

2 - - - - - x

4 Petitioners : No. 14-1406

5 v. :

6 MITCH PARKER, ET AL. :

7 - - - - - x

8 Washington, D.C.

9 Wednesday, January 20, 2016

10

11 The above-entitled matter came on for oral
12 argument before the Supreme Court of the United States
13 at 10:19 a.m.

14 APPEARANCES:

15 JAMES D. SMITH, ESQ., Solicitor General of Nebraska,
16 Lincoln, Neb.; on behalf of Petitioners.

17 PAUL D. CLEMENT, ESQ., Washington, D.C.; on behalf of
18 Private Respondents.

19 ALLON KEDEM, ESQ., Assistant to the Solicitor General,
20 Department of Justice, Washington, D.C.; on behalf of
21 Federal Respondent.

22

23

24

25

1	C O N T E N T S	
2	ORAL ARGUMENT OF	PAGE
3	JAMES D. SMITH, ESQ.	
4	On behalf of the Petitioners	3
5	ORAL ARGUMENT OF	
6	PAUL D. CLEMENT, ESQ.	
7	On behalf of the Private Respondents	21
8	ORAL ARGUMENT OF	
9	ALLON KEDEM, ESQ.	
10	On behalf of the Federal Respondent	38
11	REBUTTAL ARGUMENT OF	
12	JAMES D. SMITH, ESQ.	
13	On behalf of the Petitioners	51
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		

1 P R O C E E D I N G S

2 (10:19 a.m.)

3 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: We'll hear argument
4 first this morning in Case 14-1406, Nebraska v. Parker.
5 Mr. Smith.

6 ORAL ARGUMENT OF JAMES D. SMITH

7 ON BEHALF OF THE PETITIONERS

8 MR. SMITH: Mr. Chief Justice, and may it
9 please the Court:

10 For over a century, the following three
11 things have been true in the disputed area.

12 First, the non-Indian population has always
13 been greater than 98 percent.

14 Second, the Tribe never exercised
15 jurisdiction.

16 And third, by contrast, the State of
17 Nebraska has governed the disputed area.

18 The story of the disputed area is that of a
19 land that long ago lost its Indian character, if it ever
20 had any. The three things I mentioned at the outset
21 happened for a reason. They happened because it was
22 the -- or the intent of Congress in the context of the
23 times of the 1882 Act that the disputed area would be
24 diminished from the reservation.

25 JUSTICE KENNEDY: If I understand your

1 position correctly, you're not asking us to overrule
2 Solem?

3 MR. SMITH: No. No, Your Honor. We are not
4 asking you to overrule Solem. In fact, what we are
5 asking the Court to do is to imply -- apply the entire
6 Solem rule and, in particular, the compelling third
7 factor of the subsequent circumstances of the land's
8 jurisdictional history. As --

9 JUSTICE GINSBURG: From what -- from what
10 you just said and from your brief, I gathered -- perhaps
11 I was wrong -- that you are arguing for a de facto
12 diminishment test; that is, you pointed out the area has
13 been overwhelmingly populated by non-Indians and they --
14 they -- they haven't attempted before to exercise
15 governing authority.

16 MR. SMITH: Your Honor, we think the
17 de facto diminishment does fit within the third element
18 of the Solem test, which is the subsequent circumstances
19 of -- of after the enactment. And so obviously we would
20 not be opposed to the Court concluding and reaching this
21 decision on the grounds of de facto diminishment.

22 But we also think this case fits within this
23 Court's precedent under Solem, which would involve --
24 in -- in our view, the third element of the test is
25 particularly strong and compelling in this case, while

1 in Solem, in that particular case, it was -- it was -- I
2 guess I would call fairly easy to distinguish because,
3 as Solem talks about as far as the events, what took
4 place after the Act, the focus should be -- if you're
5 looking at intent of Congress, you should be looking at
6 what Congress is doing after the Act that is reflective
7 of not understanding essentially that they've diminished
8 the reservation.

9 JUSTICE SCALIA: It's a different Congress.
10 I mean, to say, you know, a later Congress did thus and
11 so, and therefore the earlier Congress, when it enacted
12 a particular statute, must have diminished. That
13 doesn't make any sense.

14 MR. SMITH: It --

15 JUSTICE SCALIA: And -- and -- and moreover,
16 if -- if the third factor is dispositive, as -- as you
17 assert, you would not -- we would not need the -- the --
18 the de facto diminishment doctrine whereby, by a sort
19 of, you know, adverse possession, a jurisdiction,
20 whether it's Indians or -- or even a State that used to
21 have a jurisdiction over a particular area has forfeited
22 it by long-, long-accepted usage to the contrary.

23 If -- if that is true and -- and if -- if
24 the third factor is as important as you say, we would
25 not need that doctrine. We -- we would just find

1 diminishment.

2 MR. SMITH: Well, and that would be
3 consistent with the concept that, if a party just -- if
4 they belatedly assert a claim to having sovereign
5 authority over this, as in this case it's over a hundred
6 and some years after the land was open for settlement,
7 that -- there -- at least the Sherrill case, some of the
8 principles in that case would be supportive of de facto
9 diminishment.

10 JUSTICE SCALIA: As far as --

11 JUSTICE GINSBURG: That case didn't involve
12 the -- the diminishment. Diminishment was not an issue.

13 MR. SMITH: That -- that is true. I -- I --
14 what I was referring to was the -- the principle at
15 least decided in the case as far as a long-standing
16 assumption of jurisdiction by the State over an area
17 that is primarily non-Indian in -- in population land
18 creates justifiable expectations, and if they did have
19 any sovereignty over it, they had long since forfeited.

