

I'm David Beebe representing myself, and support the mask mandate.

I also encourage the assembly to use the same rationale of public process as the resolution recently passed on the Kake Road — in regards to Senator Lisa Murkowski's Landless legislation. That it mandates privatizing 115,000 acres of public lands demands meaningful public process. Absent access, public process and transparency, the legislative product is illegitimate.

I am a Vietnam era veteran trained in the US Navy as a surgical technician on surgical teams in all the major surgical services and served for over 5 years. During this period I also moonlighted while in the Navy in civilian hospitals for 5 years and functioning as a surgical technician for over a decade.

During this time I've worn a surgical mask for 8-12 hours a day in surgery of all the major surgical services. The claim that there is a health risk of the mask wearer, or there is not a statistically significant risk of wound infection by not wearing masks is absurd.

The Southeast Alaska Landless Corporation has claimed, there was (quote)“**no good reason, there was no definitive reason,**” the so-called Landless communities were not included in ANCSA, the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act.

The CoastAlaska regional nonprofit news corporation has claimed: (quote) “A 1993 study by the [Institute of Social and Economic Research](#) (or ISER) found no significant difference between the five landless communities and others included in ANCSA.” No source references to the claim were provided, so I looked for myself.

These statements, made by these nonprofit corporations, that there was no good reason, no definitive reason, nor significant difference between the 5 “so called landless communities” and others in ANCSA are verifiably untrue as documented in the ISER source document itself.

In the very first paragraph of the Preface to the ISER study of five SE. Alaska communities, ISER concluded the following,

“Natives from these five communities were eligible to enroll as at-large shareholders of Sealaska, the regional corporation established for Southeast Alaska. But they were not eligible to form village or urban corporations and therefore received no land entitlements.”

So now that it has been established that Congress definitively considered these 5 communities in ANCSA, we can find the **definitive reason** in Chapter 3 of the ISER study **why** these 5 communities were not eligible to receive land entitlements.

Back in 1935, Congress seized the recognized lands of Tlingit and Haida in order to create the Metlakatla Indian reservation, the Tongass National Forest, and the Glacier Bay National Monument, and they were not returned to the Village based clans — And here’s why:

Upon statehood Tlingit and Haida clans went to the Court of Claims against the State of Alaska in 1959. That court determined their claims were valid and a settlement for those lands was awarded —\$7.5 million dollars (which is equivalent to about \$78 million in today’s dollars), Tlingit and Haida were charged with management of the settlement funds on behalf of its members.

Natives are also citizen co-owners of the same lands they received cash settlements for. In fact, no American citizen can claim to be landless as long as the national forest system exists.

If this is still not clear, we have the proverbial words from the horse’s mouth: Back in 1993, the KFSK News dept. covered a previous attempt in a series of attempts to privatize public lands of the Tongass and elsewhere.

Lee Gorsuch the Director of ISER, who happened to be listening to his radio in the car, stated in a letter dated 7 December 1993 to the KFSK news director:
(excerpts)

“the story was inaccurate and disappointing. No one here in ISER was contacted for the story. If you had called me or Steve Colt we could have pointed out several things that would have improved the accuracy of the story.”

"The study villages were not, however (as you reported), denied all benefits under ANCSA. Qualified residents of those villages received cash payments and they are at-large members of Sealaska regional corporation."

"We did not, as you reported, make a finding that Congress had inadvertently omitted the study villages from land benefits nor did we recommend that Congress should never award them land."

"We did not as you implied say that the study villages were entitled to the same economic benefits as Southeast communities with village or urban corporations have received."

"We did estimate what those benefits had totaled to date but that is a much different thing from making a recommendation."

"It was not in our scope of work to make recommendations — just to present factual information."

(It is not clear if the KFSK news director issued a correction)

Thank you for this opportunity to speak.