire people to work with such places as this.

In such villages as Diomede, Wales, Savoonga and Gambell particularly, ivory carving is the primary source of income during the winter months; although these figures are rough estimates, I feel that they are, for the most part, conservative. In Teller, where I have listed $17,000 per year in ivory and skin sewn product sales, the potential is far greater; however, here particularly, many of the carvers have ceased producing because of welfare and particularly food stamps.

I am also enclosing pages 9 through 27 of the Native Handcraft Identification Study done by Harold Wolff. You have a complete copy of this study which I left with you in October. These pages will give a little additional information regarding craftsmen and their products. These newer figures which I have attached show that Mr. Wolff's estimates were low. However, the information contained in these pages, I think, may be helpful to you.

I am sending a duplicate of this letter to Senator Gravel.

Good luck with your amendment to the Marine Bill.

Sincerely,

LYNN CHAMBERS,
Arts and Crafts Development Specialist.

ALASKAN COASTAL VILLAGES—POPULATION AND PRODUCTION

	Population 1970 census	Production of ivory and fur 1971
Barrow	2,663	15,000
Wainright	315	20,000
Point Hope	386	20,000
Kivalina	188	15,000
Kotzebue	1,696	3,000
Deering	85	
Shishmaref	267	25,000
Diomede	84	30,000
Wales	131	25,000
Teller	220	17,000
Nome	3,488	50,000
White Mountain	87	
Golovin	117	
Elium	174	
Koyuk	122	
Shaktolik	151	
Unalakleet	434	
Saint Michael	207	
Sheldon Point	125	
Stebbins	231	
Kotlik	228	
Scammon Bay	166	
Hooper Bay	490	
Tannunak	274	
Nightmute	127	
Mekoryuk	249	10,000
Kwigillingnak	148	
Kongiganak	190	
Tuntutuliak	158	
Eek	186	
Kwinhagak	340	
Mumtrak	218	
Platinum	55	
Savoonga	364	40,000
Gambell	372	40,000
St. Paul	450	2,000
St. George	163	1,000
Toksook Bay	257	10,000
Kiana	278	

Native Handicraft Identification

CONSULTANT'S REPORT TO: DEPARTMENT OF ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT, STATE OF ALASKA

Using all products produced by single Native craftsmen in the State in some significant quantity as a reference, we have used the term *non-Native craft product* to describe all products resembling or "imitative" of the common Native craft forms made outside of the State, or by non-Native craftsmen, or with the use of mass production devices, or any combination of these circumstances. We have also used the term *manufactured craft products* to specifically apply to those items made in a factory or larger production shop setting. When using the terms *craft-market* or *Native-craft market*, we are referring to the total market of Native products and non-Native products sharing common design and material usage.

PRODUCERS AND PRODUCTS

There are five readily distinguishable origins of Native craft or Native craft-type products: single Eskimo, Indian and Aleut craftsmen; single non-Native craftsmen; organized production shops inside the State; production shops or factories in the "Lower 48" or Canada; and imports from the Far East.

Estimates of the number of Native craftsmen currently engaged in commercial production range from 400 to 1,200 persons. The smaller of the estimates is probably accurate if limited to those persons who currently earn a significant share of their total family cash income from craft production. The larger figure would include all persons who produce even a single craft product for commerce, though the income from the sale of these products is only an incidental source of cash.

In economic terms, there are at least three distinct groups of craftsmen currently producing. The first are craftsmen, primarily residing in villages and predominately female, who produce only an occasional product for sale, and who are not reliant on such sales as a significant source of income, even though they may have no other employment. This group may number 300–600 people

who earn from $25 to $300 per year from craft sales. A second group, including more men and more urban dwellers, is dependent on craft sales as an important source of secondary income or of primary income other than welfare or other subsidy. Many of this group would have employment during summer months in construction, fishing, or other seasonal activity, producing craft items only in the winter months. This group numbers between 200–400 and would have income from crafts of between $300–$2,500 per year. A third group can be identified as working craftsmen for whom craft sales constitute the most important source of income, with the exception of periodic employment "windfalls". This group is predominately male and includes proportionately more urban-based persons. Annual income of this group ranges from $2,500 to as high as $15,000 per year for a few very productive, and market conscious, individuals. The 100 to 200 people in this group probably produce more than 50 percent of the Native crafts sold.

We have not separately identified the craft cooperatives now operating in several parts of the State, as these organizations currently act only as buying and selling agents for their individual members and do not yet have any collective or "corporate" production capability.

There are also a few, probably not more than 15, individual non-Native craftsmen who produce a Native-type craft product. While their number is small, their production can be quite high. In one case known to the writer, the craftsman produces ivory products, primarily jewelry, with sales near the highest achieved by any Native craftsman.

A third group of producers are organized production shops in the State that make Native-type items in a more or less established "product line". They range in size from small "basement" operations that employ only the proprietor and his immediate family to a few well organized manufacturing operations, the largest one employing as many as 30 people. For the most part, however, these shops are small, do not have large capital investments in equipment or facilities, and will have sporadic production varying with the seasons and with sales. In some cases, they differ from the operations of individual craftsmen only in the sense that they have established a particular identifiable product line and tie production to sales in a somewhat more systematic fashion than does the individual craftsman. At least two small production shops are owned by individual Natives.

We have not considered the local craft cooperatives to be in this category. While some do provide common facilities and equipment that are used by several craftsmen, these craftsmen are operating as individuals and sell what they produce to the cooperative rather than being paid hourly wages.

Some of the Alaska production shops employ Natives, though by no means exclusively, and, overall, Natives constitute only a minority percentage of workers employed in these shops.

The principal products made in these Alaskan shops that are competitive with the individual Native craft product are fur and skin-sewn items, slippers, mukluks, Eskimo yo-yos, etc., totem poles, and some ivory and soapstone items. These ivory and soapstone products are generally produced partially with power equipment, but require a substantial amount of hand-finishing. Fur or skin-sewn products are produced with varying degrees of assembly line equipment and methodology. In no case, of which we are aware, is a pantograph or carving machine in use in Alaska.

The fourth group of producers are the shops and factories in the Seattle-Portland-British Columbia area. These shops also vary greatly in size, number of employees, equipment used, and volume of sales. As a group they produce a substantial majority of the craft products sold in the State. The largest of these, a Seattle plant employing approximately 50 people, has an annual sales volume of approximately $200,000 *in excess of the total estimated wholesale value of Native-produced craft products.* This factory and several smaller ones produce a wide range of ivory products and commonly employ carving machines, pantographs, and assembly line methodology. Totem poles, Southeastern Indian jewelry and novelty items, and skin-sewn products are also produced in other shops operating in this area.

Some of these shops do currently, or have previously, employed Alaskan Natives residing in the area as designers and production workers; however, in total, Natives constitute only a small percentage of the work force.

A fifth origin of Native-type craft products are imports from the Far East, primarily Hong Kong and Taipei currently. Ivory and jade items are the principal imports. Those products are often excellent in quality and are very favorably priced in comparison to either individually produced Native crafts or

to those of Seattle manufacturers; however, they do not currently constitute a large percentage of Alaskan craft sales. A principal constraint on their growth in the market is the requirement that such products carry country of origin markings, a requirement that limits their sales appeal to the consumer seeking an authentic Alaskan item. In at least one case known to us, an Alaskan importer has partially circumvented this requirement by ordering ivory carvings "blocked out" and having them hand-finished by local labor, usually Natives. Similar arrangements are made with jewelry products; foreign-produced component parts are assembled locally. In both kinds of cases, importers have received favorable rulings from U.S. Customs regarding the absence of country of origin markings; however, the need for a significant amount of relatively skilled local labor still needed to finish the product reduces pricing advantages and limits the quantity of these items on the market.

A special category of products competitive with Alaskan Native products is made by individual Canadian Eskimo and Indian craftsmen. Principal of these are the soapstone carvings sold through the producer-owned Canadian Arctic Producers Cooperative and other Canadian distributors. Some fur- and skin-sewn products and a few totem poles and other Indian items also find their way into Alaskan markets.

Table I summarizes raw materials utilized and products made by producer groups. Table II attempts to estimate percentages of sales in each product group by origin of product.

DISTRIBUTION

The distribution system for handicraft products in the State, particularly for the Native-produced items, is extremely complex and cumbersome. Table III summarizes the principal marketing channels currently in operation.

This distribution system is an important consideration in the formulation of a Native-craft identification program, as we will discuss later in this report.

Raw materials and products by producer group

Raw Materials	*Products*
Eskimo craft areas:	
Walrus tusks	Ivory carvings: Animal figurines, jewelry, crib boards, pickle forks, letter openers, etc.
Grass, split willow, birch bark, berries, commercial dyes.	Basketry: Baskets with and without tops, trays, mats.
Driftwood	Wood carvings.
Skins and furs: Seal, muskrat, walrus, rabbit, wolverine, squirrel, etc.	Mukluks, slippers, dolls, masks, yo-yo's, stuffed animals.
Whale and reindeer bone	Masks and dolls.
Miscellaneous	Artifacts, miniatures, models, cards, paintings, etc.
Beads	Necklaces, pendants, etc.
Soapstone, limestone, etc	Stone carvings of humans and animals.
Jade	Jewelry and carvings.
Baleen	Boats and baskets.
Indian craft areas:	
Skins and fur: Reindeer, seal, rabbit, etc.	Moccasins, dolls, wallets, hats, handbags, gloves, purses, ashtrays, etc.
Wood: Spruce, cedar, hemlock, birch	Totems, bowls, masks, special carvings, etc.
Spruce root, cedar bark	Basketry.
Alaskan, lower "48," and foreign manufacturers of Alaskan-type products:	
Hematite, jade, ivory (usually whale tooth or elephant), silver, gold plate, plastics, metal findings, and settings.	Jewelry: Earrings, necklaces, rings, bracelets, tie bars, cufflinks, etc.
Wood, plastics, ivory, and composition materials.	Carvings or molded item.
Variety of furs, skins, plus many synthetic materials.	Skin sewn products: Gloves, mittens, hats, handbags, stuffed animals, yo-yo's, mukluks, moccasins, slippers, etc.

TABLE II.—ESTIMATED PERCENTAGE OF NATIVE-TYPE CRAFT SALES BY ORIGIN OF PRODUCT

Product	Total Percentage of craft market sales	Origin				
		Percent Alaskan craftsmen	Percent Alaskan production shops	Percent lower 48 and Canadian manufacturer	Percent Far Eastern and other imports	Percent single Canadian Eskimo and Indian craftsmen
Ivory carvings, jewelry, and novelty items	45	20	10	55	15	
Skin and Fur sewn items—Slippers, mukluks, moccasins, handbags, dolls, etc	25	15	45	30	[1]10	Probably than 1 percent.
Totem poles and other N.W. Indian-style carved items	15	15	25	40	20	Less than.
Jade jewelry and carvings	6	5	45		50	
Baskets and other woven products	2	100				
Other—Soapstone carvings, models and miniatures, whalebone and skin masks, baleen products, artifacts, prints, silverwork, etc	7	70	5	5		20.

[1] Scandinavian, German, etc.

TABLE II.

DISTRIBUTION STRUCTURE OF CRAFT PRODUCTS BOUGHT AND SOLD IN ALASKA

KEY P = Producer W = Wholesaler R = Retailer C = Consumer X = Buyer-Seller Relationships O = Future Coop Role			BUYERS						
			W	W	W	R	WRC	R	R
			Eskimo Native Stores	Distributors and Sales Representatives of Alaskan-type Craft Products	ANAC Wholesale	Taverns	Independent Traders, Bush Pilots, etc.	ANAC Retail	Alaskan Command Exchange
SELLERS	PWR	Individual Eskimo Craftsmen	X		X	X	X		X
	PWR	Individual Indian Craftsmen			X		X		
	PW	Alaskan, Lower "48" & Foreign Manufacturers of Alaskan-type Craft Products		X					X
	WR	Eskimo Native Stores			X		X		X
	W	Distributors & Sales Representatives of Alaskan-type Craft Products							X
	W	BIA Juneau			X				
	WR	ANAC Wholesale						X	X
	WR	Independent Traders, Bush Pilots, etc.							
	R	ANAC Retail							
	R	Lower "48" Retail Gift Shops							
	R	Alaskan Retail Gift Shops							
	R	Military Personnel in Alaska							
	R	Alaska Ferry System							
	R	Alaskan Command Exchange							
	WR	Taverns							
	WR	Regional Craft Cooperatives					X	X	X

Ernst & Ernst, pgs. I-26 I-27

SIZE OF MARKET

The Ernst & Ernst study,[1] on the basis of extensive interview data and some quantitative material then available, estimated the total wholesale value of Alaskan Native-type handicraft items in excess of $1,400,000 in 1965. This estimate excluded items not then (or currently) produced in any significant commercial quantity by Alaskan Natives: jade, hematite, gold nugget and other precious stone jewelry, fur parkas, and inexpensive souvenir items such as plaques, plastic dolls, ash trays, post cards, place mats, cigarette lighters, pennants, glassware, etc.

Unfortunately there does not seem to be a readily accessible method for determining with precision the current volume of sales of handicraft. The

[1] Ernst & Ernst, op. cit.; pp. I-15 to I-19.

B U Y E R S									
E	R	R	C	C	C	C	C	C	C
Lower "48" Retail Gift Shops	Alaskan Retail Gift Shops	Alaska Ferry System	BIA & U.S. Gov't Field Per-sonnel	Military Per-sonnel in Alaska	Business Travelers in Alaska	Other Alaskan Resi-dents	Tourists in Alaska	Resi-dents of Lower "48"	Private Collectors Museums, etc.
X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X	X
X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
X	X	X							
X	X		X	X	X	X	X		
X	X	X							
	X		X	X	X	X	X		
X	X		X						X
	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		X
			X	X	X	X	X		
								X	
			X	X	X	X	X		X
								X	
			X	X	X	X	X		
				X		X			
	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		X
X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		X

multi-various sources of production and marketing outlets previously described frustrate attempts to quantify handicraft sales with either ease or accuracy. For example, retail establishment data compiled by State agencies categorizes gift shops in the Standard Industrial Classification of "Miscellaneous Retail Store", which includes liquor stores, loan shops, florists, stationery and office equipment shops, sporting goods stores, etc. Even if every craft outlet were individually identified and sales information on each compiled, it would be necessary to try to isolate that percentage of total sales related to handicraft items, a task requiring interviews with each proprietor or minimumly with a selected weighted sample. The large number of handicraft producers, both individual and corporate, and their scattered locations in Alaska and outside, make compilation of data from that end equally difficult.

On the basis of our interviews with producers, wholesalers, and retailers of handicraft and some financial information available from each sector and from other reports, we find no reason to dispute the Ernst & Ernst 1965 estimates of handicraft sales. Using that figure as a base, holding per capita expenditure levels constant except for cost of product increases, we can derive estimates of sales in 1970 and projections for 1975 as in Table IV.

TABLE IV.—ESTIMATED RETAIL SALES OF HANDICRAFT PRODUCTS

	1965			1970			1975		
	Number 1965	Per capita expendture	Total	Number 1970	Per capita expenditure	Total	Number estimated	Per capita expenditure	Total
Tourists	75,000	$10.00	$750,000	125,000	$15.00	$1,875,000	186,000	$20.00	$3,920,000
Residents (includes military)	267,000	6.50	1,735,000	300,000	$10.25	3,075,000	345,000	15.00	5,175,000
Total			2,485,000			4,950,000			9,095,000

Sources: Population—U.S. Department of Commerce. Number of tourists—Alaska Travel Division. 1965 base data—Ernst & Ernst. Product cost increases—Consultant interviews, catalog price comparisons, Wage and price index, etc.

While these projections obviously leave much to be desired in scientific accuracy, the current sales estimate does seem to be internally consistent with the information we have been able to collect. Added to the estimated current retail sales of handicraft in Alaska must be some "Lower 48" sales. The Ernst & Ernst estimate for 1965 was $40,000, wholesale value. It is doubtful if these sales have increased very much in the past five years. ANAC sales to "Lower 48" outlets have, for example, decreased during this period.

Our total estimate for current sales of Alaskan-type handicraft items then is in the area of $5,000,000 retail, or approximately $2,500,000 wholesale value.

NATIVE CRAFTSMAN SHARE OF MARKET

The Ernst & Ernst study estimated that 30.8% of the total Alaskan handicraft sales in 1965 was produced by individual Native Alaskan craftsmen, the balance by "Lower 48" and foreign manufacturers (approximately 44%) and by organized craft-type businesses in Alaska (approximately 25%). There is every indication that the market share enjoyed by Native craftsmen in 1965 has been reduced by 1970.