20 JUSTICE SCALIA: But that's not what you're
21 arguing here. I -- I -- I understand you're arguing
22 diminishment, not -- not adverse possession, so to
23 speak.

24 MR. SMITH: We are arguing that it's no
25 longer part of the reservation. We are not saying it --

1 Court could not find it under the de facto, but we do
2 think the facts of this case does fit within Solem. And
3 if -- and if the Court applies the Solem test, the State
4 should prevail in this case, which --

5 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: You don't -- the
6 other side says you did not raise a City of Sherrill
7 argument. Do you agree with that?

8 MR. SMITH: We have -- we have --

9 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: A lot of the -- a
10 lot of the arguments you make seem to sound more in a
11 City of Sherrill-type proposition, but you haven't
12 raised that argument, have you?

13 MR. SMITH: We, I -- I believe in
14 paragraphs -- or pages 22, I think it's 25 of our brief,
15 we are at least citing Sherrill as -- as precedent for
16 the principle of loss of sovereignty, loss of sovereign
17 control by the fact that the State has long exercised
18 the jurisdiction.

19 But our focus --

20 JUSTICE GINSBURG: But that's based on what
21 Solem said. Solem did bring up a de facto diminishment.
22 This is on page 471 of the opinion.

23 It says "On a more pragmatic level, we have
24 recognized that who actually moved onto the open
25 reservation lands is also relevant to deciding whether a

1 surplus land Act diminished a reservation. Where
2 non-Indian settlers flooded into the opening portion of
3 the reservation and the area has long since lost its
4 Indian character, we have acknowledged that de facto if
5 not de jure diminishment may have occurred."

6 This was the theme that was picked up in
7 Sherrill, but it's stated in Solem.

8 MR. SMITH: Yes. Yes.

9 JUSTICE GINSBURG: And may I -- may I ask a
10 preliminary question? We're talking about a liquor
11 license or alcoholic beverage license and a sales tax on
12 alcoholic beverages. Does the State itself impose such
13 requirements, that is, a licensing requirement and a
14 sales tax?

15 MR. SMITH: The State itself does impose
16 liquor license requirements. They -- they can in --
17 State of Nebraska has sales taxes, yes, Your Honor.

18 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: This tax was not imposed
19 by the Tribe -- Tribe. This was a statute of Congress
20 that permitted the Indians to do this, correct?

21 MR. SMITH: My recollection was the Interior
22 Department approved the Tribe's request to have such an
23 ordinance, and then -- the Tribe's ordinance then was in
24 -- in effect.

25 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: Without jurisdictions,

1 Tribes can't tax at will. They have to get approval for
2 taxation, correct, from the Federal government?

3 MR. SMITH: Your -- your point would be
4 correct, Your Honor. The Tribe has to request it. They
5 have to have an ordinance. It has to be approved by
6 agency of the Federal government. Yes, that -- that is
7 true, but it still involves granting authority to a --
8 another sovereign.

9 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: What -- what else --
10 what else do you lose if this ruling is against you?
11 We've already circumscribed the powers of the Tribes on
12 their own reservations greatly, so what powers do you
13 lose?

14 You've already ceded to the Federal
15 government criminal prosecution powers. So you're not
16 losing out on that. What are you losing out on?

17 MR. SMITH: Well, Your Honor, I -- I -- I
18 take this -- it would be in the context of what are the
19 justifiable expectations of those who live in the
20 disputed area? What would be significantly disrupted as
21 far as their justifiable expectations?

22 I would start off with the first thing --
23 principle is just who governs you. Your -- we'd be
24 introducing an additional sovereign, the Tribe, into an
25 area which, for over 130 years, the Tribe has not

1 exercised any sovereign authority at all.

2 JUSTICE KAGAN: Mr. Smith, can -- can I take
3 you back to Justice Scalia's question? You know,
4 because usually, at least now, we don't think much of
5 subsequent history of any kind. Now, maybe they thought
6 a little bit more highly of it in the days when Solem
7 was written, but now it would -- it's -- it's pretty
8 much of a stretch to use subsequent legislative history
9 or subsequent history generally when we're dealing with
10 interpreting a statute.

11 And I'm just wondering: Is there a reason
12 why it should be more credited here than in any other
13 context?

14 MR. SMITH: The Court's precedent, I
15 believe, recognizes in the area of land surplus acts
16 that Indian land surplus acts are a unique animal from
17 your normal legislative analysis. And that would be
18 because in the context of the times back before the turn
19 of, I guess, two centuries ago in the 1800s, Congress
20 would be doing land surplus acts in which the concept of
21 are we diminishing or not diminishing a reservation was
22 really nothing that Congress thought of.

23 You put that on the basic principle that
24 only Congress can diminish a reservation, it then
25 becomes the problem of how do we determine what Congress

1 intended when, frankly, the reality of the Court's
2 precedent is, it's something that Court -- or Congress
3 generally did not think of. They were inconsistent.
4 And so the Solem test really evolves out of an attempt
5 to determine what was the intent of Congress at the
6 time, which then is why legislative history, subsequent
7 or -- subsequent circumstances takes on greater
8 significance.

9 JUSTICE GINSBURG: When did -- when did this
10 diminishment idea as a legal concept -- you said when
11 Congress acted, they weren't thinking in terms of
12 diminishment.

13 When did diminishment become the big
14 question?

15 MR. SMITH: Well, it becomes -- it becomes a
16 big question when the issue is is it part of the
17 reservation --

18 JUSTICE GINSBURG: But at what point in
19 time? Because you -- I thought you just made this
20 statement that in 1882 Congress wasn't thinking in terms
21 of diminishment.

