

STATEMENT OF FRANK GEORGE, NESPELEM, WASHINGTON, AN ENROLLED TRIBAL MEMBER OF THE CONFEDERATED TRIBES OF THE COLVILLE INDIAN RESERVATION AND A MEMBER OF THE COLVILLE BUSINESS COUNCIL, OPPOSING THE ENACTMENT OF S. 1442, A BILL TO PROVIDE FOR THE CLOSING OF THE ROLL OF THE CONFEDERATED TRIBES OF THE COLVILLE INDIAN RESERVATION PREPARATORY TO SUBMISSION OF PROPOSED LEGISLATION FOR THE TERMINATION OF FEDERAL SUPERVISION OVER THE PROPERTY AND AFFAIRS OF THE CONFEDERATED TRIBES AND THEIR MEMBERS AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES; AND FAVORING THE ENACTMENT OF S. 1169, A BILL TO AUTHORIZE A PER CAPITA DISTRIBUTION OF \$350 FROM FUNDS ARISING FROM JUDGMENTS IN FAVOR OF ANY OF THE CONFEDERATED TRIBES OF THE COLVILLE RESERVATION, AT HEARING HELD BY THE INDIAN AFFAIRS SUB-COMMITTEE, SENATE COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS AT THE NESPELEM SCHOOL, NESPELEM, WASHINGTON, OCTOBER 25, 1963.

Mr. Chairman, my name is Frank George, Nespelem, Washington. I am an enrolled member of the Confederated Tribes of the Colville Indian Reservation and presently serving as a member of the Colville Business Council, the tribal governing body of the Confederated Tribes.

I am appearing here to offer testimony in opposition to enactment of S. 1442.

I have long opposed any legislation, Federal or State, related to proposals advocating the ending of Federal trusteeship over Indian-owned lands. The pending bill, S. 1442, leads toward final termination.

I opposed the enactment of H. R. 1063 which later became Public Law 280, 83d Congress. This was a major breakthrough on Indian rights and prerogatives in that the Act destroyed part of the Indians' immunity from state jurisdiction, and its adverse affect has been felt in Indian country where State jurisdiction has been implemented.

I also opposed the 83d Congress' approval of House Concurrent Resolution 108, which expressed the sense of Congress that certain tribes of Indians should be freed from Federal supervision. House Concurrent Resolution 108, 83d Congress originally included the Confederated Tribes of the Colville Reservation of

Washington and the Osage Tribe of Oklahoma but was later amended to exclude the two reservations.

I testified against the inclusion of the Colville Confederated Tribes in the provisions of House Concurrent Resolution 108 before the House Sub-Committee on Indian Affairs in 1953.

House Concurrent Resolution 108, 83d Congress, was a pious statement or expression to be used as a basis for immediate termination of federal responsibility and withdrawal of federal services to various Indian tribes.

It is my firm conviction that any termination plan should not be put into effect now or in the years to come until a more compatible atmosphere exists on this grave question of federal trusteeship.

To lift federal trusteeship over the trust property of the tribal members of the Confederated Tribes of the Colville Indian Reservation, State of Washington, would leave the Indians with inadequate services or none at all. Moreover, wholesale and indiscriminate relinquishment of Federal responsibilities for the protection of Indian property rights is not justifiable and would be dangerous to the tribal members of the Confederated Tribes of the Colville Reservation.

"Liquidation" of tribal assets, "termination" of federal trusteeship, and "emancipating" the Indians all mean the same thing and these words serve as catchwords for those who would like to free the Indians from their remaining property by depriving the Indians of the promised Federal protection now accorded them.

Any termination of Federal trusteeship will be detrimental to the membership of the Confederated Tribes of the Colville Reservation. In any event, plans for termination should be approached with great caution. The withdrawal of Federal trusteeship will jeopardize the economic welfare of

many Indians especially those of the older generations who do not fully understand the way of life that were not of their devising.

My testimony is offered in behalf of many of the full blood Indians and those Indians who live close to Indian traditions. They view this proposed legislation with great disfavor.

These full blood Indians have been the subjects of the greatest injustices and have been on the receiving end of the most fallacious judgments. There is much misunderstanding of the Indian due to the fact that many non-Indians and also mixed-bloods are prone to appraise the Indians' society, Indian culture and Indian religion by white standards. These people who choose to sit in judgment on the Indians are themselves very conspicuously lacking in the true spiritual depth and the profound ethical traditions observed by the descendants of the first inhabitants of the North American continent. This has been their homeland since the beginning of time.