Comparison of wholesale figures of ANAC in 1965 and 1970 is one method of analyzing this reduction in market share. In 1965 ANAC had a total of $131,000 in wholesale sales of Native craft products. This was approximately 13 of the total estimated Native craftsman production of approximately $400.000 in that year, or approximately 9% of the total Native and non-Native handicraft sales of $1,400,000 at wholesale. In 1970 ANAC sold $128,000 of craft products at wholesale or approximately 5% of the estimated total wholesale value of all craft products of $2.5 million. Even assuming that ANAC's share of total Native handicraft sales has declined, due to increased contact of Natives directly with retail outlets, the development of cooperatives, and other factors, it is unlikely that it has been cut almost in half. Our own estimate based on analysis of ANAC craft purchases by selected geographical areas is that the ANAC share of the total Native craft sales may have been reduced by about 13 during this period, although this reduction may sharply increase in the next few years. If this estimate is accurate, working back from the ANAC figures, the current wholesale value of all Native craft production can be projected at around $575,000 annually or now 23% of all handicraft sales instead of the 30.8% of 1965. This may be a highly conservative estimate of the decrease. Most of the retailers interviewed believe it to be much greater than this. This discrepancy may be partially explained by the retailers' perception of the decrease focusing on the percentage of the total number of items they sell rather than the proportionate cash value of the items. In other words, while the percentage of Native craft items they sell has decreased, the cash value of these items has often increased proportionately to those of "outside" manufacturers. Also, it is probable that a higher percentage of Native crafts is sold directly to consumers today than was the case in 1965, altering percentage of sales at the retail shop level. At any rate, all indications: ANAC comparisons, retailer perceptions, and comparative data available on some of the "outside" manufacturers, indicate that the "authentic" Native product is losing its former share of the market and that the percentage of decrease is accelerating as the total volume of sales rises.

COMPETITIVE—NATIVE VS NON-NATIVE PRODUCTS

It is clear from our interviews with retailers and consumers that almost every consumer of craft-type products wishes to buy an "Alaskan" product whether or not that is what he ends up with. He wants to buy something made in Alaska, preferably of a distinctive raw material produced in the State, and in many cases, with an easily identifiable relationship to Indian or Eskimo culture and to an individual craftsman. This desire to buy something distinctive and local is stronger for the Alaskan tourist or resident than it is in most other states. For example, while the tourist in Wisconsin is probably only minimumly interested in the circumstances under which his gift package of Wisconsin cheese was produced and would be only mildly disappointed, if at all, to learn that it had been made in a modern, large, dairy products factory rather than by a small dairy farmer, the Alaskan tourist's image of what he is buying is substantially disturbed to learn, for example, that the product was made in Seattle or the Orient, under factory conditions, that the raw material comes from Japan and that the product has little or no relationship to "Native" culture, let alone to a

Native craftsman. The comparison is obviously less than perfect, but it is true that the Alaskan tourist traveling to a distant, distinctive and romantic place strongly wishes to buy a souvenir for himself or others that reflects those images. This desire is equally strong or stronger for the Alaskan resident or business traveler who on the average is a much greater consumer of locally produced craft products than residents or travelers in other states. There is little need to labor this point; it was agreed upon by every seller of craft products to whom we talked.

Manufacturer and merchant practices

In the face of this strong desire to buy something Native Alaskan, the fact is that at least 75 percent of the Native-craft type products sold to the consumer are either not made by Natives, or are not made in Alaska, or are not made of Native materials, or any combination of these circumstances. The percentage is much greater for tourists as a high percentage of Native production is sold to residents, military, business travelers, and collectors who know where to find it and how to distinguish it.

The largest volume retailer interviewed, the Manager of International Airport Gift Shops, estimates that only about two percent of the volume of sales in these three shops is Native Alaskan products. Interestingly, even in two small shops that specialize in Native products and that have made unusual efforts to obtain quantity and quality of these items, the proprietors estimated that Native products constitute less than 50 percent of their sales. The average estimate by other retailers was less than ten percent.

The retailers are faced with a two-edged problem with respect to Native-craft products. They are dependent on the sale of non-Native products to survive as businesses. Even energetic attempts to increase purchases and sales of Native crafts seem only to result in keeping the percentages of sales static. On the other hand their sales of non-Native craft products is partially dependent on the maintenance of a general desire on the part of the consumer to buy something "Alaskan" or "Native". An imitation cannot be sold, as even an imitation, if there is no reference base product. Thus, the existence of Native products in the shops, even if they constitute only a small fraction of sales, helps promote the sale of non-Native products. This fact is well recognized by retailers and is acted upon by them in a variety of ways. It provides a good part of the economic reason that retailers often go to extraordinary and uneconomical lengths to obtain Native products. The existence of Native products in their shops helps to sell non-Native products by providing an "Alaskan" and "Native" ambience. They are often featured prominently in window and case displays even when the shop has very few Native products to sell. Native products also at times provide comparisons that help break down various kinds of customer resistance. For example, in a case we witnessed, a consumer who wanted to buy a Native produced ivory bracelet for a gift and planned to spend "around $10", was shown a Native bracelet selling for $40. His resistance to this price was partially countered by seeing a "manufactured" bracelet for $20 that was as good or maybe better. He now had a choice: if he had a strong desire to buy a Native bracelet he could spend $40, but he could reduce his expectation slightly and buy a "manufactured" bracelet for $20 and consider himself ahead, even though he spends $10 more than he originally hoped. Obviously, this example would not work unless the non-Native bracelet appeared to have the characteristics of Native work, or, conversely, if the non-Native origins of the manufactured piece were stressed in its presentation.

Before going further with this discussion of the presentation of non-Native crafts by manufacturers and retailers, it should be made clear we did not witness any practice in our visits to gift shops that could be called "deceptive" in the legal sense of the word, and we do not believe that "willful misrepresentation", in the strongest sense of those words, is a common practice in the sale of non-Native crafts. * * *

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION, INC.,
Kotzebue, Alaska, April 6, 1972.

Senator ERNEST HOLLING,
Subcommittee on Commerce,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR HOLLINGS: A wave of concern and fear is now among my people. What little they have heard about the Sea Mammal legislation has created a fear that their reason for existance is going to be taken from them. My

people without formal education—my people the unemployed. My people proud of their culture and heritage—their identity, Eskimo.

We, the originators of Alaska, as being coastal dwellers, have existed primarily because the sea mammal was there. Our life as eskimos was and still is what nature meant it to be. We lived as did any animal. We lived to survive.

My father was born in a log and sod cabin with a wood stove to heat the cabin and a oil lamp to light the small room. I was born 33 years later, 23 years ago in my home in Kotzebue under similar conditions. My youngest brother also the same conditions 15 years ago. Today we still exist under the same conditions however because of progress, modern appliances and equipment have revolutionized the technique of doing things that we have always done in the past. Today, we now have electricity which has taken the place of our oil lamp at which we pay 20¢ per kilowatt hour. We now have snowmachines that has taken the place of our dog teams at which we pay $.60 to $1.15 per gallon of gas plus $1.50 for a quart of oil used per filling. We now have oil heaters and cookers that has taken the place of our wood stoves, at which we pay $20.00 to $55.00 per 50 gallon drum.

We now have all the modern conveniences that society now enjoys, but we do not have any money because there is no solid economic base. What little money the local people make during the short summer months from fishing, firefighting, and various seasonal construction jobs, is used to purchase these modern conveniences. Welfare checks must be acquired to subsidize the cost it takes to apply these conveniences to our every day living. The cost of living is so high that one cannot live with store bought goods. Even so, full time jobs in the eskimo communities are as scarce as pink elephants. Until such time that we can compare with the average american educated, until such time that we can utalize this education to participate in todays wage earning society, things will continue as they always have been.

The eskimo realizes that progress requires money. Because of the lack of specialty, education, and available industry, he tries to make a few dollars with what he's got. Utalizing portions of the animals he catch, he creates a unique art that has shown and proven valuable to the outsider as well as among his own people. To the outsider, even his cloths are valuable. All items are seen on the market each summer when the Airlines bring in thousands of tourists. This is our only small economic base that is just starting to prosper. According to facts and figures taken by various agencies, this small economic base can boom and in the future, compare with the average american income.

The mammals we get from the sea is a small economic base but a major portion of our food supply. As I stated earlier, we are a coastal peoples and therefore depend on the sea for a major portion of food. I will list the sea mammal and detail what each part is used for:

(1) *Seal.*—skin—(a) sold to fur buyers, (b) cleaned and bleached for mukluk bottoms and shoe strings, (c) cleaned and tanned for clothing use; blubber—made into seal oil and at times sold or traded among inland eskimos; meat—(a) cooked and eaten, (b) dried and stored in seal oil to preserve for the winter months; intestines—cleaned and boiled either to eat on the spot or to be stored in seal oil for future food; liver—eaten frozen with seal oil dip or fried to eat; kidney—usually boiled to eat; heart—usually boiled to eat.

(2) *Walrus.*—skin—(a) sold to jewelry companys to be used as polishing belts, (b) used for bottom of skin boats, (c) blankets for eskimo blanket toss game; blubber—same as seal; meat—same as seal; intestine—(a) same as seal, (b) skin of intestine is used for water proof coats, and minature boats (kayaks and umiaks); stomoch—skin is separated from stomoch and used for eskimo drums and water proof ware; liver—same as seal.

(3) *Whales.*—skin—the skin of the whale, called muktuk, is a priceless delicacy to all eskimo people. The whaling villages trade or sell it to surrounding eskimo villages that do not have access to hunting whales; blubber—same as seal; meat—(a) cooked and eaten, (b) stored in barrols to pickle, (c) eat frozen with whale blubber; heart—same as seal; skin of intestine and stomoch—same as walrus; bone—when it ages, they carve eskimo masks and sell them to the open market.

(4) *Polar bear.*—skin—the skin so very valuable when sold to the open market; meat—eaten cooked.

It has always been the tradition of the eskimo not to waste any part of the animal he catches if it can be used.

As I understand, the excuse used by many congressmen when relating to any provision in the Sea Mammal Legislation pretaining to native subsistance is "we gave them 1 billion dollars and 40 million acres of land—what more do they want". Why? You know just as well as I do that the full intent of the Land Claims Bill was to benefit the natives *as a whole.* Not individually. In my region, according to the bill, each native will receive only 10 dollars the first year we receive any money. How far will ten dollars get someone!

Granted, the conservationists and ecologists say that there are many dead sea mammals found on the Alaskan shores each summer. The chances of getting a walrus we shoot is only 50%. The chances of getting a seal we shoot is 75%. The chances of getting a whale we shoot is also 75%. In the years past when w did not have modern weapons, the chances of getting any of these animals we harpoon were almost nill. Such has been our life for centuries.

Please take our situation into your most serious consideration as it is a peoples, an existant culture that is the question before you. Thank you.

Respectfully yours,

BOB SCHAEFFER,

NAVAL ARCTIC RESEARCH LABORATORY,
OPERATED BY UNIVERSITY OF Alaska,
UNDER CONTRACT WITH OFFICE OF NAVAL RESEARCH,
Point Barrow, Alaska, May 1, 1972.

Senator THEODORE F. STEVENS,
U.S. Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR STEVENS: We wish to add another letter to the many already received from responsible Alaskans in support of the Natives need for exemption from the proposed Sea Mammals Bill to ban any commercial use of products. This legislation, if passed as written would greatly hasten the demise of the Native culture.

The Alaskan Eskimo has inhabited the north coast of Alaska for up to 5000 years, as we presently understand, and has hunted the mammals of the sea for that long and perhaps longer. In a harsh environment the difficult life has forced the Native to use his inventiveness and resourcefulness to simply exist. The multiple use he makes of the products of his hunt is ample evidence of this. The primary purpose of the unt is food but all parts of the animal are used probably much more efficiently than the present day commercial meat packers claim to use "everything but the squeal".

It is often thought that "now that the land claims are settled, the Natives are wealthy". This is an understandable belief in view of the great amount of publicity given to the numbers of acres and dollars of the settlement but it simply is not true. The Alaskan Native will of necessity depend on his subsistence hunting and the products from that hunt for his livelihood for many years. Anyone who has lived and worked with these people as I have for 12 years or who spends even a few months in a coastal village will readily find this self-evident. To allow the Native to hunt the mammals for food and not allow him to make use of the total animal, hides, etc. is wasteful and would be another "white mans mystery" to the average Native. To deprieve them of their traditional and in many cases only means of livelihood is cruel and unnecessary.

The sea mammals of the Arctic Alaskan Coast evidence a population stability that very definitely excludes them from any consideration as endangered species. No thinking person would encourage the hunting if an animal was believed to be on the verge of extinction but the majority of the Arctic Sea Mammals, and especially those important to the life of the Native Eskimo cannot be so considered. Studies at the Laboratory over the past 10 years in no way indicate that we need to be concerned. Additionally the harvest taken by the Native, though important to his existence is relatively insignificant to the total population and life cycle of the animals in question. There is no scientific basis to even consider the idea that continued Native hunting of these mammals will in anyway endanger their existence.

The Laboratory and I personally support you very strongly in this effort to defend the rights of the Alaskan Natives. We are also sending this letter to

Senator Gravel and Representative Begish. Please feel free to use it in anyway you wish to further assist in this matter.

Sincerely,

JOHN F. SCHINDLER,

BARROW, ALASKA, *May 2, 1972.*

TED STEVENS,
U.S. Senator for Alaska.

DEAR TED: About the biggest mammal that comes along the Arctic Coast from Point Hope Alaska up to Demacation Point is the Bow Head Whale nothing of the meat-skins even the insides Heart stomach, Intestines Kidneys Liver & Lungs are all used for food, the baleen is made into curios used in making baskets for all kinds of things even the bones are used for all kind of articles

Next is the Polar Bear—Every Eskimo like the meat of Polar Bear next to Whale I mean the Bow Head Whale then the Walrus the only part of Walrus thrown away is the hair that short hair and the bones—Next is Ogrook bearded seal all the meat is used for food cook or dried the blubber for oil the skin for covering for skin canoes & Kayaks next is the beluga white fish all the skin is used for food meat and insides, the bone is the part thrown away. The seal of any kind is the animal that stays the whole year through.

So there are many ways we Eskimoes use the above sea mammals the whole year through.

ALVA NASHOALOOK.

MAY 3, 1972.

DEAR TED: Well, I'll say few words, as I understand how we use these ocean mammals, like whale, seal, some other mammals, we use whale meat to feed ourself. Also seal we use the meat to eat and use the blubber for seal Oil. And the skin for Mukluks even for jackets. Well I should say it use many way's even some other mammals use many way's, hope use understand what I say,

With Best Wishes,
Cordially,

VIRGINIA LENA SHAGLOAK.

SAVOONGA, ALASKA, *April 29, 1972.*

TED STEVENS,
U.S. Senator,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I am very sorry that I did not know much about English language very well, but I will do my best to answer your letter. Many many years ago Eskimos real Eskimos live on this St Lawrence Island Alaska.

Our great great grandfather used all kinds of animals used for food. Our Great Heavenly Father put all kind of animal around the Island to give us for our food. So from now on we used the same kind of animal for fods. We Eskimo on St Lawrence Island we use walrus, seal, whale, polar bear the best we could. Never waste any food when we catch some of it. We Eskimo use the all mammals for food not for waste. From now on all kinds of mammals are growing around the Island here. So we use skins, for clothings, and Ivory, for carvings, and meats for food. If we waste any of this mammals, Our Heavenly Father know what we are doing, so we can used it for food the best we could. We cannot catch all this mammals every day. Some times we never catch for several months, because of weather. Thank you,

Sincerely yours,

NATHAN NOONGWOOK.

MAY 1, 1972.

DEAR TED: I have been received a letter of hearing of Senate Commerce Comittee have been scheduled on ocean mammals bills in Nome on the afternoon & evening of thursday May 11 and the morning of Friday May 12 and in Bethel in afternoon and evening

But I won't be able to make it with you people for this none or hunting these ocean mammals up in north what we used

These mammals what we expect each spring all means a lot to Alaskan people.

Here in Barrow, Wainwright, Pt. Hope, Kaktovik, Nome area and Fairbanks eskimo people live in the area and also Anaktovik Pass. If there is no any

hunting in the area of those villages dock from legislature these will be any lively hood in our family wise in eskimo living.

I am an alaskan as an eskimo from my birth and have been understanding my father have been a hunter for any use of living as a seal, fox, oog ruk, walrus and we have caught some whales with his crew when he was a hunter and I was raised from those caught by my father. When I was a boy and still to continue by my father's way of hunting.

At this time the amount of people here in Barrow population is approximately 2800 people here in Barrow plus the amount of other village mammals caught wanted to have part of the caught from here in Barrow.

The mammals caught have been used for many years as a great to use and a selebrations as a festival for nalukatak and each captain of the caughter of those mammals like whale have been served in Thanksgiving day and Christmas feast so actually the owner that have caught the whale have served to the community here in Barrow.

For in my knowledge there has been no waste in mammals like whale. I wish I could code or tell you of any waste that was lost on these whale caughts.

I thank you for your request for you to find when & where these mammals have been used.

Sincerely yours,

KENNETH TOOVAK.

NOME ALASKA, *May 11, 1972.*

My name is Harry Koozaata, I was born & raised at Gambell and I have lived there until five (5) years ago, I am spending last five years living at Nome.

I have hunted extensively since I was eleven (11) years old, but I've been hunting only during weekends & holidays since I've moved to Nome.