22 MR. SMITH: It becomes a big issue when the
23 issue is who -- frankly, who has authority to govern?
24 Is this still part of the reservation or not? Does the
25 Tribe have any authority over this area at all? And if

1 it's part of the reservation, it has authority;
2 acknowledged, it is limited authority, but it would have
3 authority over it, because if it's part of the
4 reservation. Now --

5 JUSTICE ALITO: On that question, as a
6 practical matter, if the Tribe were to exercise -- go to
7 the outer limits of its authority, what could it do in
8 the city of Pender besides opposing this liquor tax?

9 MR. SMITH: Well, what it can do, it can
10 displace State jurisdiction over environmental
11 regulations that this is a rural farming area. The
12 environment is very important. State regulation is very
13 important. It's what the people have expected. And I
14 could give an example: If you're a farmer, and the guy
15 across the road drops a load of manure in your pond
16 that's being used to feed cattle, you call the State of
17 Nebraska; you want them to come out and you want them to
18 do something. Those regulations would be replaced. You
19 call the State of Nebraska and the response is I'm sorry
20 you've called the wrong number.

21 JUSTICE SCALIA: What about municipalities?
22 What about self-governing -- or more or less
23 self-governing municipalities? Are there any of those
24 within this area?

25 MR. SMITH: Yes. There are self-governing

1 municipalities. There are villages. County,
2 obviously --

3 JUSTICE SCALIA: What -- would happen to
4 them? Would they continue to -- to exist?

5 MR. SMITH: They would continue to exist,
6 but you're going to have, what I would say, the
7 ambiguity of the extent of their authority versus the
8 extent of the Tribe's authority. You would have this
9 ambiguity in which is going to be -- I mean, people for
10 130 years, if you've expected the State of Nebraska,
11 your city council to be exercising local control, and
12 you bring in this outside authority --

13 JUSTICE SCALIA: Why would they continue to
14 exist? I mean, aren't they creatures of the State? Can
15 the State create municipalities on Indian Reservations?

16 MR. SMITH: I believe -- I believe the State
17 can create the municipalities. The issue is what
18 authority they have when you also have it on Tribal
19 land, because the Tribe --

20 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: I'm sorry. The Tribe
21 has acceded to State sovereignty and the environment and
22 in all sorts of things.

23 Have they threatened to take away the
24 State's activities in this village?

25 MR. SMITH: Not yet. The issue is going to

1 be --

2 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: This Tribe is awfully
3 small. You think they are going to have the power to
4 implement all of these things that you are fearful of?
5 To do substitute services to -- they can't tax for it
6 without the government's permission. So how are they
7 going to do all these, and why would they do all these
8 horrible things?

9 MR. SMITH: Well, I don't think it's --

10 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: I mean, it's nice to
11 have the power of taxation, but they still need the
12 government's approval.

13 MR. SMITH: I don't think it's simply the
14 test of being what -- what will they do. I think the
15 issue is once they have the authority, what --

16 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: Well, the question of
17 the City of Sherrill says if they try to exercise their
18 powers in a way that's harmful to settled expectations,
19 they might have a remedy in law. That's what City of
20 Sherrill says, but that didn't take away -- the City of
21 Sherrill didn't say the Indians weren't sovereign. It
22 just said they can't exercise the sovereignty. It
23 didn't say it was a diminishment. What they said is
24 they couldn't exercise it because of latches.

25 MR. SMITH: Well, if you say we've

1 introduced a tribe that in theory has authority, but
2 because they've never exercised it, they really have no
3 authority that -- that by itself, I would say, is the
4 inherent ambiguity of what is actually the limits of
5 their authority. You get litigations that start
6 disputing whether -- like under the Montana factors, as
7 far as they could regulate conduct that threatens, has
8 some direct effect on their tribe's integrity, economic
9 security, health and welfare. That's very, very broad.
10 And I -- to me, the -- the answer would be simply to say
11 this is not part of the reservation, rather than every
12 case that comes up when we have litigation and then
13 decide well, you're stopped from doing that.

14 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: What if -- does the
15 Tribe exercise authority in the part of the reservation
16 that's not at issue here?

17 MR. SMITH: Yes. The Tribe absolutely
18 exercises authority in the part that's not part of the
19 reservation. They've stipulated to that, that on the
20 part that's not part of the reservation that they --
21 that they have ordinances, they provide services, that
22 they enforce their ordinances on the east -- in the
23 eastern part of the railroad, which is the -- clearly
24 within the Tribe and not on the west. So they have had
25 no presence, and they've acknowledged that. They have

1 no Tribal offices, schools, industries, businesses.
 2 They've admitted that all of these governmental services
 3 are provided by state and local agencies, not the Tribe.
 4 That's the public expectation. That's what they expect
 5 is --

6 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: In the -- in the
 7 western part?

8 MR. SMITH: In the western part.

9 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Well, what about in
 10 the eastern part?

