REPORT ON FEDERAL, STATE, AND TRIBAL JURISDICTION

TASK FORCE FOUR: FEDERAL, STATE, AND TRIBAL JURISDICTION

FINAL REPORT TO THE AMERICAN INDIAN POLICY REVIEW COMMISSION



For Reference Only
Do Not Remove
From Library

SHERWIN BROADHEAD, Chairman
JUDGE WILLIAM ROY RHODES, Pima
MATTHEW CALAC, Rincon
PAUL ALEXANDER, Special Counsel
Donald R. Wharton, Specialist

Printed for the use of the American Indian Policy Review Commission

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
WASHINGTON: 1976

77-467

AMERICAN INDIAN POLICY REVIEW COMMISSION

Senator JAMES ABOUREZK, South Dakota, Chairman Congressman LLOYD MEEDS, Washington, Vice Chairman

Senator LEE METCALF, Montana Senator MARK HATFIELD, Oregon Congressman SIDNEY R. YATES, Illinois Congressman SAM STEIGER, Arizona

JOHN BORBRIDGE, Tlingit-Haida LOUIS R. BRUCE, Mohawk-Sioux ADA DEER, Menominee ADOLPH DIAL, Lumbee

JAKE WHITECROW, Quapaw-Seneca-Cayuga

ERNEST L. STEVENS, Oneida, Executive Director

KIRKE KICKINGBIRD, Klowa, General Counsel

MAX I. RICHTMAN, Professional Staff Member

(II)

LETTER OF TRANSMITTAL

American Indian Policy Review Commission, Congress of the United States, Washington, D.C., July 1976.

THE AMERICAN INDIAN POLICY REVIEW COMMISSION, Congress of the United States, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIRS AND MADAM: The task force on Federal, State and tribal jurisdiction presents to you this report pursuant to Public Law 93-580.

The report contains the task force's findings and recommendations

in some of the major areas of current jurisdictional conflict.

Before this report is published in final form, the task force urges that all Indian tribes and organizations, as well as other interested parties, be given the opportunity to review and comment on the report. It had been the intention of the task force to do this; however, limitations of time precluded such review.

With the above indicated caveat, we urge your consideration of the facts presented, and your good efforts in ensuring implementation of

the recommendations made.

Respectively yours,

SHERWIN BROADHEAD,

Chairman

MATTHEW CALAC (Rincon Band of Mission Indians)
Judge William Roy Rhodes
(Pima)

PAUL ALEXANDER,

Special Counsel

DONALD R. WHARTON,

Specialist

(III)

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

The task force—members and staff—wish to thank the many tribal leaders and individual tribal members for their consistently high level of cooperation with the task force.

The task force also wishes to express its appreciation to the following individuals who assisted in various capacities:

Professor John Barrett, Northwest School of Law—Consultant

Michael Chosa (La Courte Orielles Band of Chippewas)-Consultant

Rosemarie Cornelius (Sioux/Oneida)—Clerical Assistant

Lucy Covington (Colville)—Consultant

James Flynn-Attorney

Jan Hopkins-Duke—Secretary Professor Ralph Johnson, University of Washington School of Law-Consultant

Gene Joseph (Colville)—Consultant

Ernestine Lewis—Secretary
James McKay (Shoshone-Lummi)—Legal Assistant
Sandy McFeeley—Legal Assistant

Margaret Pena—Legal Assistant ¹ Catherine Romano—Legal Assistant

Carole Roop—Secretary
Richard Shipman—Attorney
Fred Stone—(Colville)—Research Assistant
Anthony Strong (Tlingit)—Legal Assistant

Kathryn Harris Tijerina (Comanche)—Attorney

CONTENTS

owledgments Preface A. Introduction B. Methodology
B. Methodology
B. Methodology
* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *
Issues in Public Law 280 States
Issues in Public Law 280 States
B. The Current Status of the Implementation of Public Law 280
1. Status by Tribe and State
2. Status by Subject Matter
(a) Hunting and Fishing Rights
(b) Land-Use Regulations
(c) Taxation
C. Retrocession
1. Generally
2. Status
D. The Public Law 280 States.
1. The Indian Perspective
(a) Law Enforcement(i) Adequacy of Law Enforcement
(i) Adequacy of Law Enforcement
(ii) Discriminatory Treatment
(b) Other Services
2. The Non-Indian Perspective
E. The Retrocession Movement
F. Special problem Areas
1. Recent Retrocession Experience: Lessons Learned
(a) Nevada
(b) Menominee
2. Technical and Legal Services
(a) Preparation
(1) Private Resources
(2) Federal Resources
Findings
Recommendations
The Federal Role in Jurisdiction
A. The defined role
1 Criminal Jurisdiction
(1) Major Crimes Act
Ending
Findings
Recommendations
B. Creeping jurisdiction
Indian Country
Indian Country 2. Applicability of Statutes Regulating Federal Agencie
to Indiana
to Indians 3. Applicability to Indians of Federal Statutes Delegat
ing Authority to the States
ing Authority to the States
4. Applicability to Indians of Domestic Assistance
Statutes Giving States Authority to Participate
: D
in Program Delivery
in Program DeliveryFindingsRecommendations

¹ Members of Research Unit under the able direction of Gilbert Hall, Esq.

