



# United States Department of the Interior

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20240

SEP 22 1980

SEP 22 1980

Honorable Morris K. Udall  
Chairman, Committee on Interior  
and Insular Affairs  
U. S. House of Representatives  
Washington, D.C. 20515

Dear Mr. Chairman:

This is to provide you with our views on H.R. 7919 as reported by the Committee, a bill to settle Indian land claims in the State of Maine.

We urge enactment by this Congress of H.R. 7919 as reported. We believe the bill represents a reasonable and workable settlement of the Maine Indian land claims.

We note that the Committee's report, in its discussion of section 5 of the bill in the section entitled "Summary of Major Provisions", indicates that the provision of Federal services and benefits to the Passamaquoddy Tribe and Penobscot Nation was a result of a 1978 agreement. At that time, however, the tribes were already eligible for such services and benefits. Thus, these services and benefits are not an element of the Maine Indian land claims settlement itself.

Section 5(b)(3) provides for quarterly payments to the Passamaquoddy Tribe and the Penobscot Nation of "any income received from the investment of the Settlement Fund". The Committee's report states that—

The term "income" as used in Section 5 means the return in money or property derived from the use of the assets in the Settlement Fund, including net appreciation, both realized and unrealized.

We do not interpret the above report language as suggesting that the quarterly payments must include "unrealized" income.

We also note that section 5(i)(3) of the bill provides that the State of Maine shall have initial jurisdiction over condemnation proceedings. The United States is authorized to seek review in Federal courts and is given an absolute right of removal over any such action commenced in the courts of the State. We have agreed to this provision with the understanding that it contemplates that service of process on the United States in any such proceeding is to be pursuant to the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure.

The discussion in the Committee's report respecting the fifth issue in the section entitled "Special Issues" states that certain

**U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES**  
**COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS**  
**OFFICE OF THE CHAIRMAN**

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATION,  
 PETITION, MEMORIAL AND  
 DEPARTMENTAL REPORT

ROUTING SHEET

SEP 22 1980

Department of the Interior

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY  
 WASHINGTON, D.C. 20240

SEP 22 1980

SEP 22 1980

If you recommend this matter be called to the attention of the Chairman, please so indicate by a check mark, and in any event, please initial and date this sheet to record your having seen it.

|   |          | Initial | Date | Chairman should see |
|---|----------|---------|------|---------------------|
| 1 | BOYD     | SB      | 9/22 |                     |
| 2 | McELVAIN | Law     | 9/23 | HELD                |
| 3 | SCOVILLE | SES     | 9/23 |                     |
| 4 | CONKLIN  | de      | 9/23 |                     |
|   | CHAIRMAN |         |      |                     |

Copy sent to:

Minority

Subcmte on FDX

COMMENTS:

TO BE FILED IN 1324 LONGWORTH HOB

ExecComm No. \_\_\_\_\_

Petition/Memorial No. \_\_\_\_\_

Bill No. HR 7919

GPO 68-868-b

such action commenced in the courts of the State. We have agreed to this provision with the understanding that it contemplates that service of process on the United States in any such proceeding is to be pursuant to the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure.

The discussion in the Committee's report respecting the fifth issue in the section entitled "Special Issues" states that certain

views on H.R. 7919 as reported by Indian land claims in the State of

s of H.R. 7919 as reported. We reasonable and workable settlement of

rt, in its discussion of section 5 ed "Summary of Major Provisions", federal services and benefits to the Nation was a result of a 1978 , the tribes were already eligible Thus, these services and benefits ndian land claims settlement

terly payments to the Passamaquoddy "any income received from the ". The Committee's report states

Section 5 means the return in om the use of the assets in the et appreciation, both realized and

ort language as suggesting that the unrealized" income.

of the bill provides that the jurisdiction over condemnation s authorized to seek review in solute right of removal over any

payments in lieu of taxes to be made by the tribes "will most likely be paid with funds to be provided to the tribes by the federal government." Although such payments may be possible as an incident of contracting or other assistance provided to the tribe by the Federal Government, we believe it is clear, as indicated in the Committee's further discussion of section 6(b)(1) in its report, that the United States has no obligation to make such payments, except as they are authorized by section 6(d)(2) of the bill to be paid out of the Settlement Fund income. The tribes could only use Federal funds for such payments when such use is consistent with the terms under which such funds are provided to the tribe by the Federal agency involved.

It is our understanding that it is not the intent of section 6(b)(1) to allow taxation, encumbrance, or alienation of lands held by the United States in trust. This interpretation is consistent with the language in the Committee's report that the application of Maine law cannot jeopardize or impair the clear title of the United States or obligate the United States, as titleholder, to pay taxes or fees. This subsection parallels existing Federal law in which jurisdiction is granted to States. This is also fully consistent with the tribes' agreement to make payments in lieu of real property taxes and their agreement to pay other taxes and fees as do other persons or entities in the State of Maine. The application of the laws of the State of Maine regulating land use and environmental matters, which the tribes agreed to allow to apply to themselves and which the bill ratifies, is consistent with existing law without obligating the United States or impairing title in the United States.


We also wish to reiterate our understanding of section 6(b)(2) of the bill, relating to the use of Federal funds "consistent with the purposes for which they are appropriated" and section 6211(1) of the Maine Implementing Act which provides that "[t]o the extent that any . . . program requires municipal financial participation as a condition of state funding, the share for either the Passamaquoddy Tribe or the Penobscot Nation may be raised through any source of revenue available" (emphasis added). We believe it is clear from the language of the State Act itself that regardless of whether certain funding sources may be prohibited by Federal law or regulation from supplanting State funds under section 6211(2) or (4) of the Maine Implementing Act, such funds may be used to provide the local share for matching purposes when such use is consistent with the purposes for which such funds are appropriated.

Finally, we note a typographical error in the excerpt from Attorney General Richard Cohen's August 22, 1980 letter, printed in the report. In the sentence beginning "It was understood", the words

"Federal law" should read "Federal statutes or regulations", as shown in the complete text of the letter later in the report.

The Office of Management and Budget has advised that there is no objection to the presentation of this report from the standpoint of the Administration's program.

Sincerely,

  
SECRETARY