11 MR. SMITH: I'm sorry if I wasn't clear.

12 In our -- in the eastern part, the Tribe
 13 does have its ordinances. It does provide services. It
 14 does enforce its ordinances and laws in the eastern
 15 part, but not in the western part, and never has. All
 16 of those services are provided by the State of Nebraska.
 17 The State of Nebraska, you name it in the form of
 18 government services have been provided by the State of
 19 Nebraska, its municipalities, not by the Tribe. This
 20 comes in -- we come in; we're going to tax you; we're
 21 going to take the money; and maybe you get services,
 22 maybe you don't. And, in fact, the idea of local
 23 control is if the people in the disputed area are
 24 unhappy about what the Tribe is doing, unlike if it's
 25 their local city council, they don't get to vote. They

1 don't get to remove them from office --

2 JUSTICE KAGAN: Mr. Smith, I -- I can
3 understand why people might be concerned, for all the
4 reasons that you're talking about. We do have pretty
5 clear and settled law in this area with respect to
6 diminishment, that we've said only Congress can
7 diminish, that the idea is that we're supposed to look
8 to congressional intent. And you say Congress didn't
9 really think in these terms. And there's something
10 that's fair about that.

11 But Congress did use very different language
12 in different ones of these acts, and we've looked to
13 that language as a pretty good guide to suggesting which
14 ones diminish and which ones do not. And it seems as
15 though the language here in -- in the act in which we're
16 concerned -- it's -- it's none of the language that
17 would suggest that Congress diminished this act.

18 So I was wondering if you could talk to
19 that. Is there anything in the language of this statute
20 that suggests a diminishment? Any of the usual kind of
21 we cede everything, we relinquish everything? Like,
22 what's the best you can do on that?

23 MR. SMITH: Appreciate that, Your Honor.

24 And -- and yes, the standard diminishment
25 test starts with looking at the Act. Is there language

1 in the Act? Hagen and Solem both specifically say no
2 particular form of words are required.

3 What we do have in this Act is we've got two
4 areas of the reservation. The area west of the
5 reservation, it's a very well-defined area. It doesn't
6 create a checkerboard effect.

7 What is significant is the different -- the
8 Act treats the area west of the railroad different than
9 the area east of the railroad. Specifically -- and this
10 is a major distinction in Solem -- there is nothing
11 reserved for the Tribe in the land on the west of the
12 railroad, the disputed area. There's nothing reserved
13 for -- in the bullpen, so to speak. There is no
14 reservation of land-use rights. There's no reservation
15 of land-use rights for schools, agency, Tribal religious
16 purposes, no reservation in mineral rights.

17 In Solem those were considered significant
18 factors because what you end up with is that the Tribal
19 headquarters, its governmental headquarters ended up in
20 Solem being in the disputed area.

21 JUSTICE SCALIA: Counsel, do you agree that
22 City of Sherrill did nothing more than deny particular
23 equitable relief and did not repudiate the proposition
24 of Indian sovereignty over the land in question?
25 Because if you agree with that, then I guess I'm more

1 inclined to give greater weight to the third factor.
 2 But if you disagree with it, as I think you ought to,
 3 then -- then I don't see why we need the third factor.

4 MR. SMITH: Well, City of Sherrill, it does
 5 have the element of the Tribe trying to unilaterally
 6 just --

7 JUSTICE SCALIA: Yes, but it says the Tribe
 8 doesn't have sovereignty, is what it says.

9 MR. SMITH: It -- well, it says the Tribe
 10 doesn't have sovereignty just to buy land back and get
 11 back sovereignty that it had long ago lost --

12 JUSTICE SCALIA: That's right.

13 MR. SMITH: -- and it applies equitable
 14 principles to say you're --

15 JUSTICE SCALIA: To say -- to say that the
 16 Tribe does not have sovereignty.

17 MR. SMITH: Yes. Yes. And I -- and I think
 18 it's perfectly reasonable for the Court to reach that
 19 conclusion with a land which long ago it lost its Indian
 20 character, long ago they've -- they've never exercised
 21 any sovereignty, and then show up after the public, the
 22 descendants, everyone who's lived there, and after 130
 23 years you suddenly find out we -- we've got an Indian
 24 Tribe that somehow has some governmental authority over
 25 us.

1 We've never elected them; we don't have any
2 right to vote them out of office. If we don't like what
3 we're going to do, I guess we can complain to somebody,
4 but we can't recall members of the Tribal Council.
5 It's -- it is a recognition that those things happened
6 because that's what Congress intended to have happen,
7 and as Solem looks in the context of the times.

8 As far as that legislative history or
9 what -- what happened afterwards, Solem emphasizes the
10 decades immediately after the Act. And in the decades
11 immediately after this Act, we don't have what Solem
12 talks about, the rife with inconsistencies. What we
13 have is a total, one hundred percent consistent record
14 that everyone understood.

15 This land was diminished. It's not part of
16 the reservation. Congress in -- eighty, ninety-six
17 years later, and I understand the point about subsequent
18 congressional intent, but at least they did not take an
19 action that would reflect Congress didn't understand
20 what they did.

21 JUSTICE KAGAN: Mr. Smith, on the City of
22 Sherrill point, the Chief Justice asked you before do
23 you agree whether this was -- whether this is waived.
24 And you said, well, we cite City of Sherrill on page 25
25 or something like that.

1 Below, what was the status of the City of
2 Sherrill argument in the lower courts?

3 MR. SMITH: The -- in the lower courts, the
4 argument -- the argument was made as far as that de
5 facto diminishment can be found. The Eighth Circuit's
6 opinion is what I would call a --

7 JUSTICE KAGAN: I'm not sure quite what that
8 means. Does that mean de facto diminishment under
9 Solem, or does that mean -- Solem -- or does that mean
10 that you talked about City of Sherrill as an independent
11 ground?

12 MR. SMITH: We talked about de facto
13 diminishment as an independent ground. I didn't argue
14 it, but my -- my recollection is Sherrill is not cited
15 for -- as authority for that, but we did make the
16 argument that it was de facto because Solem does say we
17 have recognized de facto diminishment.