However, the nature of my job during last 4 yrs. has given me some opportunities to visit villages from Shishmaref to Stebbins, and St. Lawrence to Elim.

I have watched hunters coming home with their day's catch in every one of the villages that I have visited, and I have been given some food to take home by the people of these villages—nothing was offered for sale, just given, I had turned down possibly ½ ton of food during last 4 years, I accepted just what I need.

Very small portion of meat are sold because of limited market.

However, the skins from seals, and oognuk are processed to be sold and the ivory from walrus are carved to be sold, very small portion of ivories are sold in raw form, mostly because the boat owners are caught without ready cash when they ran out of gas, what with selling price of gasoline at $1.00 per gallon at some plases.

I still carve ivory to make the end meet as to buy some extras.

Without the benefit of the proceeds of my ivory carvings, I would be in financial crises most of the time, but I know lots of people who are wholly dependent on ivory carvings in order to make their livings, without this income these people would be in extreme financial hardships, some of them would have spent the entire day without eating anything if it wasn't for the income they derived from ivory carving or skin sewing.

Last of all I wants to express my sincere appreciation to the senators of Alaska for making this hearing possible. And special thanks to Senator Hollings.

Thank you.

Director.

SAVOONGA, ALASKA, *May 1, 1972.*

Senator TED STEVENS,
Room 411, Old Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR STEVENS: I would like to attend the hearing in Nome, May 11th. on H.R. 10420. However I can not afford a ticket to fly to Nome so I am sending you this letter which I hope you will read at that meeting.

First let me say that I am an Eskimo, born and raised on Saint Lawrence Island. My husband is a whiteman and is engaged in the guiding business in the Brooks Range and the Yukon Flats area of Alaska. The past two springs he has booked hunts for 3 of the Eskimo men here in the village in an attempt to get them started in the guiding business. He did all the advistising, corresponding

and ordering of supplies. He also cooked for the hunters and intertained them while they were in the village.

The hunters were charged $950.00 each. My husband received a commission of $100.00 on each hunt. Food and lodging averaged about $125.00 per hunter. The Eskimo guides received between $720.00 and $750.00 from each hunter they guided. They guided 3 hunters in 1970 and 3 in 1971. The average number of days that a guide took the hunters out is 1 day. This means that after buying gas and oil, the Eskimo guides cleared an average of $700.00 per hunter. Part of this was paid to the 4 or 5 crew members of the Eskimo guides' skin boat, so people benifitted from this hunting. The meat was also salvaged and devided among the crew members.

The guiding is good for the village because it brings in cash income, not available from any other source. It is better for the walrus because boats going out meat hunting kill at least 4 times as many walrus as those guiding sport hunters. (Guides and crew members are not allowed to hunt while they are engaged in guiding activities.)

Studies by Fish and Game personal here in Alaska indicate that walrus population have been gradually increasing over the last 20 years. We use the skins of seals to make parkas, boots, souvineirs, etc. Some of these we use ourselves and others we sell to the tourist industry. Ivory and bone from the walrus are carved and sold to the tourist industry also. Since we are not exterminating these animals, but rather these numbers are remaining stable or increasing. I think to limit our harvest of them in ancy way is unjust. It woqld be no different if we here were to inact a law making it illegal for people in the lower states to kill beef and pork or use the leather for industry. After all we receive more benifit from killing 1 walrus than those people receive from killing 1 cow, both in pounds of meat, dollars per animal profit or any way you want to figure it.

I am also opposed to the mammal bill because it encourages racial discrimination at a time when our nation is seeking to eliminate this kind of prejudice. My husband hunts for seal and walrus here on the island and we use the meat and skins and they are an important part of our livihood. Would you favor a law that let my sister's husband hunt for food but says mine can not because he is white?

So in sumary I am opposed to this bill for 3 reasons: (1) Because it would have an adverse affect on the economy of our village and family, (2) There is no biological grounds for changing the seasons or bag limits for walrus and seal in our area, and (3) Because it encourages racial discrimination.

Thank you for taking the time to read this letter. Mr. Stevens. It is my hope that you will do everything in your power to see that it does not pass. If it must pass please amend it so that all residents of the coastal areas of Alaska are treated equally, regardless of race.

Sincerely Yours,

VELMA PUNGOWIYI KOONTZ,

P.S. Sending a copy to Daily News Miner in Fairbanks.

COOPERATIVE EXTENSION SERVICE,
UNIVERSITY OF ALASKA,
College, Alaska, May 15, 1972.

HON. TED STEVENS,
U.S. Senate,
317 Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR TED: Thank you for your letter of May 2 and the opportunity to reaffirm our concern about Senate Bill 3161. As you know, the Alaska Rural Development Council highly supports careful consideration of legislation that could affect in a substantial utilization of Alaska's natural resources by its residents. We strongly endorse the amendment that you have proposed to Senate Bill 3161 that would, if passed, provide for utilization of sea mammals for handmade native arts and crafts and clothing. Legislation that would prevent such economic activities would work harshly against Native Alaskans who are striving to do for themselves—earn their basic living—with a resource they have used for centuries.

It doesn't appear reasonable within the American scale of values to prevent earning such a livelihood by legislative action that does not recognize and appreciate the unique requirements of their existence.

The following statistical data has been developed by Alaska's Department of Fish and Game that reflects the importance of this means of earning a livelihood.

	Harvest of walrus verified	Value estimated
1970	1,422	358,745
1969	1,443	
1968	1,436	
1967	1,317	383,945

It should be noted that where data exists that 50–60% of the value of the harvest is produced from the by products developed. The taking away of this source of income would be particularly harmful to mature and older Native Alaskans who predominate in the residents involved in those long stand cultural and economic pursuits.

Since 1965 the taking of seal has declined from 50,000 annual harvest to an estimated 15,000–20,000 in 1970. Coincident with this decline has been the elimination of a bounty fee in 1967 by the Alaska Legislature.

It should also be noted that during the whaling era of the late 1800's and early 1900's 10,000–20,000 walrus were harvested annually that threatened depletion of this basic resource for Alaska's Native people. It is reassuring to note that the State of Alaska through its legislative and regulatory process is taking positive measures to manage harvest of sea mammals along its coastal environments.

We would ask in support of your amendment that Alaskan residents, and particularly its native people who are most affected by the legislation, be allowed to continue their traditional use of sea mammals. To do otherwise would defeat a proud people who are seeking a very modest livelihood through a process exceedingly well established by tradition and culture. Such a defeat is not in keeping with the goals and ideals of our great American democracy. We do not quarrel with the general intent of Senate Bill 3161 if it would be modified as you propose to preserve an irreplaceable cultural heritage.

Sincerely,

JAMES W. MATTHEWS,
Chairman, Alaska Rural Development Council.

WAINWRIGHT, ALASKA, *May 4, 1972.*

Mr. TED STEVENS,
U.S. Senator,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. STEVENS: In your letter, you probably refer to ocean mammals bills S. 1315 and S.2579 introduced by Senator Harris of Oklahoma.

I can't help but feel sorry for a gentleman from Oklahoma for introducing such bills as S. 1315 and S. 2579 perhaps without first acquainting himself with actual ocean mammal population in our Arctic shores where we live.

Let me say first, that I have been acquainted with whaling since my adolescent years. Actually I've spent nearly all of my active years as boat steerer and whaler and hunter in general and presently should know the conditions involved in every aspects of life along these shores.

I can still say that ocean mammals are still plentiful along our Arctic shores, statements such as "near depletion" are groundless. The whales, walrus, Ogorok (large bearded seals) and ordinary hair (Arctic seals) are still plentiful and you know as well as we do up here, that these ocean mammals are very much our life blood along this Arctic coast. In view of the fact that we don't grow vegetables out in our yards, the very ocean mammals in question serves us like

vegetables from our garden along the Arctic coast. Please note, skins or hides of Ogorok are continually used to cover our many frame canoes or Omiaks. Skins of walrus cows are used for canoe covers also. Times are when caribou is not too plentiful close to the coast and instances of this kind, we depend and still depend on seal, ogorok, walrus and whale for our sustenance and survival. To pass above bills will in my opinion greatly effect the very lives of the Eskimos up here who from time immemorial have so depended so much for their survival and still is today. May I add again, that to pass the above bills would only promote and bring calamity on the Eskimo people, many of whom today being jobless depend and rely so much on ocean mammals for their physical sustenance and support. Life along the Arctic shores have always been rough and rugged and still is. Most Eskimos today in my opinion will never get by even at the present stage of our lives without continual supply of meat and oil from ocean mammals. Hence, my reason and objection for the passage of bills S. 1315 and S. 2579.

The village in subsequent years take 1, 2 or 3 whales a season and some springs we don't get any at all. Whenever we did get one, we get and save whatever we can from a whale, meat and all except bones. The same goes on other ocean mammals. When there is no whale catch, our yearly walrus catch tends to be more and our people are always keenly aware that none of the meat is wasted.

I would insist on opposing the above bills if I was you, Mr. Stevens and you can be assured of our cooperation and back you all we can. You can be sure that you have our support on this. If by any chance the bills should pass the Senate, the very sparks of life along these shores will be impaired, the results we know can only bring resentment and despair and here, again, Mr. Stevens, let me urge you that on behalf of our Eskimo people of the Arctic coast as well as for the welfare of our people along these shores, that you take a real interest and effective action to stop these bills which we know are not necessary at all.

If justice is to be kept and done for all of our poor Eskimo people living on the Arctic coast, this is the time to do it. We assure you of our support.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

ROBERT JAMES.

FAIRBANKS NATIVE ASSOCIATION,
Fairbanks, Alaska, May 8, 1972.

Hon. TED STEVENS,
U.S. Senate,
304 Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR STEVENS: The Fairbanks Native Association strongly opposes H.R. 10420!

For time immemorial, the marine mammal (seal, whale, walrus and polar bear—as applied to Alaska) has been a vital part in the total picture of the Eskimo existence, providing not only food and clothing but also having sociological and psychological applications upon the total culture.

In our early history, marine mammals were hunted systematically with certain natural conservation practices being followed. These practices continue to be followed, as the marine and land mammals remain the mainstay of the Eskimo way of life. All parts of the marine mammal have been consistently utilized, including such parts as the stomach (for drums, food storage containers, etc.) and the bones (utinsels and utilitarian art, etc.), as well as the more recognized skins, teeth and tusks. Many by-products have been successfully sold, bringing the Eskimo into the cash-basis way of life.

The social activity revolving around a hunt, pre-hunt and post-hunt festivities, being able to assume a position in the captain's boat, and sharing the catch all are a part of the people.

An attempt to take away the lifeblood of a people is my interpretation of H.R. 10420.

Another frightful side result of such conservation of certain marine mammals would be the profound effects on the sea life on which these marine mammals feed.

At this time, there is no need for action by the United States Congress in the area of marine mammal regulation.

Sincerely yours,

Fairbanks Native Association Board of Directors
DAPHNE GUSTAFSON,
Member.

WALES, ALASKA,
May 5, 1972.

U.S. SENATE
Wash., D.C.

DEAR SIR: I like to trying to write a few lines about ocean mammal. Frist thing I like to Indicate myself, I am Eskimo live in Wales, Alaska, over 64th year old, stays here, liveing on sea animal and sea ducks and land ducks. My schooling is not so high grade, so I try to write best I can. Our parents didn't have a hunting rules or Laws those days, cause this Alaska is there land. And all the Animals are the games and use them for foods, and hides of Walrus for cover of boats and never waste the meats of sea seals and even big whales meats, and walrus tusk Ivory is use hunting spare parts, and carve it any ways, when white people's wants carve things.

We didn't have a luck always, the hunting is on weather & ice, and the small boats are not like ships, they load them only in small loads of meats. About on big mammals like black whales up here where we are they neve caught them aways. Only once in a while but up Northern; they almost caught every spring those big black whales are very good eating to us, that's why there hunt them maybe there sold some of the skins those who caught in few, on seals animal like bigger seals like oogruks they use the hides for bottom of mukluks the seal skins they use them for pants and other use, there are very useful there will hunts them while Alaska is still cold in winter, up here in Northern part of Alaska.

We never have a Gardens like White peoples do. Its to cold even summer, thats why we trying hunts for mammals, we never put them in can's, I means the meat's only dried them put them with seal oil in barrels. Only when we get enought for winter use, we poor Eskimo didnt trying to stop white peoples thats brings in lots liquor Alcoholic drink in Alaskans peoples thats hurts of peoples and spoild the young peoples with it, its just getting worst and worst on living in Alaska, to much liquor. I myself, I like to see white peoples and natives help or work together with out to much trouble in Alaska land. hope, you will understand my poor writings.

FROM WINTON WEYAPOK, SR.

GAMBILL, ALASKA
May 5, 1972.

DEAR STEVENS: I am telling you as I can about the sea mammals, only I do not learn English much so it will hard for you to understand. I tell you about male walrus or old bulls how we use them. We cut the hide and blubber and meat right clear to the bones or ribs and cut it in oblong something about 2 feet by 4 feet. Then we twisted all around the edge, something like big ball, and store them in under ground cellars, for sometime use. And about female, we save there hide for our skin boats as many we need now. We save the meat and dried them for sometimes use. We use their tusks of them as our income, for which we have no income. We sold either way raw or mostly carved and save more by Arts and crafts. So we like to catch more as we can, while it were close around because there are passing away up north and also of so much bad wether to go out after them. I tell you about little male hide, now skinned some of them for sale when we have order from some where I think you understand little about. We like to catch more female with their babies, new born few days or many week olds. No matter one, two or three years, we use their skin for our ropes, for walrus and older ones for whales. I tell you little about the sea mammals how we uses them.

Cordially

LINCOLN BLASSI.

L AND S OUTFITTERS,
SAVOONGA, *May 2, 1972.*

Ref: *H.R. 10420*
Hon. TED STEVENS,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

I am writing in opposition to the Sea Mammal Bill. I feel very strongly that enactment of the Harris bill would result in gross mismanagement of the resource and an irrefutable loss to many people dependent upon the resource. I will limit my comments to walrus, however as you well know, similar conditions exist with each of our sea mammals.

I have personally spent between 35 and 120 days of each year hunting, photographing and observing Alaska's various sea mammals including whales, hair seals, sea lions and polar bear. While attending the University of Alaska, where I received a degree (B.S.) in Wildlife Management, I spent considerable time researching native utilization of the sea mammal resource, and for the past eight years have specialized in outfitting Eskimo style hunts for walrus and polar bear (dog-team hunts).

Prior to Statehood, Alaska did not recognize the walrus as a game animal, and it has been only in the last 15 years that sportsmen have been able to harvest this highly esteemed trophy. Until that time the animals were protected by law and could only be taken by Eskimos for subsistence purposes. Alaska's reasoning behind such a law was simple. Many Alaskan Eskimos were dependent upon the walrus for the necessities of life, and early lawmakers felt that to permit sport hunting of walrus would have meant taking food out of the mouths of its native peoples. Fortunately for the Eskimos, and the resource, a number of forsighted people fought for and obtained new laws governing the taking of walrus. Their argument was that legal recognition of the walrus as a game animal would benefit the resource while at the same provide the Eskimo with a base for an additional source of income through guiding and providing transportation to sportsmen.

Senator Stevens, these arguments have proven 100% correct! Officials of the Alaska Department of Fish and Game have testified that the reasoning is indeed sound, and wise game management. In the case of walrus, surveys have shown that the Pacific walrus herd has increased two-fold during the past several decades, and investigation into the valve of sport hunting to over 100 Eskimos and their families and some two-dozen non-Eskimo guides engaged in outfitting walrus hunts would show an annual income of well over $75,000 annually. This figure is increasing each year and in at least one village (Savoonga), represents more than a quarter of all non-government monies that come into the village.

During this same period the need for subsistence hunting in the pure traditional sense of the word has greatly diminished. While natural foods, such as walrus and seal meat, still dominate the fare of most inhabitants of the bush villages. Commercial foods are playing an increasingly important role in the diet of the people. This is evidenced by the tremendous and ever increasing volume of food stamps and welfare monies distributed within the various villages. The economy, although still dependent upon hunting, is a *cash* economy; and maximum utilization of every subsistence animal taken should be a major goal of any legislation governing the harvest of the resource. Where appropriate, saleable products must include services rendered in the sport hunting of the walrus resource, carvings and souveners made from the ivory, baculum and other parts of the walrus, the hides and skins of walrus and seals, and walrus meat which is now being commercially sold to a limited, but very real market among the Eskimo population now living in urban areas throughout the state. (With the decreased number of dogs to support, the bulk of a potentially valuable resource is being wasted. Whereas in 1964 there were over 800 working dogs at Savoonga, last spring I counted only 59 dogs total, many of them no longer working. The first snow machine made its appearance in 1966; there are now over 160 running machines in this village of 350 inhabitants. Whereas in 1964 well over 80% of all useable meat and products were salvaged from every walrus taken, during the past several season's a figure of 15% would be too high—primarlly because of the lack of dogs that formerly required the bulk of the meat taken for subsistence purposes. Recently however, in addition to the meat market there is an established market for several hundred walrus skins each year, to be used in the metal polishing industry. These hides are bought for $85 per hide.)

