

Testimony before Senate Judiciary Committee, 4-12-17.

Good afternoon. My name is Mary Bishop; I live in Fairbanks. I testify today in opposition to the confirmation of Jahna Lindemuth as the state's AG.

I am a passionate supporter of equal rights. I hope you are, too. Like Elizabeth Peratrovich, I am an opponent of government discrimination based upon race or ethnicity.

I am not confident that Ms. Lindemuth supports the state's commitment that all persons are equal and entitled to equal rights and opportunities.

In my opinion, Ms. Lindemuth has acted against the State Constitution and the state's sovereign interest on three issues:

- First -- She has actively participated in developing the MOA between the Interior Department and an Ahtna Inter-tribal Commission which seeks to provide special harvest permits for members of 8 Ahtna village tribes ONLY -- above and beyond even the rural preference -- above and beyond sharing with neighboring tribal members in Nenana and Tetlin. Her participation was gratefully noted by Interior Solicitor Ken Lord during a Federal Subsistence Board hearing. Of course, the MOA says "nothing herein is intended to conflict with Federal, State or local laws or regulations". I wish it would say "nothing herein may be used to argue for Indian country and reservations" -- because it will.
- Second -- Ms. Lindemuth's support of State authority is muddy with regard to the Klutina area RS2477.
- Third -- and most egregious in my opinion, is that she dropped the state's opposition to tribal "fee-to-trust" lands and did not oppose BIA's approval of Alaska's first post-ANCSA Indian reservation -- in Craig. She claimed the state's case was "weak". Obviously previous AG Richards and the previous Parnell administration did not believe it was weak. Senator Ted Stevens made sure strong wording was included in ANCSA in order to avoid Indian country in Alaska...and Stevens was supported by the vast majority of Native village representatives. Now, however, the state's position will likely become weaker with each tribal application that the state does not oppose -- and three new applications have just been issued to the state by BIA.

In summary, I suggest we need an AG who will not support one tribal interest against a neighboring tribal interest. We need an AG who will support the **State's** sovereign authorities to tax and regulate-- not tribal authority to tax and regulate. We need an AG who will work toward **lessening** our unfortunate rural/urban divide -- **not** help to put that divide on steroids.

Can a government help to implement racial discrimination—  
and then expect to get rid of (reverse) discrimination?