18 Mr. Chief Justice, if -- if I may reserve
19 the remainder of my time if there's no further
20 questions.

21 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Thank you.

22 Mr. Clement.

23 ORAL ARGUMENT OF PAUL D. CLEMENT

24 ON BEHALF OF THE PRIVATE RESPONDENTS

25 MR. CLEMENT: Mr. Chief Justice, and may it

1 please the Court:

2 The question in this case is whether an 1882
3 Act of Congress diminished the Omaha Reservation and
4 redrew its boundaries. We think multiple considerations
5 make clear that the Act of Congress did not diminish the
6 reservation, but simply opened up a portion of the
7 reservation for settlement within the existing
8 boundaries.

9 Now the first, and probably most
10 significant, factor is that the text of the statute uses
11 the classic language this Court has identified for
12 opening up a reservation for settlement without creating
13 a diminishment.

14 But secondly, and I think very telling and
15 specific to this statute, at the same time there is no
16 language in the statute that supports a finding of
17 diminishment. I think there is language in the statute.
18 Specifically, the final proviso of Section 8 that is
19 very inconsistent with the idea that what Congress did
20 is draw a new western boundary to the reservation,
21 because the -- that proviso gave Tribal members the
22 right to take their allotments east or west of the
23 right-of-way.

24 And the record reflects that many -- that --
25 that a number of members of the Tribe took their

1 allotments west of the right-of-way. And importantly, a
2 number of them took their allotments that actually
3 straddled the right-of-way.

4 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: What number?
5 What -- what is the number?

6 MR. CLEMENT: There are 15 --

7 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Nine?

8 MR. CLEMENT: No, 15, I think -- well, the
9 parties dispute -- between 10 and 15, about 850 to 900
10 acres. But I don't think --

11 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Out -- out of how
12 many that took allotments?

13 MR. CLEMENT: Out of how many Tribal
14 members? I think there were roughly 300-plus
15 allotments. So it was, you know, three percent.

16 But I think the fact that they were allowed,
17 even though they're small numbers -- I'm not trying to
18 make a -- a volume argument here. I'm making an
19 argument that if what Congress just did was draw a new
20 western boundary to the reservation, it would have been
21 very odd to allow Tribal members to take their
22 allotments off the reservation, and maybe odder still to
23 allow them to take an allotment that essentially was
24 bisected by the new boundary.

25 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Why would that be

1 odd? They -- they could have taken allotments anywhere,
2 couldn't they --

3 MR. CLEMENT: Anywhere --

4 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: -- within the area
5 that was opened up? Couldn't they have chosen to
6 purchase their --

7 MR. CLEMENT: I don't think --

8 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: -- or take
9 allotments outside the reservation?

10 MR. CLEMENT: I don't think that would have
11 been a logical assumption, given the conception of the
12 time, where I think Congress was thinking in the main
13 that Tribal ownership or Indian ownership went with the
14 reservation status.

15 And I think, again, if you think of this as
16 being a Surplus Land Act that simply opens the
17 reservation up, a portion of it to settlement, then it
18 makes perfect sense to say the Tribal members can take
19 their allotments anywhere on the reservation.

20 But if you think you've really drawn a new
21 boundary to the reservation, then I think it's more than
22 passing strange that you can take allotments to the west
23 of it, or you can take an allotment and the new border
24 is smack dab through the middle of it. That --

25 JUSTICE KENNEDY: I don't understand the --

1 your answer to the Chief Justice's question. An Indian
2 who wanted to have an allotment off the reservation, and
3 allotments were generally available, could take that
4 allotment off the reservation if the Indian chose to do
5 so, correct?

6 MR. CLEMENT: No. My position is no, they
7 couldn't. And they could take it west of the
8 right-of-way, but I am saying that's how --

9 JUSTICE KENNEDY: Allotments were only open
10 to non-Indians?

11 MR. CLEMENT: No, no. Before any settlers,
12 non-Indians, came in, the existing Tribal members were
13 allowed to take their allotments.

14 JUSTICE KENNEDY: All right.

15 MR. CLEMENT: And they were allowed to take
16 their allotments anywhere on the preexisting
17 reservation.

18 JUSTICE KENNEDY: All right. So we're not
19 talking about allotments open to the general population?

20 MR. CLEMENT: No. No.

21 JUSTICE KENNEDY: Thank you.

22 MR. CLEMENT: And -- and this is clear from
23 the proviso in Section 8. It's the allotment only for
24 members of the Tribe. And they can take, consistent
25 with the historical understanding, an allotment anywhere

1 on the reservation, including west of the right-of-way.
 2 And that seems to me to be very consistent with the idea
 3 that the right-of-way is an interesting thing that the
 4 Tribe granted through their reservation, but it's not
 5 some new boundary. And I think the subsequent history
 6 really supports that as well.

7 JUSTICE GINSBURG: What do you mean --

8 MR. CLEMENT: I mean, my friend on the other
 9 side --

10 JUSTICE GINSBURG: But what do you mean,
 11 Mr. Clement, of the language that I read from Solem
 12 itself which seems to fit this case?

13 MR. CLEMENT: Well, I take that language,
 14 Justice Ginsburg, as Justice Marshal writing for the
 15 Court saying that when you're in the third factor, when
 16 you witness de facto immunity -- I'm sorry -- de facto
 17 sort of diminishment, that that may ultimately support a
 18 conclusion that there was in fact diminishment as a
 19 matter of law.