The days of a pure subsistence economy as provided for in the Harris Sea Mammal Bill are gone forever. Walrus hunting is expensive, whether for the purist concept of hunting for meat alone, or the more realistic concept of subsistence hunting which must include commercialization of the hunting wherever possible, and utilization of all natural raw materials harvested.

According to Webster's New World Dictionary, the word subsistence means "(1) subsisting, (2) a means of providing sustenance, and (3) A MEANS OF SUPPORT OR LIVELIHOOD." My point is this: In its wisdom and in keeping with the American traditions, the Congress of the United States has consistantly acknowledged the need for subsistence hunting by its peoples. However, in actual practice the defination of subsistence hunting must be carefully reviewed and reconsidered in light of its true and contemporary meaning.

Let us assume the Harris Bill is enacted unamended:

First, what is the native hunter going to do with the ivory and baculum (oosik). Simple, it will be sold on the black market.

Secondly, what is the native hunter going to do with the meat he takes for subsistence? A mature bull walrus will weigh between 3,000 and 4,000 pounds, females ½ to 23rds of this amount. He won't be able to sell the hide or meat and blubber, and as he has only a few or/no dogs at all he will sink the meat at the site of the kill. The intestines and stomach cannot be made into skin drums or artifacts for sale, so the bulk of the internal organs and raw materials are sunk as well—a few clams from the stomach of the walrus may be saved, and perhaps a portion of one lobe of the 150 pound liver. A portion of the ribs, flippers and hide may also be saved for human consumption, but it doesn't take much of the 3000 pound animal to satisfy a family whose diet is supplemented with commercial foods.

Thirdly, and something that is extremely difficult to put into words, is the intense hunting instincts of the Eskimo people. These people do hunt instinctively, and will continue to hunt even if they are prohibited by law from salvaging a single portion of the animals taken. I do not mean this to be unjust or degrading . . . on the contrary . . . I am a hunter myself (I make 100% of my income from guiding and hunting) and I can fully appreciate this intense hunting instinct. It seems to be something that a non-hunter cannot, nor would not even if possible, truely understand. More and more Eskimos involved in sporthunting (walrus and polar bear) are finding, just as I have found, that the hunting instinct is all but satisfied by the excitement of the chase and the close contact to animals that guiding offers. This is an extremely important concept. Already more and more of the Eskimo people are beginning to realize that the chase is as important as the kill, and many are beginning to police their own ranks and in time will greatly help to eliminate poor conservation practices, such as killing an animal only for its ivory, or a few pounds of meat. One key in the solution appears to be the SPORTHUNTING OF WALRUS & POLAR BEAR (dog-team only/not aircraft).

A quick look at the walrus taken by a sport hunter:

First, the sportsman is charged a minimum of $500 by the Eskimo crew to take him out. More often the figure is $750 to $1250, cash.

Secondly, the Eskimo crew is normally booked for a duration of several days, and in searching for a large trophy bull many small bulls and females are passed over. Not only is the hunting more selective away from the breeding segment of the population, it is also *much* more efficient. When a bull is sighted and the stalk made for a trophy, every precaution is taken to insure a clean kill without losing the animal (as opposed to at least a 50% loss generated in meat hunting).

The result is devious but often overlooked. A walrus taken by a sport hunter, with the help of a native guide and boat crew, is worth many times the walrus taken purely for food, not only to the Eskimo, but to the resource as well. At the *same* time, the meat, internal organs, hide and flippers are still available to the village from the sporthunter's kill.

I certainly must question the reasoning of any legislation that would prohibit the utilization of the most valuable products of any resource—by the people for whom this same legislation has allowed that the resource should be available to —when such prohibition is to the detriment of the resource and the people involved.

Thank you Sir, for your consideration of my thoughts.

LYNN M. CASTLE.

APRIL 18, 1972.

Mr. TED STEVENS,
U.S. Senate,
Washinton, D.C.
Subject: Ocean Mammal.

DEAR SENATE STEVENS: We are very thank you that you are Help us for the ocean Mammal this is our live in the Native life on the Nunivak Island not only us back in the main land on shore line, What ever Eskimos of Native Villages in the Coast the only one they have to live for it many years ago and we got no money to get but on the few Seal skins we got to sell and get little money for it.

This is very impotent to live the Native People in Alaska they only live for the Ocean Mammal in the very Cold Areas in winter and summer for live with.

And this is the very point I know when the Eskimo Natives People move out to the out some where from Alaska they have had weak on there body because they missing there own food.

And when they go back to there own village in Alaska they are getting back there good Heaths. And one more thing, When Eskimos go to outside some where they write to there homes and ask for the Native food and ask for they some kind of Ocean Mammal skins to make some thing to sell because need money they have to use them what they need to buy.

So we are very many Tank you when we hear your voice from the NOME Radio station on KICY from Nome. That way ALL ALASKA COAST LINE HEAR your voice.

I am the S/sgt. Williams Alaska Army National Guard in the Nunivak Island, And my home Address is on the Envelope. Again many tanks for Help.

Sincerely Yours;

JACK U. WILLIAMS SR.

MARCH 29, 1972.

DEAR TED: I am deeply concerned about the fact that the Natives will not be allowed to sell their skins, if the Marine Mammal Bill goes thru as it is now, even with your amendment. I have done a weeks time of research, talked to Natives, Fish & Game, Health Service, etc in order to get the necessary backup for my claims and statements in enclosed letter. This letter is meant to give you the same kind of amunition as the others use it, i.e. EMOTION. But in my case the "emotion" is backed by facts and is the truth. I have no personal interest, other than to prevent a bad mistake; I can and do not expect a personal gain because I am out of the business and actually crazy to even get involved again. But I have to live with myself and I can't stand injustice. You know under which conditions the Natives live up north; and to deprive them now of one of their very few sources of cash income is—in my opinion—a despicable act which has to be prevented.

Please use my letter to its outmost, give it—if possible—wide publicity in congressional and senatorial circles (beside the congressional record) and please *win the case.* If for any reason you want to change or add or omit any parts of the letter in order to make it more effective, please feel completely free to do this. I am not lobbying; all I want for you is to get a weapon which you can use.

The Marine Mammal Protection Act, as such, is good and very much along my lines. It was I who introduced, fought for, and obtained legislation for the protection of hairseals in Alaska. The results of this protection were not only a sustained yield, but an actual increase in the hairseal population. Udalls Moratorium of 5 years will be most detrimental for us, because, just as on the Pribbiloffs, once you start to manage a resource you have to stay with it. The claim that there is inadequate knowledge of the population dynamics of Marine Mammals is not correct for Alaskas seals. On Furseals we know just about everything we will ever know and on hairseal we have a seven year headstart If possible at all, try to get an exemption from the moratorium for Alaskas hairseal. Otherwise we will get a population explosion with all its repercussions from the Fishing Industry; and this at the time when we want to begin bottom fishing. The question is: Who is going to get our fish? The Russians, the Japanese and the seals, or WE?

Kindest personal regards,

VICTOR F. REVENTLOW.

ANCHORAGE, ALASKA, *March 29, 1972.*

Attention: Max Gruenberg.

DEAR SENATOR STEVENS: Your amendment #1048 to the Marine Mammal Protection Act is a step in the right direction to protect our native arts and crafts and through them the native culture. However, out of my experience in the arctic and in the hair seal industry, in which I personally have no monetary interests, I know that this amendment is not sufficient to cover the existing problems, because it does not cover the sale of sealskins.

Let me explain: 1. Better then 50% of the proteins, fats, vitamins and minerals consumed by the eskimos in coastal villages comes from marine mammals. (See the "Alaska Dietary Survey 1956æ1961" by the Public Health Service, publication #999–AH–2.)

In addition, seals are taken for their oils as a preservative for greens, which contain vitamin C, necessary for the health of the natives. Natives collect willow leaves, mix them up with seal oil, pack them in seal pokes and bury them in the perma frost for fresh keeping. *(Doctor Christine A. Heller Ph. D., authority on native nutrition in Alaska.)

Seals are taken for dog food. In severe cold spells, dogs can not live *a single day* without seal or fish meat and blubber.

2. The amounts of seals taken for the abovt listed purposes, although modest in comparison to the total seal population, exceed the number of skins necessary for arts, crafts and clothing. However, these excess skins are the main source of income besides relief checks for the eskimos. The sole purpose in obtaining additional income is for the purchase of milk, carbohydrates such as sugar, grains, canned fruits, soft drinks etc.. None of these things is naturally available in the arctic and must be imported.

Sealskins are taken by the native stores in lieu of payment for the above mentioned goods. Usually the value of the skins are just deducted from the amounts owed at the stores by the natives.

The value of a skin is rated by the natives in terms of how many bags of groceries they can obtain for them. Once or twice a year a fur buyer comes into the village and buys a couple of hundred skins for cash. The money he injects into the village is just about the only cash most natives ever get to see.

Relief checks are credited to their accounts in the native stores. Native arts and crafts are delivered to the stores and also credited and therefore do not produce any cash return. Only those few arts and craft products which are sold to occasional Polar Bear hunters and government employees passing through the villages, together with the excess skins sold to fur buyers provide a cash revenue. This cash if not spent for groceries is used to buy clothing and accessories by mail order.

3. In section 2 it was stated that only part of the skins taken are used for native arts and crafts. This is in spite of the fact that good native designs and sufficient knowledgeable skin-sewers are available. The reason for this discrepancy lies in the difficulty of marketing native made products at this time: (a) Most skins used by native craftsmen are "home tanned the native way". This dressing makes a strong skin but leaves a fishy, rancid odor in the product which is intolerably offensive to Caucasians.

(b) When making slippers, mukluks or other clothing items, the people from the villages can not yet comply with our commercial sizing codes.

For example, a size six slipper ordered from five different sewers will probably result in five different sizes and probably none of them will be a size six. But it should be remembered that Eskimos have an amazing visual memory. A shape once observed in the landscape seems to be fixed in his mind forever. After one good look at a stranger the Eskimo woman can go home and complete a set of clothing which will fit from parka to boots as if it had been tailored after innumeral fittings.

4. The solution to the problems mentioned in section 3 is simple: (a) A small but efficient sealskin dressing plant is available and working in Anchorage. This plant can dress the skins from the villages perfectly and odorless. Payment for the dressing can be made in skins in lieu of cash.

tested products using powered tools and modern and efficient methods and operations. They then will send these precut items in kit form, back to the villages and have them completed by their skilled craftsmen to assure a sale price with a fair cash return to the worker. This utilization of the native crafts and production in a larger volume with commensurating quality can easily be achieved.

For-going claims coincide with research findings about developing a "Hand Craft Industry for the natives" by the Bureau of Indian Affairs Industrial Developement Branch, Juneau Alaska.

The only raw materials available in abundance to the coastal Eskimos, Aleutes and Indians in Alaska are hair sealskin of a species which are not endangered. Varification available by the Fish and Game Dept.)

The use of this raw material which actually is a by product of the main, local food and vitamin source for our coastal natives is gravely curtailed and becomes under the pending bill, practically worthless.

The Natives must retain the rights to work, barter, trade or sell their skins as they have done since time immemorial, long before the white man arrived.

I beg of you Dear Senator Stevens to insure by further amendment that these rights are secured. If we do not do this we will deprive our natives of their aboriginal rights, we will infringe on their human rights and endanger their right to exist.

At this point, the conservation of fellow human beings appears much more important then the conservation of marine mammals which never have been and never will be endangered by the native take.

Respectfully yours,

VICTOR F. REVENTLOW.

NOME, ALASKA, *May 1972.*

MR. CHAIRMAN: Each of us developes his own particular viewpoint toward hunting, which has probably become more pointed in these strange and polarized times. Naturally, I support the cause of good hunting—for such is the traditional, historic principal of the Alaska native. My personal approach is based on two interwoven ideas, which I like to feel go to the root of the Eskimo's instinct and the reason for his being.

First, the Eskimo has been a hunter for the thousands of years of his existance. Roving room and the presence of animals in their natural conditions are essential to his survival and psychic well being. Since time-immortal, the Eskimos have been utilizing the land and sea mammals as the main-stay of his existance. At no time, Ifee l, have any of the species hunted for food become endangered to extinction. If there is to be a blame for the endangering of a specie, I feel that it rests upon the shoulders of those who hunt for the excitement or trophy. History speaks that the Eskimo endures many hardships in harvesting his life—giving food. Therefore, I feel that if conservation is of the prime importance, commercial killing of whales should be forbidden, and all the other mammals should be removed from the trophy hunter's list. The Eskimos should be allowed to harvest, as they have been doing for eons past, the main-stay of thtir diet.

Second, wildlife and fish are clearly the barometer of environmental health and ecological balance. Without the water, woods, and fields in ample supply, the game will be gone, and so too, in due course, will the civilized society of man.

"As soon as he ceases to be a hunter or food gatherer, he ceases in my thoughts to be natural." So observes Dr. Frank Fraser Darling, the noted ecologist.

The Eskimo needs no apology, for game species are not threatened by the gun. But all wild life is threatened by man's massive alteration and pollution of the environment, and the killing of the remaining mammals on a commercial scale.

My convictions, are to allow the Eskimo to harvest, as he has always done, the sea mammals that are his prime and staple food.

Thanking you for your time and consideration, I remain,

Respectfully,

VERNON F. MILLER.

KONGIGANAH, ALASKA, *April 20, 1972.*

TED SEVENS,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. STEVENS: I'm very glad I heard you come to Alaska for hearing. Native life, May 12–72 afternoon at Bethel maybe you don't understand my writing or what I say. I have not much speak English I'm school only 4 years. Now I tell you we, all the people here in my home, I know in 1929 Native life I know I see in my home lots of mud houses. Egloo house no lumber house. No

white people only Moravian mission in Bethel. I don't see many stoves in the mud house no glass windows wall. Only middle the top window seal instance. Not much cooking because no stove, we eat dog meat dry tomcod dry fish frozen fish raw meat with seal oil. All time seal oil important to us Natives. Eskimo use all time when we eating, no electric light we use only seal oil lamp at evening use Greasy lamp. Put inside seal oil use mantle moss from ground. Some people don't have drink tea no coffee, because no white people that time. No air plane, no ships this is my story. Now when I was glowing the time comes to seal hunting go out use Kavak only spring time maybe no paud or maybe no colanther that time still no stove using ——— only I use gun not new old. Now is little ——— in Alaska. I see that time, hard to get seal no see. Some all day or 2 or 3 day get nothing, not many all time. I sleep in the Kayak very cold no sleeping back use only parka, duck skin, no lay down in the Kayak. Sometime very cold I'm sitting in my Kayak all night not much sleep. This is my story little bit. (Now today is change over life because lots of white people here in Alaska. Appears by laws from senators some bill is getting trouble for us our life now. Now today I heard sea mammal I heard 3 man try to stop our seal hunting try to stop selling ivory skins. Women baskets or other Native craft. Why? I heard Mike Gravel helping these 3 man this is true or not? I heard Mr. Harris from Oklahoma, this is not from Alaska this man stay in outside why this man try to stop our food seal mammal. You should bring these 3 men when you come up to Alaska we like to see him these men. This men start like war for us. You bring these men, we like to teach him how to hunting seal or hunting or try to get food under ice winter time.

Now I don't want to see white people when I'm hunting front of my eyes. I'm o.k. life or die now. I'm still in army over 21 years. I'm just like everyone else for that these men, I don't want hungry in my own home with my kids and with my people lots of Native people very sad. When we heard a sea mammal. Now I say I don't want I cannot stop hunting our food. Thank's Ted Steven, telling us. You and George Homan and Martin more. Not Mike Gravel, maybe Mike Gravel not helping Eskimo only work white people. Thanks again Ted.

Yours very truly,

DICK R. KUNRYA,
Member of Village Council.

ALASKA MORAVIAN CHURCH,
Bethel, Alaska, April 25, 1972.

Senator ERNEST F. HOLLINGS,
State Commerce Department,
Room 432, Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR HOLLINGS: Our church has been in this area since 1885 and has worked very closely with the Eskimo peoples of the Kuskokwim River and Bay region. We are concerned about the effect of the bills that are before Congress S. 1315 and S. 2579.

The Board which is the ruling Board of our church met recently and it includes in its five members three of the Eskimo population. The Board took action asking me to write in opposition to the bill. It is recognized care must be taken to preserve all species of animal life. However, it is felt the Alaska State Department of Fish and Game is aware of the problem and is handling it. It is also true that other responsible agencies are aware of the problems that are involved.

It is recognized in addition to this that, for the Eskimo people in Alaska, this has been a livelihood and a means of existence for the time they have been here. It is recognized that the conomic life of the Eskimo is changing and that presumably at some future date his livelihood and his existence will not depend as greatly upon this source of food and economy. In fact, that change has been in progress. However, it seems to us that this is rather a sudden decision, and that it will create real hardship for many of the people on the coast. Not only in that it develops a hardship in the way of economics and the obtaining of food, but it also disrupts a way of life for him. It seems to us that in a society where so much is available, so many avenues of interest can be pursued, that this kind of curtailment of the way of life, for a people who have so very little, is asking a great deal.

