

imagination would be reduced expenditures for Native welfare programs, a less costly BIA, and a Native population which would make major contributions to the economic growth of Alaska. A satisfactory settlement which departs from the past would also substitute goodwill for bitterness by demonstrating to the Native peoples that our system does work and can produce justice.

An analysis of the pending proposals demonstrates that, while the draftsmen of the Federal Field Committee and Interior Bills obviously intended to be fair to the Natives, and the Bills contain certain constructive features, they nevertheless do not afford the Natives their just due. This is so because these Bills do not take into consideration the true value of the lands in question; their compensation provisions are either inadequate or too speculative; they do not recognize the Natives' need for lands; they ignore the sharp differences between the regions of Alaska; they do not permit the Natives to be sufficiently involved in making decisions affecting their lives; and, administratively, they simply cannot work.

We respectfully submit, however, that the AFN proposal constitutes a new and dynamic approach which can finally produce a satisfactory solution to a problem which has thus far proven insoluble.

We turn now to our analysis of the three proposals relating to compensation, land and administration.