20 I don't take him to be opening up an
 21 entirely different route to finding immunity --
 22 diminishment, rather, that doesn't go through an act of
 23 Congress. And I think that's the only way to read the
 24 opinion as a whole because when the Court starts the
 25 opinion, it says the very first principle in this area

1 is that only Congress can diminish a reservation.

2 And it's perfectly compatible with that to
3 say that when we get to the third factor and we're
4 looking at all sorts of things, we'll look at settlement
5 patterns as part of that. But I don't think it's
6 consistent with that world view to then say that,
7 actually, the third factor is a standalone alternative
8 route to find diminishment, not by congressional action,
9 but by market reaction to a surplus land Act.

10 JUSTICE SCALIA: Did -- did -- did we cite
11 Solem in Sherrill? I -- I don't really recall.

12 MR. CLEMENT: I -- I -- I don't recall.
13 I --

14 JUSTICE SCALIA: If it held that, it would
15 have been -- it would have been cited and Sherrill would
16 not have been any big deal.

17 MR. CLEMENT: Well, I -- I -- I think
18 that --

19 JUSTICE SCALIA: I thought Sherrill was a
20 big deal.

21 MR. CLEMENT: Well, I think -- I think --

22 JUSTICE SCALIA: Justice Ginsburg wrote it.
23 I think she thought it was a big deal.

24 (Laughter.)

25 MR. CLEMENT: I'm not here to tell you it's

1 not a big deal. I am telling -- I'm here to tell you
2 two things, though.

3 One is that Solem went out of its way to not
4 decide the diminishment issue. So it is clearly an
5 alternative way of thinking about the cases, and I don't
6 think they're coextensive. Which is to say, I think
7 there could be a particular assertion of Tribal
8 authority that you might say violates City of Sherrill
9 principles, even within an undiminished reservation.

10 And I do think it's then critically
11 important that -- my friend on the other side has not
12 raised this argument below. I certainly did not
13 understand it to be an independent argument in this
14 Court. It's all well and good to cite the case, but
15 that doesn't make it an independent argument.

16 Even his amici, who thought that they wanted
17 to bring before this Court the City of Sherrill
18 argument, admitted that the Petitioners hadn't made a
19 City of Sherrill argument.

20 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: But -- but Solem did
21 talk about de facto diminishment. And it seems to me
22 that you've got to recognize when they do that, they're
23 talking about something other than de jure, in other
24 words, pursuant to the law. It's pursuant to the facts
25 on the ground.

1 MR. CLEMENT: I understand,
2 Mr. Chief Justice, but I think there's two ways to talk
3 about de facto v. de jure. One way to talk about it is
4 that they're two totally alternative routes. Another
5 way is to say de facto diminishment means the settlement
6 patterns, and that's something that can inform the
7 ultimate conclusion of whether there's diminishment.

8 And I really think the Court in Solem was
9 using it in that passage in the latter respect. And I
10 think that's the only way to make sense of the case as a
11 whole, because --

12 JUSTICE GINSBURG: Except that it's -- it's
13 presented before the Court turns to apply the
14 principles.

15 MR. CLEMENT: Exactly. That's right. It's
16 part of the general principles of the Court --

17 JUSTICE GINSBURG: It's -- it's not -- it's
18 not tied to the third factor.

19 MR. CLEMENT: Well, I -- I -- I take,
20 though, that it actually is, in my view, tied to the
21 third factor. I think Justice Marshall was laying out
22 all of the factors, starting with the first and
23 governing principle, being that only Congress can
24 diminish. And he winds up the sort of general principle
25 section with this last thing about de facto/de jure --

1 de facto diminishment, and then that ties up exactly to
2 his discussion of settlement patterns in the third
3 factor of Solem. And I really think that's the right
4 way to read that opinion.

5 I would like to make one other very
6 important point here, though, is I think the Court
7 should understand that if you were to rule in favor of
8 Petitioners in this case, the parties would essentially
9 have to go back and reconstruct the right-of-way because
10 the railroad is no longer there. There's no
11 Rails-For-Trails program in Thurston County. So if you
12 take a Google map and look at this area, you can't even
13 tell where the right-of-way was.

14 Now, I think that's significant, because if
15 there really was a contemporaneous understanding in the
16 1950s and 1960s, when the railroad literally pulled up
17 its tracks and left, that the right-of-way was the
18 boundary of the reservation, then I think there would
19 have been some effort to sort of preserve that
20 jurisdictional boundary.

21 JUSTICE KENNEDY: Well -- well -- well,
22 please correct me if I'm wrong from the record. My --
23 my understanding was in the west portion, the Tribe had
24 done -- had exercised no jurisdiction until the Beverage
25 Control Ordinance recently, but on the east portion,

1 that they had. But then you say, well, we can't tell
2 the difference in east and west.

3 MR. CLEMENT: Well, I -- I -- I --

4 JUSTICE KENNEDY: And I mean, is -- is that
5 reading of the record mistaken?

6 MR. CLEMENT: Well, I -- I think what there
7 is is a practical understanding -- as Justice Sotomayor
8 indicated, this is not a wealthy Tribe that's looking to
9 assert jurisdictions in places that are impractical. So
10 it's made a judgment that most of its efforts are
11 directed at the eastern portion of the reservation.

12 But what I'm saying is --

13 JUSTICE KENNEDY: What -- what -- but does
14 the fact that nothing, if -- if the record is correct --
15 let's assume the record shows that the Tribe exercised
16 no jurisdiction over the western portion until this
17 alcoholic Beverage Control Ordinance. Is that relevant
18 to the case at all?