We do oppose the bill. We do not object to the concern that has developed it, but we believe that concern can be developed in other ways and that the time is not yet come for what seems to be this kind of drastic decision. Certainly the Fish and Game Agencies are aware of the dangers involved in over-taking of fish and game and we believe that we can trust them.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely yours,

HARRY J. TRODAHL,
Chairman Provincial Board.

RURAL ALASKA COMMUNITY ACTION PROGRAM, INC.,
Anchorage, Alaska.

RESOLUTION 72-3—ENTITLED: OPPOSING SEA MAMMAL LEGISLATION

Whereas, The primary goal of Rural Alaska Community Action Program is to advocate for the rural people of Alaska and to combat poverty in these areas; and

Whereas, If Alaskan Natives are prohibited from using marine mammals as a resource for production of commercial arts and craft items, supplemental income of people in 90% of Alaskan Native villages will be greatly affected; and

Whereas, Approximately 90% of the Alaskan Native arts and craft products are derived from marine mammals; and

Whereas, The arts and craft industry provides total or supplemental income for approximately 30,000 Alaskan Natives; and

Whereas, The pending marine mammals bill, in its present language, is a restrictive bill which unreasonably prohibits Alaskan Natives from pursuing their traditional endeavors;

Now therefore be it resolved, That the Rural Alaska Community Action Program Board of Directors oppose the marine mammals legislation in its present inhibiting language; and be it

Resolved further, that the Rural Alaska Community Action Program Board of Directors will oppose amendments to the marine mammals legislation that will unreasonably prohibit the Alaskan Natives from utilizing their natural resources in their traditional way of life and culture; and be it

Resolved further, that any legislation being acted upon by the United States government should reflect the consideration of the government for the Alaskan Natives as proud people with cultural values of their own;

Resolved further, that the Rural Alaska Community Action Program Board of Directors will support marine mammal legislation on the basis of a sustained-yield philosophy, provided such legislation recognizes continuation of traditional Alaskan Native hunting of sea mammals as the Number One priority in any management system devised by the federal government.

Adopted at an Executive Committee Meeting held in Anchorage, Alaska on the 22nd day of March, 1972.

MAY 25, 1972.

Senator ERNEST F. HOLLINGS,
White House,
Washington, D.C., U.S.A.

DEAR SENATOR HOLLINGS: Please find enclosed a Resolution passed by the Yukon Native Brotherhood supporting the position of the Alaska Natives concerning the taking of sea mammals and it is imperative that the Alaska Natives be given serious consideration in their position stated.

Sincerely yours,

ELIJAH SMITH,
Chief, Yukon Native Brotherhood.

Enclosure.

SEA MAMMAL RESOLUTION

Whereas, the Alaskan Natives have existed on Sea Mammals as long as they have been on this continent, and

Whereas, the Alaskan Natives have never killed indiscriminately but have harvested the sea out of necessity with no waste or wanton destruction of their main source of food stuff and

Whereas, the Alaskan Natives utilize the by products such as ivory, skins, etc., to create art objects which they sell to purchase food, fuel, and other articles necessary to hunt and exist, and

Whereas, the Natives of the Yukon Territory and Northwest Territories also depend upon sea mammals for subsistence and traditional utilization of the by products for clothing, arts and crafts and

Whereas, All Native Peoples in circumpolar regions likewise depend on sea mammals for preservation of a unique and beautiful culture

Now therefore be it resolved, That the Yukon Native Brotherhood respectfully request that the Congress of the U.S. reconsider H.R. 10420 now pending before the U.S. Senate Committee on Oceans and Atmosphere by exempting Alaska Natives from the onerous prohibitions incorporated in the Sea Mammal legislation.

H. 3204.
Introduced Messrs. Carter, Sanders, and Kneece.

A CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ENDORSING LEGISLATION BY THE CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES PROVIDING FOR SOUND RESOURCE MANAGEMENT OF MARINE MAMMALS AND THE COOPERATION WITH WILDLIFE AGENCIES OF STATES WITH AN INTEREST THEREIN—APRIL 27, 1972

Whereas, due to the thrust of civilization many wildlife species have been and continue to be exploited by man; and

Whereas, one form of response has been to ban the taking of all wildlife whether for scientific, sport, or commercial interest; and

Whereas, the total protection of all wildlife without independent consideration would constitute a threat to the balanced preservation of many species and a serious obstacle to the development of international cooperation; and

Whereas, there are presently pending certain legislative proposals in the Congress of the United States to ban the taking of marine mammals; and

Whereas, due to the interdependence between marine mammals and their environment, flexible programs based on principles of sound resource management must be continued and expanded if marine mammals are to thrive and prosper; and

Whereas, under basic conservation practices of maintaining wildlife population which permit maximum sustainable yield, the interest of wildlife and man can be compatible.

Now, therefore, be it resolved by the House of Representatives, the Senate concurring:

That the General Assembly fully endorses marine mammal legislation which would establish programs based on principles of sound resource management and urges that any such national policy on marine mammals be conducted in close cooperation with state wildlife agencies in the case of those marine mammals which reside within lands and waters of the State and it opposes legislation which would ignore scientific management methods.

Be it further resolved, That each member of the South Carolina Congressional Delegation be urged to assist in the enactment of marine mammal legislation founded upon principles of sound resource management for the good of the marine mammal resource.

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA,
In the House of Representatives,
Columbia, South Carolina.

We hereby certify that the foregoing is a true and correct copy of a Resolution passed in the House of Representatives and concurred in by the Senate.

SOLOMON BLATT,
Speaker.
INEZ WATSON,
Clerk of the House.

PERRYVILLE, ALASKA, *May 5, 1972.*

Senator TED STEVENS,
Old Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR STEVENS: Concerning the meetings May 11, and May 12, 1972, in Nome and Bethel, and the Sea Mammal Bill:

We regret to inform you that at this time we will be unable to send a representative to either meeting May 11 or May 12, due to financial limitations. Because of our concern in regards to this present bill we would like however to pass along the following information.

(1) We use Spotted Seals and Sea Lions as a source of food for our families.

(2) We utilize the entire seal and what is not used immediately is salted down for future use.

(3) Following is a list of the utilized parts:

(a) Meat—spare ribs, heart, liver, kidneys, tongue, neck, hind quarters, shoulders, and back. These are prepared by boiling, baking, or frying;

(b) Guts—intestines, eaten; stomach, used to store oil;

(c) Fat—melted down into seal oil which is used to spice many dishes much the same as Mayonnaise;

(d) Skin—clothing, footwear, and rugs.

(e) Flippers—eat them;

(f) Nose—eat them; and

(g) Whiskers—used for toothpicks.

(4) Items not included in the above list are fed to the dogs.

We would oppose any Bill that would not be in the best interest of our future utilization of this food source.

We would encourage any legislation however, that would prohibit or limit the killing of seals by sportsmen.

Sincerely yours,

VILLAGE COUNCIL, *Native Village of Perryville.*

Boris R. Kosbruk, President; Harry O. Kosbruk, Vice President; Marvin Yagie, Executive Director; Moses Kosbruk, Council; John Kosbruk, Council; Andronic Kosbruk, Council; Thomas Phillips, Council; Ralph Phillips, Council.

NAVAL ARCTIC RESEARCH LABORATORY,
UNIVERSITY OF ALASKA,
Point Barrow, Alaska, May 1, 1972.

Senator MIKE GRAVEL,
New Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR GRAVEL: We wish to add another letter to the many already received from responsible Alaskans in support of the Natives need for exemption from the proposed Sea Mammals Bill to ban any commercial use of products. This legislation, if passed as written would greatly hasten the demise of the Native culture.

The Alaskan Eskimo has inhabited the north coast of Alaska for up to 5000 years, as we presently understand, and has hunted the mammals of the sea for that long and perhaps longer. In a harsh environment the difficult life has forced the Native to use his inventiveness and resourcefulness to simply exist. The multiple use he makes of the products of his hunt is ample evidence of this. The primary purpose of the hunt is food but all parts of the animal are used probably much more efficiently than the present day commercial meat packers claim to use "everything but the squeal".

It is often thought that "now that the land claims are settled, the Natives are wealthy". This is an understandable belief in view of the great amount of publicity given to the numbers of acres and dollars of the settlement but it simply is not true. The Alaskan Native will of necessity depend on his subsistence hunting and the products from that hunt for his livelihood for many years. Anyone who has lived and worked with these people as I have for 12 years or who spends even a few months in a coastal village will readily find this self-evident. To allow the Native to hunt the mammals for food and not allow him

to make use of the total animal, hides, etc. is wasteful and would be another "white mans mystery" to the average Native. To deprive them of their traditional and in many cases only means of livelihood is cruel and unnecessary.

The sea mammals of the Arctic Alaskan Coast evidence a population stability that very definitely excludes them from any consideration as endangered species. No thinking person would encourage the hunting if an animal was believed to be on the verge of extinction but the majority of the Arctic Sea Mammals, and especially those important to the life of the Native Eskimo cannot be so considered. Studies at the Laboratory over the past 10 years in no way indicate that we need to be concerned. Additionally the harvest taken by the Native, though important to his existence is relatively insignificant to the total population and life cycle of the animals in question. There is no scientific basis to even consider the idea that continued Native hunting of these mammals will in any way endanger their existence.

The Laboratory and I personally support you very strongly in this effort to defend the rights of the Alaskan Natives. We are also sending this letter to Senator Stevens and Representative Begich. Please feel free to use it in any way you wish to further assist in this matter.

Sincerely,

JOHN F. SCHINDLER, *Director.*

ALASKA LEGAL SERVICES CORP.,
Anchorage, Alaska, April 12, 1792.

Re Proposed marine mammal legislation.

Senator ERNEST F. HOLLINGS,
Commerce Subcommittee on Oceans and Atmosphere,
Old Senate Office Building, Washintgon, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR HOLLINGS: Enclosed find a "Statement in Support of Protection of Native Alaska, Eskimo, Aleut, and Indian Subsistence and Arts and Crafts Activities" on behalf of the Village of Little Diomede. In examining the coastal environment of the Northern and Western coasts of Alaska, two major factors are readily apparent:

1. That there is a strong dependence on walrus and seals by Native Alaskan people for subsistence and for arts and crafts activities.

2. That the walrus and seals relied upon by Native Alaskan people are not endangered species.

There is no ecological or biological reason why the presently controlled and regulated harvest of these animals should be discontinued. There are, however, persuasive ethical and economic reasons for continuation of present controlled harvest practices.

The benefits of the Alaskan Native Land Claims settlement will not be realized by Native Alaskan individuals for several years. Even if such benefits were immediately available, it would be unconscionable to sanction a severe blow to Native culture occasioned by an unnecessary restriction of Native arts and crafts activities.

Marine Mammals have been the foundation of the Native Alaskan Eskimo and Aleut culture and economy for as long as these people have occupied the Northern and Western coasts of Alaska. Even if the economic dependence is removed, the cultural roots remain and should be afforded protection.

It is urged that Native Alaskan subsistence and Arts and Crafts activities be afforded complete protection. Sections 107 and 109 of Senate bill 3161 appear to afford the best protection based on available research data.

It is suggested that the traditional customs aspect of Sec. 107(a)(1) of Senate Bill 3161 be deleted as the term eludes precise definition, and modern methods may prove to be more efficient and humane thus decreasing the total animal harvest.

Thank you for your consideration in this matter.

Sincerely yours,

FRANCIS M. FLAVIN,
ROBERT C. BUNDY,
Attorneys for the Village of Litttle Diomede, Alaska.
By FRANCIS M. FLAVIN,
Attorney at Law,
B.S. Wildlife Management.

Enclosures.

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES, SUBCOMMITTEE ON OCEANS AND ATMOSPHERE OF THE COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE

IN THE MATTER OF PROPOSED LEGISLATION TO PROTECT MARINE MAMMALS; TO ESTABLISH A MARINE MAMMAL COMMISSION; AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

STATEMENT IN SUPPORT OF PROTECTION OF NATIVE ALASKAN ALEUT, ESKIMO, AND INDIAN SUBSISTENCE AND ARTS AND CRAFTS ACTIVITIES

The most comprehensive investigation of the interdependence between Alaska Natives and the wildlife resources of Alaska was accomplished by the Federal Field Committee for Developing Planning in Alaska and reported in the publication "Alaska Natives and the Land" (October, 1968, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C.). This study set forth four criteria which should be utilized in assessing the impact of the proposed marine mammal legislation on both the marine mammal species involved, and the people and culture dependent upon these species. The criteria to be utilized in the balancing of varying national and regional requirements and interests are:

> . . . the dependency of some Alaska Native populations upon a wildlife subsistence supply in order to sustain life;
>
> . . . the economic requirements of the State and its citizenry derivable from the wildlife resource (including some dependence upon subsistence and commercial use, but primarily upon the aggregate economics of the sport and recreational harvest);
>
> national goals and objectives for the preservation and wise use of wildlife resources and habitats of unique national values; and
>
> . . . combinations of these factors (Alaska Natives and the Land, *supra*, at p. 291).

The proposed marine mammal legislation's most marked impact will be on the subsistence, cultural, and limited commercial dependency of the Alaska Native population and the national goals and objectives for the preservation of wildlife resources and habitats. A thorough investigation of the regions of Alaska in which Native populations utilize marine mammal resources reveals that both national and local interests are compatible. That is, that Native subsistence and arts and crafts activities have been and will continue to be, no threat to the viability of marine mammal species utilized in these activites.

I. STATES OF ALASKAN MARINE MAMMAL SPECIES GENERALLY

This section will deal with the present population status of Alaskan marine mammal species generally. However, one overriding consideration must be pointed out initially. It is assumed that the proposed marine mammal legislation will deal with the marine mammal resources from a management point of view, and not with the view that killing of animals in itself is immoral. If killing itself is in question, then legislation should be aimed at the killing of all animal species, for it is repulsive both to logic and to humanity to designate harvesting of animals for subsistence or for arts and crafts proposes as immoral while sanctioning killing for sport of the gourmet delight of the right or prosperous. As will be shown here, and has been shown to the committee by much scientific evidence already presented, many of the marine mammal species in Alaska are not endangered nor are they diminishing. (*See* letter of Frederick A. Dean, Head Dept. Wildlife Management, University of Alaska, annexed hereto and incorporated by reference as Exhibit "E").

A. Pacific Walrus

The Pacific walrus in Alaska has been the subject of intensive research and management. American whaling vessels from 1870 to 1880 decimated the Alaskan walrus herds, and these herds probably reached their smallest numbers between 1930 and 1950.

As early as 1963, it was recognized that the walrus herds were slowly increasing due to the occurrence of walrus in areas of their former range which had long been vacant. (J. W. Brooks, *The Management Status of Marine Mammals in Alaska*, Transactions of the 28th North American Wildlife and Natural Resources Conference, March 4, 5, 6, 1963, the Wildlife Management Institute, Washington, p. 319).

Again in 1965, a study by John J. Burns revealed that:

> On the basis of present findings, it appears that the walrus herds are slowly increasing. The difference between the rate of reproduction (14%) and the mortality rate (13%) indicates that all possible steps should be taken to prevent removal of the small annual increment by continued protection of cows and calves, and by encouragement of less wasteful hunting practices. (J. J. Burns, *The Walrus in Alaska, Its Ecology and Management*, 1965, Alaska Department of Fish and Game, p. 25).

This trend has continued until the present, and today, . . . "the Pacific walrus is common and increasing at an encouraging rate." (Letter from John J. Burns, Marine Mammal Biologist, to Miss Moria A. G. Worland, Executive Officer, Survival Service Commission, IUCN, dated March 14, 1972, a copy of which is annexed hereto and incorporated by reference as Exhibit "A").

It would appear that the dangers of international hunting, and pollution are more of a threat to walrus populations than hunting pressure by the people of the Arctic and Western coasts of Alaska.

B. Hair Seals

The hair seals in Alaska include the harbor seal, ringed seal, ribbon seal, bearded seal and the Northern elephant seal.

The harbor seal far outnumbers oll other seals in Alaska's coastal waters and is common in all areas of the State. (See J. W. Brooks, *The Management and Status of Marine Mammals in Alaska*, *supra*, at p. 317; and letter from John J. Burns, *supra*).

Harbor seals are common in the Arctic Slope, Bering Strait, Bering Sea, Southwest Coastal Lowlands, Bristol Bay, Aleutians, Kodiak, Gulf of Alaska, and Southeast Regions of Alaska, with no increase in harvest expected, except for small increases in the Bering Sea and Aleutian areas, and decreases in the Southwest Coastal Lowlands and the Kodiak regional harvest. (Alaska Natives and the Land, *supra*, Figs. IV 2–5, 10–12, 15).

Commercial harvest of the land breeding harbor seals is regulated on a day to day basis by the State of Alaska, and current harvest are below the rate of natural recruitment resulting in a species abundance (See "Statement of the State of Alaska," Pertaining to the Marine Mammal Protection Act of 1971, H.R. 10420, at p. 5, attached hereto as Exhibit "C", and incorporated by reference).