IV.	Special Problem Areas	
.	A. Hunting and Fishing Rights 1. On-reservation Hunting and Fishing Rights 1. On-reservation Hunting and Fishing Rights	
	1. On-reservation Hunting and Fishing Rights	į
	(a) State Regulation	ł
	(i) Present Status of the Law	
	(n) States	(
	(b) Federal Regulation	(
	(c) Tribal Regulation	(
	2. Off-Reservation Hunting and Fishing	(
	(a) The States	(
	(b) Federal Regulation	,
	(c) Tribal Regulation	ź
	3. Aboriginal Fishing Rights	
	Findings	;
	Recommendations	÷
	B. Child Custody	ξ
	2. Legal Status—Who Decides?	5
	Findings	8
	Findings	È
	C. Jurisdiction over non-Indians	8
	1. The Legal Case for Jurisdiction Over Non-Indians	Š
	2. Indian country	ę
	3. Viewpoints	Ç
	(a) Non-Indians	ę
	(b) Indian Viewpoints	Ć
	Findings	10
	Recommendations	10
	D. Taxation 1. Federal Taxation of Indians and Indian Property 1. Federal Taxation of Indians and Indian Property 1. Federal Taxation of Indians and Indian Property	10
	1. Federal Taxation of Indians and Indian Property	10
	2. State Taxation of Indians and Indian Property	10
	3. Taxation by Indian Tribes	10
	Findings	11
	Recommendations	11
	E. Land Use Controls	11
	1. The Federal Government	11 11
	2. Federal, State and Tribal Interplay	11
	3. State Controls on Tribal Land 4. Tribal Controls of Lands Within Reservation	11
	4. Tribal Controls of Lands Within Reservation Boundaries	11
	Findings	11
	Recommendations	11
	F. Oklahoma	12
V.		12
• •	A. Background	12
	A. Background B. The Current Justice Systems	12
	1. Issues	
	(a) Capabilities	12
	(b) Training and Funding	12
	(c) Coordination and Cooperation	12
	C. Indian Civil Rights Act	12
	1. Legislative History and Background	12
	2. Summary of Provisions of Indian Civil Rights Act	13
	3. Scope of Intervention by Federal Courts	13
	(a) Legislative History of Habeas Corpus Pro-	13
	vision of Twisdistion Under 28 II S C	10
	(b) Expansion of Jurisdiction Under 28 U.S.C. 1331 (a) and 28 U.S.C. 1343 (4)	13
		10
	(c) Exhaustion of Tribal Remedies or Limita- tion on Federal Court Intervention	13
	(d) Lack of Justiciable Issue	13
	4. Sovereign Immunity of Tribe From Suit	13
	5. Cases by Subject Matter	13
	(a) Free Exercise of Religion, Freedom of	- 0
	Speech, Press and Assembly	13
	~p~~~~, - = ~~~ - ~~~ ~~~~ ~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~	13
	(1) Free Exercise of Religion	10

V.	The Exercise of Jurisdiction by Indian Justice Systems—Continued
	C. Indian Civil Rights Act—Continued
	5. Cases by Subject Matter—Continued
	(b) Freedom of Speech
	(c) Equal Protection
	(1) Legislative Reapportionment.
	(2) Fair Election Practices
	(3) Age and Residency Requirements
	for Voting
	(4) Enrollment and Membership in the
	Tribe
	(d) Due Process
	(e) Property Disputes
	(f) Criminal Procedures and Ordinances
	(1) Attorney Cases
	(2) Jury Trial
	(3) Revocation of Probation
	(4) Imprisonment for Inability To Pay
	Fine
	(5) Unreasonable Search and Seizure
	Findings
	Recommendations
VI.	Findings and Recommendations
	A. General
	Findings
	Recommendations
II.	Appendixes:
	A. Special Problem Areas: Water Rights
	B. Indian Child Welfare Statistical Survey
	C. Jurisdiction Over Indian Hunting and Fishing Authority
	D. Proposal for Clarifying the Tax Status of Indians