19 MR. CLEMENT: I don't think it's
20 dispositive. I think, yes, it's --

21 JUSTICE KENNEDY: Is it relevant?

22 MR. CLEMENT: Yes, relevant.

23 JUSTICE KENNEDY: Why is it -- why is it
24 relevant? To what point?

25 MR. CLEMENT: It -- it -- I think it could

1 be relevant to the third factor of Solem in a case where
2 the situation was very cloudy.

3 But one of the things also to keep in mind
4 is that even before Montana, the authority that a Tribe
5 would have over a principal non-Indian settlement on a
6 reservation is fairly limited. And if you're --

7 JUSTICE GINSBURG: Limited to what?

8 MR. CLEMENT: What's that?

9 JUSTICE GINSBURG: What -- what -- what does
10 it state beside the alcohol tax -- sales tax? What
11 else, on your theory, could the Tribe do in the way of
12 governance in this area?

13 MR. CLEMENT: I think as a practical matter,
14 Justice Ginsburg, there's two other things that are at
15 stake here, and they both go to the equities of the
16 Indians on the reservation, not the non-Indians, because
17 the non-Indians on the reservation, the Tribal authority
18 is very, very limited.

19 So one thing that is at issue here is the
20 potential to continue the revenue-sharing agreement with
21 the State. And this is something that the State
22 actually came to the Tribe about. And the theory of the
23 revenue-sharing agreement for the fuel taxes is that
24 there are going to be transactions in the western
25 portion of the reservation where it's actually Tribal

1 members that are buying gasoline over there, which does
2 happen, because there are a lot of gas stations over
3 there. And of course, the Tribe would have authority to
4 tax the Tribal members on the reservations for those --
5 those transactions. So what --

6 JUSTICE KENNEDY: You -- you --
7 Justice Ginsburg asked you a question, you said, as a
8 practical matter. I thought -- maybe I misinterpreted
9 her question here -- as a legal matter. As a legal
10 matter, if you prevail, can the Tribe cast any doubt on
11 the authority and the jurisdiction of the existing
12 municipality?

13 MR. CLEMENT: No, not at all. What they can
14 do is they can make cooperative agreements with the
15 State of Nebraska to tax Indians when they make
16 purchases in Pender.

17 And the other thing they can do is that,
18 when two Tribal members get in a scuffle in the village
19 of Pender, the Tribal authorities can be contacted, and
20 that matter can be handled in the Tribal courts --

21 JUSTICE ALITO: If the City of --

22 MR. CLEMENT: -- rather than the State
23 court.

24 JUSTICE ALITO: If the City of Pender is on
25 a reservation, under what authority could the Town of

1 Pender regulate things that go on in Pender?

2 MR. CLEMENT: Under -- under its
3 authority -- first of all -- I -- I mean, you know, let
4 me say two things:

5 One is: I'm not even sure, because of the
6 retrocession under -- after Public Law 280, it's not
7 even clear to me that Nebraska ceded its civil
8 jurisdiction that it enjoyed under 280. The -- the
9 retrocession, as I understand it, was criminal
10 retrocession with the exception of the motor vehicle
11 laws.

12 The second thing: As a practical matter, I
13 think this is very important to understand. The next
14 town east from Pender is the Town of Walthill. It is
15 unambiguously in the reservation boundaries. It is an
16 incorporated municipality of the -- of sort of civil
17 government of Nebraska.

18 In the Winnebago reservation --

19 JUSTICE ALITO: Well, just educate me
20 because I -- I don't know the law on this point. Can --
21 excuse me.

22 Can a State incorporate municipalities
23 within the boundary of a Indian Reservation?

24 MR. CLEMENT: Yes. It can, and it does, and
25 it's quite common. And what this Court -- in fact, this

1 Court in -- in -- in the Seymour case, one of its
2 earliest diminishment cases, confronted a Federal
3 township, Omak, Washington, that had always been a
4 township. There's civil authority there, but it's still
5 on the reservation. And that is actually quite common.

6 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Does that displace
7 Tribal authority in that area?

8 MR. CLEMENT: No. Because again, remember,
9 the Tribal authority over the non-Indians is so small.

10 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Well, the -- the --
11 we're talking about the area.

12 Can Tribal -- Tribal police patrol within
13 the municipality?

14 MR. CLEMENT: I think they probably could.
15 The only, really -- with an eye towards seeing if there
16 were Indians there who were, you know, needing
17 patrolling. And there's some evidence in the record --
18 this is at Joint Appendix 371 and 372 -- that there were
19 occasional patrols of the Tribe into Pender. There's
20 also a footnote in that same section that says that as a
21 practical matter, when a Tribal member was apprehended
22 in the Village of Pender, the police officer would call
23 over to the Tribal authorities and have them take over
24 the person.

25 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: So there's

1 overlapping jurisdiction? The municipality and the
2 Tribe --

3 MR. CLEMENT: Yes.

4 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: -- within the city?

5 MR. CLEMENT: Within the city. And one
6 other aspect --

7 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Doesn't that create
8 conflict?

9 MR. CLEMENT: No. It really hasn't created
10 significant conflict. And what eliminates the conflict
11 is your Montana decision which substantially limits the
12 Tribe's authority over the non- --

13 JUSTICE GINSBURG: But the -- the liquor tax
14 that we're talking about is not imposed only on Indians,
15 right? It's imposed on everybody who buys liquor in
16 Pender.

17 MR. CLEMENT: It -- it is, but that is the
18 exception that proves the rule, because alcohol on
19 reservations has been a unique Federal authority for as
20 long as there's been Indian Reservations. In fact, this
21 Court had a case in 1911 arising out of the Omaha
22 reservation where it reaffirmed the Federal authority.