The ringed seal and bearded seal are mostly confined to the Arctic ice and as early as 1963 it was recognized that the annual harvest of 8,000 to 10,000 animals had no effect on seal abundance (J. W. Brooks, *supra*, at p. 319).

The ribbon seals are relatively rare but the scanty population appears to be characteristic of the species and not related to exploitation. (J. W. Brooks, *supra*, at p. 319).

The ribbon seals are probably slowly increasing in numbers at present according to the Alaska State Fish and Game Department. ("Statement of the State of Alaska", *supra*, at p. 8).

The Northern elephant seal occurs periodically in Southeastern Alaska, but is of little significance to the State. (J. W. Brooks, *supra*, at p. 319).

C. Fur Seals and Whales

The fur seal harvest is restricted to the Pribilof Islands which is covered by International Treaty and will not be covered by this statement. Only the bowhead and beluga whales are harvested by Native Alaskans. The bowhead harvest is limited to 15–25 animals yearly, and the beluga is common in Alaskan waters, and is in no danger of over-exploitation ("Statement of State of Alaska", *supra*, at p. 4; "Alaska Natives and the Land", *supra*, at p. 296).

D. Sea Otter

The sea otter population after being decimated by commercial hunting prior to the turn of the century have made a marked comeback, particularly in the Western Aleutians. Shortly after World War II, it was recognized that in some areas of the Western Aleutians, principally around Amchitka Island, sea otters had made a comeback and in fact were in some instances above the carrying capacity of the local environment. (J. W. Brooks, *supra*, at p. 17, and C. Schneider, 1971, "Sea Otter Saga", in Alaska Fish and Game Tales and Trails, May and June, 1971, at p. 2).

II. REGIONAL UTILIZATION PATTERNS OF MARINE MAMMAL SPECIES BY ALASKA NATIVE PEOPLES

The utilization of marine mammals species by Alaskan Native people varies from region to region as both the variety and population numbers of these species differ due to local environmental factors.

A. Arctic Region

This area of Alaska includes the Villages of Point Barrow, Wainwright and Point Hope located on the Arctic Coast.

There is a strong dependency of marine mammal species for food supply in this region, both by necessity and by cultural preference. (See, "City of Barrow, Coordination and Development, Past, Present and Future, Alaska State Housing Authority," p. 21, annexed hereto as Exhibit "F" and incorporated by reference). "In the coastal villages, the meat of the ringed and bearded seals is most important on a regular basis." (Alaska Natives and the Land, *supra*, at p. 293, 294 and Fig. IV–2). Both the ringed and the bearded seal are presently abundant in the Arctic regions. There has been no change in the harvest pattern in the last decade, and no change is expected in the future.

In the Arctic Region some baleen and raw ivory are used in arts and crafts activities; however,

> The former commercial value of baleen and raw ivory has greatly diminished. There is a limited quality and quantity of ivory that is carved for sale, though the carving industry is centered in the Bering Strait Region. It is probable that the major value of wildlife resources in the Arctic will remain of a subsistence and sporting nature . . . (Alaska Native and the Land, *supra*, at p. 293; See also Barrow Coordination, *supra*).

It is clear that the walrus is not utilized to a great extent in this region; the species is common with only 200 harvested per year and no increase in harvest expected in the future. It would seem unnecessary to prohibit the harvest of any of the aforementioned marine mammal species in the Arctic region of Alaska due to their local abundance.

B. Bering Strait Region

This region includes the numerous villages (such as Nome and Shishmaref) on the Seward Peninsula as well as Little Diomede Islands and Norton Sound communities.

As has been pointed out, the Bering Strait Region is the center of the carving industry in Alaska. There is also a heavy subsistence dependence upon marine mammal species for food. Because of this dependence on marine mammal species, the wildlife resources of this region are actively managed by the State of Alaska.

The State Fish and Game Department has worked very closely with the Native people of the Bering Strait Region in insuring that the population levels for marine mammal species utilized remain in a stable and viable state.

> The field work by all persons involved with the marine mammal investigation provided the opportunity for the most important and challenging aspect of walrus management—public education and information. The close and relatively prolonged contact with hunters encourages the public exchange of ideas and questions, and of greater importance, with individual leaders.
>
> Hunters realize the Department's dependency on their assistance, a situation which makes them participants in a research program of interest to them (John J. Burns, Work Plan Segment Report, Federal Aid in Wildlife Restoration, Walrus and Seals, Proj. No. W–6–R–6 and W–14–R–1, Jan., 1965—Dec., 1965, p. 28).

This type of close working relationship between management officials and the people directly involved with the resource is indispensible to any program attempting to foster the protection of wildlife species.

Despite initial misgivings about harvest restrictions, the people of the Bering Strait Region have actively supported State programs to protect and preserve the populations of marine mammal species in the Bering Strait Region.

> Brooks (1954) recognized that a restriction on the killing of female walruses is probably the most effective means of preventing a possible decline in walrus numbers. Although it was thought that there would be consider-

able opposition to any restriction of hunting privileges, a regulation establishing a limit of seven adult female walrus per resident hunter, became effective on January 1, 1960. The present limit of five females for resident hunter was promulgated by the Alaska Board of Fish and Game in 1961. In spite of some initial resistance to this regulation, particularly by hunters of Little Diomede Island, *it has been strictly adhered to.* (J. J. Burns, Work Plan Segment Report for Federal Aid in Wildlife Restoration, Proj. No. W–6–5, 6, January 1, 1964 to December 1, 1964, pp. 7–8, Walrus Biology and Population Studies, emphasis added).

The Native people of the Bering Strait Region, utilize bearded seal and ringed seal which are abundant, and harbor seal, walrus, bowhead whale and beluga whale which are common. (Alaska Natives and the Land, *supra*, at pp. 294, 295 and Fig. IV–3).

Aside from the arts and crafts activities involving carving, commercial utilization of wildlife resources in this region remains scant consisting mainly of the barter of meat and skins between hunters. The main utilization of marine mammal resources remains the subsistence utilization of marine mammals for food and clothing.

C. Bering Sea Region

Only St. Lawrence Island in the Bering Sea Region is currently occupied. Here, there is a strong dependence upon marine mammal species for daily existence; both nutritionally and culturally.

Eskimo residents of St. Lawrence Island depend upon marine mammals as a primary means of subsistence, and for a large proportion of their monetary income. Meat from walrus harvested in the year 1966 for subsistence use was valued at $60,000. Value of raw ivory, skins, bacula and other sellable products exceeded $28,000 and the potential value of such products is considerably more. Seals provide a significant share of subsistence foods; their skins are used in the home manufacture of boots and other wearing apparrel, and raw skins have a value of at least $12,800 at current prices.

Whales, including belugas, bowhead, and gray, are hunted but relatively few are taken and they do not provide a sustained reilable means of subsistence. (Alaska Natives and the Land, *supra*, at p. 296).

The marine mammal species relied upon by the people at St. Lawrence Island are all common, and only a small increase in uitilization is seen in the future. (Alaska Natives and the Land *supra*, Fig. IV–4).

D. Southwest Coastal Lowlands

The Southwest Coastal Lowland Region of Alaska (including such villages as Bethel and Emmonak) has a long history of commercial and subsistence dependence upon marine mammal species.

Fur bearers and marine mammals furnish an important source of cash income, both directly by sale of raw skins, or indirectly through their use in the manufacture and sale of such items as mukluks and parkas. The commercialization of the fur resource began long before the occupation of Alaska by Americans; first by barter to the more northern communities of Eskimos; and later with Russians who had established several trading posts on the Yukon and Kuskokwim Rivers. (Alaska Natives and the Land, *supra*, at p. 297).

The bearded, harbor, ribbon and ring seals, and the walrus are all common in this region, but only the seals are utilized to any extent by the Natives of this area (Alaskan Natives and the Land, *supra*, Fig. IV–5).

E. Utilization in Other Areas

There is some subsistence utilization of marine mammals in the Bristol Bay, Aleutian, and Gulf of Alaska Regions of Alaska; mainly as a nutritional or cash supplement to seasonal employment in these areas. The harbor seal is the only species utilized to any extent and is very common in all these regions. ("Statement of State of Alaska", *supra*, at pp. 5, 7; Alaska Natives and the Land, *supra*, Figs. IV–10, IV–11 and IV–15).

The Pribilof Islands have a complete dependence upon the fur seal harvest which dates back to the Russian era of Alaskan history. Because of their unique status and due to treaty considerations, they will not be covered in this statement. The dependency pattern of the Pribilof people closely parallels that of the regions covered herein.

III. NATIVE LAND CLAIM BENEFITS

There appears to be a great misconception about the amount of benefits which will be distributed through the Alaska Native Land Claims Act (Act of December 14, 1971). The two key sections of the Act which are immediately relevant to potential benefits accruing to Native people of Northern and Western Alaska are Section 5(a) and Section 7(j).

Section 5(a) provides:

> The Secretary shall prepare within two years from the date of enrollment of this Act a roll of all Natives who were born on or before, and who are living on, the date of enactment of this Act. Any decision of the Secretary regarding eligibility for enrollment shall be final.

Enrollment of Alaska Native people is just now commencing and it is doubtful whether the two year time period alloted to the Secretary of Interior can be significantly shortened. Until this enrollment is completed, there can be no distribution of cash to any shareholders.

Section 7(j) provides:

> During the five years following the enactment of this Act, not less than 10% of all corporate funds received by each of the twelve regional Corporations undr Section 6 (Alaska Native Fund), and under subsection (i) (revenues from the timber resources and subsurface estate patented to it pursuant to this Act), and all other net income, shall be distributed among the stockholders of the twelve regional Corporations . . .

It is doubtful whether more than 10% of the regional Corporations will be distributed to the shareholders in the first five years of corporate existance. The major emphasis of the regional Corporations will be on establishing a solid financial foundation; consequently, large distributions to shareholders will be initially questionable.

One thing is absolutely clear about the land claims settlement; *there will be no instant millionaires.* As is shown by the letter from the Nome Inter-agency Council (attached hereto as Exhibit "A"), the Alaska Native people of the Bering Straits area will probably receive amounts less than $454 per Native over the five-year period (that is, the first five years of operation of the regional Corporation). Clearly, this will not provide a source of income to match the loss of income from arts and crafts activities necessitated by marine mammals legislation.

IV. IMPORTANCE OF ARTS AND CRAFTS ACTIVITIES TO ALASKAN NATIVE PEOPLE

The importance of arts and crafts activities dependent on the marine mammal resource base to the Native people of the Northern and Western coasts of Alaska cannot be over-emphasized. The people of the Village of Little Diomede succinctly state the importance of the marine mammal resource to them in their letter of March 29, 1972, to Robert C. Bundy of Alaska Legal Services Corporation:

> We the under signed would like you to represent the Natives of Diomede Is., Alaska on the Sea Mammal Law pertaining to limitation of killing of mammals by citizens of Alaska
>
> If this bill is passed, the people of Diomede Village will have to turn to Dept. of Health and Welfare for subsistence for the only way we make our living is by sales of carving from the tusks of the walrus and sales of hand sewed products from the skins of the seals. There are no available steady jobs here at the Island.
>
> Although this moratorium may be for only a period of five years, it would hurt the way of life here. The people of Diomede are very proud of their heritage which has been handed down through the years. Most of the people would refrain from turning to Welfare for subsistence. This is turn would have some of them move to bigger town where the temptations of intoxicating liquor would make the living very miserable.
>
> We have sincere hope you will be able to represent our situation clearly to those who are trying to change our mode of living and taking of the sea mammals for subsistance. (A copy is attached hereto as Exhibit "D").

Several economic studies of the Northern and Western Coastal Regions of Alaska have emphasized the importance of Native arts and crafts activities for the economic stability of these areas. An economic study of the Village of Teller which is located on Northwest Alaskas' Seward Peninsula revealed that:

> Teller presently has a very limited economy. Aside from some mining and reindeer herding, the principal activities being carried on at Teller which bring new money into this community are teaching (including the Head-start Program), ivory carving and skin sewing, plus the seasonal visits to the city of polar bear hunters and a few tourists . . . (*City of Teller Comprehensive Development Plan*, Summer, 1968, prepared for the Alaska State Housing Authority by Alaskan consultants, p. 22).

Again, in Nome, arts and crafts activities play a major role in the economic base of the community:

> As a by-products of hunting carried on in the Nome area, ivory and skins are taken and are fashioned into arts and crafts products for commercial sale, principally to tourists. This is a cottage-type industry in which an estimated 50 persons, when computed on an average full-time basis, were engaged locally during 1967. Nome has a number of highly skilled ivory carvers and skin sewers and these activities provide an important source of cash income for many of the city's Native families . . .
>
> Providing that quality is stressed and prices are reasonable, the production of Native arts and crafts have continued to be the significant factor in Nome's economy over the next twenty years . . . (*City of Nome Comprehensive Development Plan*, Fall, 1968, prepared for the Alaska State Housing Authority by Alaskan consultants, p. 76–77).

The importance of a continuation of a marine mammal harvest to the Native Alaskans cultural heritage has been recognized by the Alaska Historical Society:

> The use by Natives of such mammals as part of their folk culture should, we feel, be preserved, as its use constitutes an important cultural link with their heritage. (letter from Richard W. Montague, President, Alaska Historical Society to U.S. Representative Nick Begich, March 1, 1972, reported in Congressional Record, H1931, March 9, 1972).

Perhaps nowhere can the importance of Native arts and crafts activities be better illustrated than in the key role they played in the development of two of Alaska's greatest Native artists: Ronald Senungetuk and Melvin Olanna.

> I grew up at Wales, located at Bering Strait across from Siberia . . . While at Wales, I learned to carve ivory. Carving ivory was a way of life supplemental to hunting. (*Cross-cultural arts in Alaska*, Ronald Senungetuk, "The Artist Speaks", AMU Press, 1970, p. 44).

Arts and crafts activities likewise influenced Melvin Olanna's artistic development:

> This village (Ikpik) had a unique feature that probably shaped Mel's future. It had a large, heated hall which had all the required tools for the craftsmen in the village to use in the long evenings during the wintertime. These were coastal people, so their fishing and hunting were seasonal. In the off-season periods, the men spent many hours in the hall carving ivory and bone. (*Alaska Journal*, Autumn, 1971, E. DeWitt, "Melvin Olanna", Vol. 1, No. 4, p. 35).

Despite the importance of Native arts and crafts to their cultural heritage, the present status of arts and crafts activities in Alaska is not certain:

> In light of this historic rationale, it is surprisnig to find Alaska's Native arts and crafts as good, and as abundant, as they are . . . Yet, they are in a precarious state despite the surface evidence (to the contrary) of fully-stocked shelves in the Anchorage gift shops or 1,401 choice objects on display at the Museum during the Festival of Native Arts. Indeed, unless ingenious and almost herculian efforts are made now, the end of this decade will see even the most basic and utilitarian handicrafts, such as skin sewing and basketry, joining the passenger pigeon in oblivion. (*Cross-cultural Arts in Alaska*, Michael Kennedy, "Reviving Native Arts", AMU Press, 1970, p. 15).

It would indeed be unfortunate if passage of the proposed marine mammal legislation provided Alaskan Native arts and crafts with the final nudge into oblivion.

V. CONCLUSIONS

A detailed analysis of the biological, ecological, and economic factors in the inter-relationship between the marine mammals and the Alaskan Native peoples of the Northern and Western Regions of Alaska establishes:

1. That there is a strong cultural and subsistence dependence of Native Alaskan people upon the marine mammal resource for food, clothing, and arts and crafts activities.

2. That the marine mammal species relied upon by these Native people, namely the ribbon, ringed, harbor and bearded seals and the walrus and beluga and bullhead whales are neither diminished nor endangered.

3. That to deny Alaskan Native people access to the marine mammal resource base would result in a severe blow to their culture and livelihood.

VI. RECOMMENDATIONS

In light of the biological and economic evidence available the following recommendations are made:

1. That the following Alaskan populations of marine mammal species be exempted from the provisions of proposed legislation: Pacific walrus, sea otters of the Western Aleutians, beluga whale, and harbor (both oceanic and land base), ringed, ribbon, and bearded seals. It is especially important that these populations be exempted from any moritorium provisions that may be proposed.

2. That a permit system administered by the Alaska Department of Fish and Game be established to allow a limited harvest of bowhead and gray whales for subsistence purposes.

It may be desirable to issue such permits to the regional Corporations of the regions involved. However, this determination can best be made on information gained through public hearings in the areas of Alaska most affected by the proposed marine mammal legislation.

Of all the legislative provisions proposed, Sections 107(a) and 109 of Senate Bill 3161, comes closest to a full realization of the true conditions and status of the Native people of Alaska, and the marine mammal resources upon which they are dependent.

The term "in accordance with traditional customs" in Sec. 10761 of Senate Bill 3161, which allows a Native subsistence harvest, should be deleted because:

1. The term eludes precise definition;

2. Modern methods may be more efficient thus lessening the total animal harvest necessary;

3. Modern methods may be more humane; and

4. The purpose of a subsistence harvest is to provide food and clothing and should not be unduly restricted by stereotyped concepts of how Natives should function within their environment.