There is a definite need for a continuing policy on the part of the Federal government to protect Indian property from exploitation by those who look upon Indian trust-held property with much avarice.

Any sudden lifting of Federal trusteeship on the Colville Indian Reservation would be premature. Federal trusteeship is a guaranty of the homeland of the Indians and is a wide departure from the view of tribal members who possess a small quantum of Indian blood, but who are very vocal in claiming a large degree of privilege as Indians.

I opposed the enactment of sections 4 and 5 in H. R. 7190 which later became Public Law 772, 84th Congress, the Act of July 24, 1956. Louis Wapato, Dr. Paschal Sherman and I testified in July, 1955. We opposed the enactment of Sections 4 and 5 of H. R. 7190. The Colville Business Council had five members in attendance at the hearing and they favored the use of tribal funds to make

in lieu of tax payments at the rate of \$40,000 per annum over the initial three-year period after passage of the Act (Section 4 of the bill) and the Council's support was also given to section 5 of the bill whereby the Act would incorporate the terms of Colville Business Council Resolution numbered 1955-33, dated April 8, 1955.

At the time Public Law 772, 84th Congress, came into being, we were under a national administration that sponsored congressional legislation for termination of Federal trusteeship. While it may have been based on good intentions, it was a most persistent and serious attack on Indian people and their property.

I speak of the so-called "termination" formula. This formula was and still is a special legislative device which would permit the presently responsible agencies and public officials to shift their responsibilities elsewhere, and, literally speaking, dispose of the Indian problem by sweeping it under the rug.

S. 1442 is also a legislative device that points toward eventual termination or liquidation. I am of the firm belief that the "liquidators" or "termination-ists" will make attempts of a more destructive nature by seeking amendments to this bill and ask that the Senate incorporate language of a bill now pending in the House of Representatives. Such action would make an unfavorable bill even more unworkable.

Enactment of Public Law 772, 84th Congress led us to the dilemma now confronting us. The Indian Bureau was successful under the previous national administration in instilling into the minds of our tribal government the philosophy of a "termination" formula. Our tribal government, in 1955, expended their efforts in cooperation with the Bureau of Indian Affairs to devise an unworkable scheme from the standpoint of good government. Those efforts more or less depended on talents for tranquilizing the tribal members into a state of nonresistant conformity to a scientifically determined pattern of

human behavior. For my part, I see little difference between the terms "termination" and "liquidation". They both lead to the final destruction of an Indian-owned land base.

The proposal to close the membership roll of the Confederated Tribes of the Colville Indian Reservation upon enactment of S. 1442 is unsound. There is also a serious question involved as to whether or not tribal members who die between July 24, 1961 and the enactment of this bill should not be excluded from the membership roll.

We should not be subjected to the same pressures that were employed on Indians during the 83d and 84th Congresses. There should be no pressure movement armed with distortions of facts, conflicting statements, half truths, glaring errors, and crass exaggerations as to the present need of Indians for a termination of federal trusteeship or for any movement in that direction.

All termination bills have the net effect to throw all Indian lands on the tax rolls and thus get them out of Indian ownership. This observation is borne out from historical instances whereby practically all the lands have passed out of Indian ownership after being fee patented. In the end, Indians would have no alternative other than to sell their lands, to break down their Indian community organizations, and to be deprived of all protection and assistance by the Federal Government.

Speaking as a minority member on the Colville Business Council, I say that I am alarmed by the stand taken by the tribal government. The Council's resolution for termination was made a part of Public Law 772, 84th Congress. There are also other documents that have been submitted that were clear invitations for a termination of Federal trusteeship. (Council's statement of October 10, 1953, presented to Commissioner Emmons at Yakima, Washington, and the statement submitted to the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs

at the hearing held at Nespelem, Washington, on October 17, 1953)

In closing, I ask that S. 1442, 88th Congress, 1st Session, not be enacted into law.

\*

S. 1169

As to S. 1169, I favor enactment of the bill to authorize a per capita distribution of \$350 from funds arising from judgments in favor of any of the Confederated Tribes of the Colville Reservation. I am not certain whether the bill lists all of our Dockets before the Indian Claims Commission but that can be corrected if necessary when the bill is considered by the full committee and then all judgments completed or still pending before the Indian Claims Commission can be included under the provisions of this bill.

Thank you for permitting me to appear before your Sub-Committee today.

\* \* \*