Respectfully submitted, this 12 day of April, 1972.

[Exhibit "A"]

NOME INTERAGENCY COUNCIL,
Nome, Alaska, April 5, 1972.

Re Proposed Sea Mammal Legislation.

Senator ERNEST HOLLINGS,
Chairman of the Senate Committee on Environment and Oceanography, Old Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR HOLLINGS: We, of the Nome Interagency Council,[1] would like at this time to register our opposition to the bill presently before your subcommittee which would prohibit the taking of ocean mammals for five years. While generally in agreement with the laudable purposes of the bill, we feel that to forbid the taking of ocean mammals, particularly seal and walrus, for use by Native Alaskans in arts and crafts activities would work an overwhelming hardship on many Native Alaskans while providing a corresponding small aid to the purposes of the bill.

First of all, the effect on many Alaska Natives must be considered. In many Native communities, the sole consistent source of cash income, aside from welfare,

[1] The Nome Interagency Council is an informal group comprised of representatives of Federal, State, City, Churches and other agencies who, through the council, attempt to work together to provide more meaningful services to the people of Nome and avoid wasteful duplication.

is the sale of items handicrafted from the by-products of ocean mammals. Gainful employment opportunities are few. For example, in the village on Little Diomede Island, the only jobs available are store manager and maintenance man at the BIA school. Further, there is not now, nor does there appear to be any prospect in the future for any kind of vocational rehabilitation or skills training program meaningful to life in the villages.

Nor, is income from the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act a substitute for that which would be lost should this bill be passed. A general misconception exists throughout the country as to what the Alaska Native Land Claims Settlement Act actually means to the individual Native Alaskan. To begin with, there can be no distribution of funds from the United States until the enrollment of all Alaska Natives in the regional corporations, organized by the terms of the Act, is completed. That process will take at least two years. After enrollment is completed, the regional corporations must, by the terms of the Act, distribute at least ten per cent (10%) of the income received during the first five years to the individual Native shareholder. However, it is doubtful that the regional corporations, in the interest of sound investment policy, will distribute more than the 10% required by the Act. The total to be received by the regional corporations during the first five years will be 272.5 million dollars. Ten per cent of that figure divided among the approximately 60,000 Alaska Natives amounts to a less than staggering $454.00 per Native over the five year period. Therefore, it is plain that the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act will not provide a source of income to make up for that lost by the elimination of the sale of arts and crafts.

Turning to the purposes to be served by the bill, it would seem that to provide an exemption allowing Alaska Natives to engage in the sale of arts and crafts objects would in no way interfere with those purposes. First of all, there is every indication that the populations of species utilized by Natives for arts and crafts are not in danger, or, for that matter, even being depeleted. Dr. Frederick Dean of the Department of Wildlife Management, University of Alaska, has stated unequivocally that walrus and seals of the type used by Alaska Natives for arts and crafts purposes are not an endangered species and that, from a wildlife management point of view, there is no reason why controlled harvest of these animals should be discontinued. Secondly, the numbers of ocean mammals taken by Natives for use in arts and crafts does not appear to be significant in view of the population of these animals as a whole. Therefore, to deprive a group of citizens of their livelihood, where to do so would provide no demonstrable benefit to their fellow citizens (nor, for that matter, to the descendants of their fellow citizens) would seem to be, at best, inefficient legislation.

At the same time, we recognize that it may be a legitimate concern of many people that the number of ocean mammals taken for use by Natives in arts and crafts activities will increase so as to become a danger to the mammals in question. We feel that the nature of the market for native handicrafted items, the time and skill needed to produce the requisite skills combine to assure that there will be little, if any, expansion of demand for ocean mammal by-products as they are used for Native arts and crafts purposes.

Furthermore, there are available to Congress less drastic measures which would assure the continued existence of large populations of ocean mammals and, at the same time, allow Native Alaskans to continue plying the only trade producing, at the present time, any cash income for many of them.

One such measure would be to grant permits for the sale of any object handicrafted from the by-products of ocean mammals only to certain licensed permit holders. The permit holder would be required, under penalty of law, to keep an accurate accounting of any and all transactions and would be allowed only to sell a certain quantity each year. The permit would be non-transferable. Perhaps, the permit holders could be designated. A natural entity to hold such a permit would be a regional corporation established by the Native Land Claims Settlement. The regional corporation would be issued a permit from the Secretary of the Interior for the purchase and sale of a certain number of pounds of ivory and for a certain number of seal skins. The amount would be determined by experts. As an added advantage this arrangement would tend to eliminate the sharp practices and unconscionable dealings which are presently the hallmark of many traders. It would insure that Native arts and crafts will be truly Native and that the benefit would not innure to others.

For the above reasons, we feel that the Natives of Alaska should be allowed to continue utilizing ocean mammals for the production of arts and crafts.

Should your subcommittee choose to allow the people closest to the situation to testify by holding hearings in Alaska, we feel our position will be amply supported by the evidence presented at such hearings.

Respectfully,

ROBERT BUNDY, *Acting Chairman.*

[Exhibit B]

STATE OF ALASKA,
DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND GAME,
Fairbanks, March 14, 1972.

Miss MOIRA A. G. WARLAND,
Executive Officer, Survival Service Commission,
Switzerland.

DEAR MISS WARLAND: A copy of your memorandum, and the attached "Fact" sheet, concerning the potential classification of the Pacific walrus as rare or decreasing mammal was passed along to me for reply, by Mr. Jack W. Lentfer.

I was very surprised to learn of this potential classification because the Pacific walrus is certainly neither rare nor is the population decreasing. In fact, the Pacific walrus is common and increasing at an encouraging rate.

It is my intent to review the content of the fact sheet in the same sequence that subject headings were listed.

Status.—All of the statements are essentially correct. It should be pointed out however, that the American estimate of 100,000 walruses, is our most conservative effort based on repeated surveys (1961, 1968 with another planned for this year) and repeated statistical analyses of walrus population composition (1962, 1967 and again this year. Both methods, over the period of ten years, have provided consistent results which are in agreement. The actual population is estimated at 115,000 to 120,000. However, allowing for a safe margin of error (in order to definitely prevent over-exploitation) we use the figure of 100,000 walruses.

The statement that ". . . . full recovery is being retarded by the present rate of killing.", is very misleading (perhaps intentionally so). Any exploitation will decrease the potential rate of increase. However, by enforced regulation, the walrus population is increasing while still providing the necessities of life to the people that depend upon walruses.

This first paragraph establishes the fact that walruses are nether rare nor decreasing.

Distribution.—These two paragraph are also misleading. The present range is precisely the same today as the former range. As is stated, "formerly used areas are again being used to an increasing extent as slowly growing population spreads into its former range." In the last seven years we have again observed the presence of numerous walruses on the mainland, Poort Moller (Alaskan Peninsula : 60 animals observed). Amak Island in southern Bristol Bay, the Walrus Islands, and every island that was formerly used in the American sector of eastern Bering Sea. One exception has been the pribilofs. However, over 400 walruses were observed within 50 miles of these islands during April 1971. In addition both King Island and Soviet Big Diomede Island are now used. These were formerly inhabited by Eskimos, but since the villages have moved, walruses are utilizing them as hauling grounds.

Habitat Trend and Conditions.—As stated above, there is presently no portion of the Pacific walruses range in which walruses do not now occur, *as long as sea ice is present.* Therefore, the first statement is erroneous. We can assume that present density of animals is lower than it was when the population was higher, but the fact still remains that they now occur throughout their former range.

The question of failure to repopulate southern areas is due more to 1) changes in climate and the distribution of sea ice and 2) development in the formerly isolated areas.

Population Trend and Condition.—This paragraph is also very misleading. Walruses *never* occurred regularly south of the Alaska Peninsula during recent geological time, nor did the necessary drifting sea ice. If you refer back to the section on Distribution, it is seen that historically, they were rare in the Aleutian Islands.

The occurrence of walruses on the Commander Islands can only be considered as irregular. These islands are south of the normal range with respect to water depth (remember walruses are bottom feeders and therefore, their distribution is tied to the extent of the continental shelf), and regularly occurring sea ice.

Areas east of Barrow have always been poor walrus habitat due again to water depth and the fact that in summer the ice is over water too deep for walruses to feed. However, a few regularly arrive at Barter Island, during summers when sea ice remain close to shore.

I believe the statement, ". . . for which Zenkovich reckoned a population of about 60,000 animals.", is true. In other words, this Russian investigator estimated the population of Pacific walruses during the low point to have been more than the present estimates of our Soviet colleagues. The estimate by Zenkovich in 1938 is also in line with our present estimates and the estimated rate of increase.

Conservation Measures Taken.—Regulations concerning the taking of walruses by Alaskans has reduced the total harvest, especially of females, in all areas of the state where these animals occur.

Conservation Measures Proposed.—I would hereby propose safeguarding the habitat by international agreement from such things as pesticide and heavy metal pollution, unregulated offshore oil development, etc.

Remarks.—This paragraph is acceptable as written.

In summary, I cannot concur that the Pacific walrus is either rare or decreasing. The designation of any mammal as rare or endangered should be based on fact, and every effort should be made to reverse the trend. Classification of the Pacific walrus as such would foster a considerable credability gap with respect to the other mammals so designated, and it would further impose a severe hardship on certain groups of Alaskan Eskimos which are dependent upon the rational use of this invaluable resource. Programs presently in effect will insure both continued increase of the walrus herds as well as rational utilization.

I appreciated the opportunity to review this new data sheet and to submit my comments. In return, would you please be so kind as to inform me of where the action to classify the Pacific walrus as rare or decreasing mammal was initiated.

Sincerely,

JOHN J. BURNS,
Marine Mammal Biologist,
Division of Game.

[Exhibit "C"]

STATEMENT OF THE STATE OF ALASKA PERTAINING TO THE "MARINE MAMMAL PROTECTION ACT OF 1971"—H.R. 10420

INTRODUCTION

During 1971, legislation has been introduced in the U.S. House of Representatives, dealing with the protection and/or management of marine mammals. In some cases similar legislation has been submitted in the U.S. Senate. Such bills include H.R. 6554 (attachment 1) and S. 1315 cited as the "Ocean Mammal Protection Act of 1971," H.R. 7556, also cited as the "Ocean Mammal Protection Act of 1971." (attachment 2), H.R. 10420, cited as the "Marine Mammal Protection Act of 1971." (attachment 3)

The intent of this legislation is to extend federal protection (H.R. 6554, 7556 and S. 1315) or assert federal management jurisdiction over all marine mammals (H.R. 10420).

Most of this legislation has received considerable opposition from organizations and agencies concerned about, or involved with responsible marine mammal management programs. An impressive number of national conservation organizations have also expressed opposition to H.R. 6554 and S. 1315 (attachment 4), as did the Honorable /Ted Stevens, Senator from Alaska (attachment 5) and the Alaska State Legislature (attachment 6). Most of this legislation can best be described in light of scientific marine mammal management as an unrealistic approach to this problem in response to the well meaning but emotional pleas of concerned U.S. citizens.

It is generally thought that H.R. 10420 is more realistic than previous legislation in its declaration of policy and proposed definitions, prohibitions, limitations, permits, etc. Although H.R. 10420 is the least objectionable bill proposed to date, it still contains several significant areas of concern to the State of Alaska. Due to the variety and importance of marine mammals to the well being of Alaska residents, and the obvious legal status of the several marine mammal species themselves, H.R. 10420 would have detrimental effects upon current federal and state sponsored management programs, the question of state versus federal control of resident non-migratory animal species, and the livelihood of thousands of Alaskan residents. According to several knowledgable informants, H.R. 10420, as written stands a good chance of being approved in the House, if strong opposition to the assertion of federal jurisdiction over resident ocean mammals does not develop.

Marine mammals as defined in H.R. 10420 include several important species which the State of Alaska acknowledges as presently in need of total protection on an international basis. Conversely, several of the marine mammal species are not presently nor in the foreseeable future in any danger of being extirpated or exterminated. As a point of fact, many marine mammal species are being managed on the basis of sound scientific information and responsive regulations. This latter group includes all of the species presently of importance to Alaska residents, with the exception of the whales.

Additionally, H.R. 10420 includes several important species that reside within the territorial waters of and frequently upon the adjacent lands of Alaska. Assertion of federal jurisdiction and management over these resident species would be in direct conflict with "The Alaska Statehood Act" and "The Submerged Lands Act."

We fully recognize the present public interest and awareness of marine mammal conservation problems and the response of Congress in proposing legislation to protect the animals in question. However, we cannot neglect or overlook the principles dictated by a sound management program, which is necessary if the marine mammal resources of Alaska and the world are to be perpetuated.

We present the following as a discussion of major points relating to the position of the State of Alaska in reference to the "Marine Mammal Protection Act of 1971."

PORPOISES, DOLPHINS AND WHALES (OTHER THAN BELUGAS)

The State of Alaska is basically in agreement with H.R. 10420 as it pertains to porpoises, dolphins and whales other than belugas. The preservation of whales has been the subject of a resolution by the State Legislature (attachment #7). Porpoises and dolphins are species which are not utilized or managed at present, and for which there is no apparent potential use in the United States. Should a potential develop for their utilization, H.R. 10420 would assure that research was conducted to determine permissible harvest levels, and that harvests were then kept below these levels.

It is reported that United States tuna fishermen annually kill in excess of 200,000 porpoises, which are taken incidental to fishing operations and are not utilized. It is suggested that H.R. 10420 make provisions for research designed to develop methods of tuna fishing whereby the associated kill of porpoises would be greatly reduced.

Some of the large whales are in fact endangered and most are wide ranging. Some spend time within the territorial waters of several states and countries as well as in the high seas.

The State of Alaska does not have a whale research or management program, and believes that the federal government could better conduct such a program. The federal government, through the Departments of the Interior and Commerce, will prohibit, after December 1971, the import of products from whales and their harvest by U.S. citizens. H.R. 10420 might create a conflict with these prohibitions in that permits could be issued for harvesting whales. If the intent of H.R. 10420 is total prohibition of marine mammal hunting then, in the case of whales, the same thing has been accomplished by actions of the Departments of Interior and Commerce.

Alaskan Eskimos harvest 15–25 bowhead whales annually, for human consumption. Although acculturation is changing many aspects of Eskimo life, bowhead whales have traditionally been hunted and utilized by these people for years. Because whale hunting and subsistence use is, and will continue to be

a significant part of the Eskimo culture, it is suggested that H.R. 10420 continue to provide for the present relatively low Eskimo harvest, and establish a research program to determine if such harvest levels can be continued indefinitely. If present harvest levels are excessively high, it is recommended that limited quotas be established for villages, and more efficient harvest methods be developed to assure 100 per cent recovery of all whales "struck".

Beluga whales, which are widespread in much of Alaska's territorial waters, including some rivers, are essentially a resident species. Some belugas are harvested by Eskimos each year for food. The Alaska Department of Fish and Game has been concerned with predation of belugas on downstream migrating salmon. A technique has been developed whereby recordings of killer whale vocalizations are used to drive belugas away from salmon migration routes. Because belugas are basically a resident species, are also an Eskimo subsistence item, and prey on salmon, it is therefore recommended that they continue to be managed by the State of Alaska.

While the State of Alaska recognizes that the manatee is an endangered species in need of protection, it is a resident species within several states. As such these animals should be properly under State jurisdiction, if so desired by the states in question. At present the state and federal governments provide complete protection to manatees. Therefore, H.R. 10420 would provide little additional protection to these animals.

SEA OTTERS SEA LIONS, AND LAND-BREEDING HARBOR SEALS

Certain marine mammal species are essentially resident in Alaska and its territorial waters. These include the sea otter, Stillar's sea lion and land-breeding harbor seals. These species breed and pup on land or close inshore, are not migratory, and spend the majority of their time either on land or within state territorial waters. Virtually all hunting of these species in the past has been conducted either on land or in the waters of Alaska.

These non-migratory species, like most land mammals are not now and should not be a subject of federal control. The rights of the respective states to manage and utilize resident species is a precedent of long standing. In the State of Alaska this right has been reaffirmed by the "Alaska Statehood Act" and the "Submerged Lands Act."

None of these resident species are endangered, and all are under intensive study and management by the State of Alaska. Sea otters, once severely reduced in numbers have continued to increase under state jurisdiction and recent extensive transplants have reintroduced sea otters back to much of their previous range. Certain populations of sea otter, primarily in the Western-Aleutians Islands have exceeded the optimum carrying capacity of their habitat and are presently subjected to high rates of natural mortality. These populations are capable of sustaining a limited annual harvest, and the reduction in number is desirable.

Land breeding harbor seals and sea lions, both the subject of former predator control programs are now protected by seasons and limits. Commercial harvest of these species is regulated on a day to day basis at the harvest locations. Both species are abundant and regional harvest levels are below the rate of natural recruitment to the populations.

NORTHERN FUR SEALS

Fur seals are managed by the federal government by authority of "The Fur Seal Act". While the State of Alaska is not directly involved in the management of this species, it has a definite interest in continuation of this program.

House Bill 10420 and other related bills preceding it implies that an examination of the present fur seal program would show that harvesting should be curtailed or stopped. This program has been reviewed continually by groups both inside and outside the federal government. These reviews have considered the humaneness of harvest methods, and the effects of these havests on the fur seal population. The program is an excellent example of successful and intensive species management, based upon the application of sound biological information. Through this program the Pribilof seal herd has increased from approximately 200,000 animals during the early 1900's to its present optimum level of 1.3 million. It now sustains an average annual harvest of 50,000 seals.

House Bill 10420 offers, at best, a questionable future for the preservation of fur seals as a species. Termination of "the Fur Seal Act" could cause the United States to lose control and management of this valuable resource. A cessation of harvesting would result in increased natural mortality caused by overcrowding on the rookeries and increased demands on the fisheries resources which support the seals and are also utilized by man. The result would be no real improvement of the herd, but only an increase of mortality by starvation, disease, parasites and other natural causes.

Additionally, it is likely that the fur seal population will be seriously jeopardized due to a drastic population decline caused by the factors previously described, unless present population controls are continued. The federal government and the State of Alaska would not receive revenue derived from this resource and the 600 Pribilof Aleuts would lose the ability to support themselves in their ancestral home.

Another critical side effect resulting from termination of "The Fur Seal Treaty" might be the resumption of pelagic seal hunting by other nations. Japan has expressed the desire to harvest fur seals in this manner. If the United States fails to manage this resource, other countries may have a justifiable reason for resuming pelagic hunting. The compensation provisions of H.B. 10420, in all likelihood, will not be adequate to prevent this possibility. There would be little if any reason to accept this compensation when the potential for harvesting a larger number of fur seals on the high seas exists.

High seas hunting is non-selective with respect to sex and age of animals taken, and there is a substantial loss due to wounding and inking.

The present fur seal harvest program is subjected to constant and critical review. Any rational analysis of this program will reveal that it is not detrimental to the species.

OCEANIC HAIR SEALS

The term oceanic hair seals is used to differentiate between resident hair seals (i.e. land breeding harbor seals) and those populations and species present mainly, or entirely beyond the three mile limit of state territorial waters. The oceanic species include ice breeding harbor seals, ringed seals, ribbon seals and bearded seals. All of these species are presently taken by resident Alaskans, primarily Eskimos. These seals are not the object of commercial exploitation by American nationals. However, there is a substantial commercial harvest of ribbon and bearded seals by the Soviet Union. As pointed out by Senator Stevens of Alaska (Congress. Record. V. 117, No. 100, 29 June 1971), these species appear to have stable populations. Estimates of numbers are: bearded seals, 300,000; ringed seals, 250,000; ice breeding harbor seals, 200,000; and ribbon seals, 150,000.

Ribbon seals are probably experiencing a slow increase in numbers, after having been reduced by Soviet commercial sealing operations during the early 1960's.

The estimated annual harvest of all hair seals in Alaska is about 25,000 to 30,000 animals. Approximately half of these are taken by Eskimos and used for food, clothing and the home manufacture of articles for sale.

To date, all four of the oceanic hair seals have been the subjects of full time research programs sponsored by the Alaska Department of Fish and Game, and directed at the questions involved with sustained yield management. Regulations, as necessary, have been promulgated to attain this objective.

WALRUS

The Pacific walrus constitutes a population of marine mammals which is presently the subject of continuing investigation and management by the Alaska Department of Fish and Game. The commercial value of walruses (mainly for ivory) was definitely responsible for their initial decline (during the period 1860 through 1920), and prompted the close management attention presently devoted to them by the Alaska Department of Fish and Game.

State regulations pertaining to walrus include: (1) a walrus refuge in northern Bristol Bay; (2) a permit system regulating the purchase and sale of raw ivory; and (3) a trophy hunting bag limit of one adult bull per year. However, there are provisions that residents dependent upon and utilizing walrus for food, may additionally take up to five adult cows or subadults (either sex) per hunter, per year.

Each year, Alaska Department of Fish and Game personnel are stationed at the major walrus hunting sites for purposes of enforcing the regulations and conducting ongoing research programs. This effort involves the attention of five department employees for the entire spring hunting season, as well as the full time attention of two biologists.

There are estimated to be 70,000 to 110,000 Pacific walruses at this time and the population is continuing to increase.

POLAR BEAR

The State of Alaska manages polar bears, recognizing that they are a renewable resource, capable of sustaining an annual harvest without jeopardizing welfare of the species. The Alaska Department of Fish and Game is recommending that a more sophisticated management policy be adopted by the State with high quality recreational use (photography, hunting, observation) as its principle objective. Under the proposed policy, the use of aircraft in hunting polar bears would be prohibited and replaced by ground hunting, employing Eskimo guides. This would upgrade the quality of recreation furnished by hunting, and would be more acceptable to the general public. In addition, the number of bears taken would be reduced to a level where there would be no reason for concern about excessive harvests.

Only skins from those bears taken without the aid of aircraft can now be sold. Under the proposed new policy, sale of all skins would be prohibited. It would be desirable, if the economy of northern Alaskan coastal villages could be bolstered by income received by Eskimos for guiding persons interested in photographing, hunting and observing bears.

The program for harvest assessment, initiated shortly after Statehood, and intensified in succeeding years, has provided detailed harvest data since 1961. An intensive mark and recovery program is providing information on movements and discreteness of sub-populations of polar bears. The State of Alaska is also conducting studies on polar bear breeding biology and productivity, denning, relationships of bears to sea ice and seal populations, incidence and levels of parasites, pesticides, and pollutants in bears, and is radio-tracking these animals from aircraft (and hopefully satellities) to determine movements and obtain related information. Although it would be desirable for other organizations to study various aspects of polar bear life history, it would be most unfortunate if research projects now being conducted by the State of Alaska were terminated prior to their scheduled completion. This would occur if primary responsibility for research and management were transferred entirely from the State of Alaska to the federal government.

It is acknowledged that only the federal government can conduct treaty negotiations with foreign governments. However, the State of Alaska can act as an advisory to the federal government in any such negotiations. This was successfully achieved by the unified and cooperative approach of federal and state representatives at the 1965 International Polar Bear Meeting. Biologists from the State of Alaska have dealt directly and in a productive manner with research personnel from the federal government, as well as from other countries. This is evidenced by working relationships within the International Polar Bear Group of the International Union for the Conservation of Nature.

SUMMARY

Marine mammals occurring in the waters adjacent to Alaska and which are currently utilized to some degree by Alaska residents include: Steller's sea lion, sea otter, land breeding harbor seal, northern fur seal, ice breeding harbor seal, ringed seal, ribbon seal, bearded seal, Pacific walrus, polar bear, beluga whale, bowhead whale and California grey whale (the latter two are legally hunted by natives as the result of specific exceptions in regulations of the International Whaling Commission).

Except for bowhead and California grey whales, the State of Alaska is presently engaged in research and management programs of most marine mammal and other fish and wildlife species. The Constitution of the State of Alaska states that, "Fish, forets, wildlife, grasslands, and all other replenishable resources belonging to the State shall be utilized, developed, and maintained on the sustained yield principle, subject to preferences among beneficial uses." (Article VIII, Sec. 4). According to Alaska Statutes, Title 16, Section 16.05.020, the Com-

missioner of the Department of Fish and Game shall, ". . . manage, protect, maintain, improve, and extend the fish, game and aquatic plant resources of the State in the interest of the economy and general well-being of the State . . ."

The mandates set forth by the State Constitution and statutes are in part presently being met by the Alaska Department of Fish and Game. Investigation, management and protection programs are presently directed toward marine mammals as well as other fish and wildlife species. Six senior biologists, representing 72 man-months of time per year, are presently involved in the research and management of Alaska's marine mammals. These investigators are additionally supported by 48 man-months of temporary assistant time and 12 man-months of enforcement effort. Effective regulations are considered and promulgated by the Alaska Board of Fish and Game, as necessary. Furthermore, the Department has the authority to institute emergency regulations whenever they are necessary.

With regard to management and enforcement measures, as applied to resources harvested outside of the territorial waters of the State, including marine mammals, various landing laws have been applied to all persons leaving from and returning to the State. This has been necessary in order to maintain a viable protection and management program aimed at those species occurring and/or being harvested outside of the State's territorial waters.

The preceding comments are intended to demonstrate that the State of Alaska has a sound, flexible and responsive management and protection program. This program is currently contributing to the welfare of those marine mammal species of importance to Alaska residents (with the exception of bowhead and California grey whales, and the northern fur seal which are now subject to federal jurisdiction).

The State of Alaska opposes H.R. 10420, as presently written because it would: 1) violate State's rights by asserting federal jurisdiction over certain resident species of marine mammals; 2) seriously jeopardize the existing effective and responsive State research, management and enforcement program which considers all aspects of conservation including protection and utilization of marine mammals, based on productivity and human welfare; and 3) as evident in the *Findings and Declaration of Policy* of this bill, it is fallaceous to include *all* marine mammals when actually only a *few* species are endangered of being diminished (compare sections 2.1, 2.2 and 2.3 with sections 2.4 and 2.5)

We strongly recommend revisions of H.R. 10420 to include only the endangered or diminishing species, and including the broad categories of porpoises, dolphins and whales, but excluding belugas. We recommend that the State of Alaska, because of its direct involvement and interest in the marine mammal resources, should have responsibility for research, management and protection of polar bears, oceanic hair seals and walruses; in addition to exclusive jurisdiction of those populations which are essentially resident within the State's territorial waters.

We also recommend that the current federal management program concerning North Pacific Fur Seals, be continued, and that North Pacific Fur Seal Treaty not be terminated.

We further recommend that the management of dugongs and manatees remain subject to the jurisdiction of the states in which they occur.

[Exhibit "D"]

DIOMEDE, ALASKA, *March 29, 1972.*

ROBERT C. BUNDY,
Attorney, Alaska Legal Service Corp.,
Nome, Alaska.

DEAR BUNDY: We the under signed would like you to represent the Natives of Diomede Is., Alaska on the Sea Mammal Law pertaining to limitation on killing of mammals by citizens of Alaska.

If this bill is passed, the people of Diomede Village will have to turn to Dept. of Health, Education and Welfare for subsistence for the only way we make our living is by sales of carving from the tusks of the walrus and sales of hand sewed products from the skins of the seals. There are no available steady jobs here at the Island.

Although this moritorium may be for only a period of five years, it would hurt the way of life here. The people of Diomede are very proud of their heritage which has been handed down through the years. Most of the people would refrain from turning to Welfare for subsistence. This in turn would have some of them move to bigger towns where the temptations of intoxicating liquor would make the living very miserable.

We have sincere hope you will be able to represent our situation clearly to those who are trying to change our mode of living and taking of the sea mammals for subsistance.

Signed,

David Menadelook
Michael Soolook Sr.
Robert Soolook Sr.
Glenn Iyahuk
James Iyapana
Alice Soolook
Annie Iyahuk
Peter Ahkvaluk
Isabell Ahkvaluk
Emma Kiminoel
Amy Iyapana
Sam Moy Jr
Annie Kunayak
Andrew J. Kunayak Sr.
Larry W. Meier
Donald Kiminoel
Margaret L. Meier
Arthur Ahkinga
Oscar Ahkinga
Jacob Ahkinga
Catherine Ahkinga
Orville Ahkinga
Albert Iyahuk

Samuel Soolook
Evelyn Iyapana
Emily Iyahuk
Jack Gatrik
Edna Iyapana
Eileen Gennie
Vera Gennie
Margaret Soolook
William Kapletarki
Justina Kunayak
Philip Ahkinga
Lenora Ahkinga
Louis Gennie Sr
Sophie Gennie
Walter E. Menadelook

[Exhibit "E"]

UNIVERSITY OF ALASKA,
College, Alaska, April 10, 1972.

COMMITTEE ON OCEANS AND ATMOSPHERE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIRS: The following letter is an expression of my personal opinion as a professional wildlife biologist, but it does not necessarily represent the opinion of the University of Alaska and is not to be construed as the official position of the University.

I am writing concerning Bills which are currently in the Congress of the United States and particularly those before your Committee which have to do with restricting the take of marine mammals of a number of species. I have not had an opportunity to review the latest versions of these Bills but did see several earlier this winter. Consequently, my comments will be of a general nature rather than specifically directed at detailed points of particular Bills. I am speaking from a base of over seventeen years professional work in wildlife biology in Alaska. Although my own research has not involved marine mammals directly, I have had students working on some species of marine mammals during the course of graduate programs, and I have followed the work of a number of professional marine mammalogists fairly closely.

At present, I see no valid reason for the blanket prohibition of the take of marine mammals in Alaska. There are none that are truly threatened with extinction; even the sea otter has made a strong comeback under close management.

The populations of all species of seals and walruses in Alaska can stant regulated harvest. The combined efforts of the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and the Alaska Department of Fish and Game should be more than adequate to guarantee proper management of these resources. There have been many statements in the press in recent months holding up the idea that man should not utilize marine mammals. Most of these have been based on good intentions related to a humanitarian emotional reaction to the killing of these animals. While I certainly agree very wholeheartedly that any killing of wild animals should be done with respect for the life that is being taken and by the most humane method possible under the circumstances, I feel quite strongly that our society must recognize that man is a predator and will have to kill in order to survive. It may be that some of the killing will be of plants and some of animals. The critical thing in my mind is that whenever killing is done it be done with respect.

I believe that many people who have objected to the killing of marine mammals and other wildlife have lost sight of the whole system view in their concentration on one aspect of the system. Frequently, it is suggested that we should be using substitute products for those obtained from wild animals. I strongly suspect that if we had sufficient knowledge of the impact of the manufacture and the subsequent waste disposal of substitute materials, we would be able to say that the associated environmental damage caused considerably more harm to wild animals than does the killing associated with reasonable, controlled harvest. The situation associated with the PCB plastics is probably going to prove to be a case in point.

In Alaska there is, as you must know quite well, a strong dependence of many native peoples on marine mammals both for food and cash income. I believe that it would be a gross error to restrict the killing of such animals or the sale of products derived from them in the name of a humanitarian effort. Many of these people have little in the way of reasonable alternatives, particularly if we are to permit them to elect a subsistence or largely subsistence life style. I will not deny that there has been considerable waste associated with some of the harvest of walrus in the past. There are well-documented instances of so-called head hunting in which the animals were killed but abandoned after the ivory was removed. This is a practice which certainly should be curtailed; however, it seems best left to the Alaska Department of Fish and Game. There is no question but that a stronger enforcement effort would help this Department. I would like to see a training program in which village residents could be educated in the matters of law and wildlife law enforcement so that they could be deputized and serve as local representatives of the Department. Probably a program of this sort would be a much better place to spend some concern and money with respect to upgrading the general marine mammal situation.

If natives are allowed to take marine mammals for food and the products that they can use themselves, it seems quite wasteful not to permit them to sell the excess portions of the animals. I feel that material derived from ivory, bone, hides, or even meat should be saleable as long as the animals had been taken for personal use. There may be even some cases where a commercial harvest would be legitimate if the meat were to be sold to other villages for human use.

I personally can find much less justification for the relatively mechanized, commercial exploitation of sea lions for animal food. However, this does not appear to be a profitable venture to date as far as I know.

I hope that your Committee will find no reason to pass federal legislation restricting the killing of marine mammals unless it is based on sound evidence that there is a biological need to so restrict the killing. While I have a strong agreement with most of the general concern for the quality of our environment, I am discouraged by the readiness of many members of the public to jump on a bandwagon which decrys killing without looking at the whole picture carefully enough to see and weigh the many facets that are involved.

If I can be of any assistance to your Committee, I would be most happy to do what I can.

Sincerely,

FREDERICK C. DEAN,
Professor of Wildlife Management,
and Head, Department of Wildlife and Fisheries.

[Exhibit "F"]

STATE OF ALASKA—DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND GAME

The Department of Fish and Game is responsible for conservation and development of the commercial fisheries, sport fish, bird, game and fur bearing animals. When asked to comment about the possibility of commercial development of wildlife in the Barrow area, a Department of Fish and Game spokesman in Fairbanks said that polar bear hunting is a big business, but that little returns is realized by the residents of Kotzebue and Barrow. He said that most of the income goes to the registered guides, who are mainly from Anchorage and Fairbanks.

The spokesman also mentioned that shellfish, caribou and marine animals are being used for subsistence purposes, but that these were not likely to develop into commercial ventures in the Barrow area.

As a supplement to Barrow's growing tourist industry, the Fish and Game Department representative mentioned organized trips into the surrounding country, led by local residents, to observe and/or photograph the wildlife. This could be a special attraction for younger tourists. Many tourists now visiting Barrow and the Arctic Research Lab are older people from the "lower 48" and many of these stay in Barrow for only a single day.

According to the Fish and Game Department, the population growth in Barrow does not pose particular dangers to the surrounding wildlife. Their observation was that substantial full-time employment (such as that found in Barrow) reduces the dependence on wildlife resources and therefore the numbers taken. Of course any kind of economic decline in Barrow could reverse this trend and possibly endanger the neighboring wildlife.