23 JUSTICE KENNEDY: So on Indian Reservation
24 lands, I take it Tribal police have jurisdiction over
25 non-Indians as to minor offenses?

1 MR. CLEMENT: I -- I don't think that's
2 actually true on the ground in Nebraska, at least as to
3 the highways. Because when they retroceded authority in
4 1970 --

5 JUSTICE KENNEDY: Well, you -- you have the
6 example of a scuffle. Suppose an Indian and a
7 non-Indian are in a scuffle. If -- if there's a -- a
8 minor criminal statute making this a minor offense, does
9 the Tribe have jurisdiction over the non-Indian?

10 MR. CLEMENT: I -- I don't think that it
11 would within the Village of Pender. And I think that is
12 a reflection of the very limited authority that the
13 Tribe has over non-Indians --

14 JUSTICE KENNEDY: And that's true with
15 reference to all Indian tribes? Can you cite me any
16 proposition for that?

17 MR. CLEMENT: Well, ultimately, it might
18 be -- it might turn on the scope of the Montana
19 decision. And obviously, this Court has the Dollar
20 General decision in front of it. I want to make one
21 more point, if I could, about the overlapping
22 authorities here, cause the other authority here is
23 Thurston County, if I just finish this one point.

24 Pender is the County seat of Thurston
25 County. Thurston County has -- by State statute since

1 1922, its western boundary has been defined as
2 coextensive with the reservation, and there are Tribal
3 members who's -- one of the council members on the
4 county is a Tribal member.

5 Thank you, Your Honor.

6 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Thank you, counsel.

7 Mr. Kedem.

8 ORAL ARGUMENT OF ALLON KEDEM

9 ON BEHALF OF THE FEDERAL RESPONDENT

10 MR. KEDEM: Mr. Chief Justice, and may it
11 please the Court:

12 In Solem v. Bartlett, this Court explained
13 that once a block of land is set aside as an Indian
14 Reservation and no matter what happens to the title of
15 individual plots within the area, the entire block
16 retains its reservation status until Congress explicitly
17 indicates otherwise. It has not done so here.

18 I'd like to start, if I may, with the
19 question: What would change if this Court were to rule
20 that the reservation is still intact? First of all,
21 with respect to services, States can provide services to
22 members of tribes and nonmembers alike anywhere within
23 the reservation. And the State of Nebraska provides
24 services not only in the disputed area but on the east
25 side as well.

1 Let me give you a very specific example.

2 There's a town called Bancroft, which is split in half
3 by the right-of-way. There's another town called
4 Rosalie, which is clearly within the eastern undisputed
5 part of the reservation. There's a school district
6 called the Bancroft-Rosalie School District, which is
7 administered under the auspices of the State of
8 Nebraska. And that is true notwithstanding the fact
9 that much of the land is on the east side, and true
10 notwithstanding the fact that many members -- many
11 students who go to that school are members of the Tribe.

12 JUSTICE GINSBURG: That's what -- what the
13 State can do, but the State wouldn't be obliged to do
14 that, wouldn't be obliged to provide schools?

15 MR. KEDEM: I see no basis for the State to
16 refuse to provide services to its own citizens,
17 especially if they are not members of the Tribe.

18 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Well, it would be a
19 question of sovereignty.

20 MR. KEDEM: The State --

21 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: This is -- this is
22 the reservation. That's your argument. It's the
23 reservation, and that's not the -- the State land, so
24 we're going to spend our money for schools or whatever
25 on the -- in the State, not on the reservation.

1 MR. KEDEM: The State retains regulatory
2 sovereignty to make laws with respect to its own
3 citizens and nonmembers on a reservation. That's true
4 on the east side. It's true on the west side.

5 I think you also may be left with the
6 impression, after my friend's argument, that the State
7 would stop issuing environmental permits and all of a
8 sudden the Tribe would start issuing them. That is not
9 correct. First of all, the Environmental Protection
10 Agency has been administering on the west side of the
11 reservation, including providing permits for animal feed
12 lots. There's also a permit for wastewater --

13 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: The Environmental
14 Protection Agency, which -- the State or Federal?

15 MR. KEDEM: Federal. Federal.

16 -- including a permit for a wastewater
17 treatment facility, although I believe it discharges
18 into Logon Creek on the east side; so it may not tell us
19 all that much about the jurisdiction.

20 JUSTICE KENNEDY: But our -- our questions
21 have been, suppose that you prevail, what can the State
22 do? And we say, oh, it's a practical matter. Don't
23 worry. They won't do -- the Tribe won't do anything.
24 The Tribe won't do anything. What could the Tribe do?

25 MR. KEDEM: What could the Tribe do?

1 JUSTICE KENNEDY: Yes, to regulate nonTribal
2 members.

3 MR. KEDEM: So the things that the Tribe
4 could do would be any express delegation of authority
5 from Congress. The only one that we've heard about is
6 the alcohol ordinance. Beyond that, the State and Tribe
7 could go back --

8 JUSTICE GINSBURG: We heard about the
9 fuel -- the revenue sharing of the fuel.

10 MR. KEDEM: That's right. There was an
11 agreement to share revenue fuel, although that was
12 something that the State entered into voluntarily with
13 the Tribe. Beyond that, the Tribe would have to fall
14 under one of the two Montana exceptions, which are, as
15 this Court is aware of because of the Dollar General
16 case, very limited.

17 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: I suppose one reason
18 the Tribe might -- might not provide services is because
19 the area is 98-point-whatever percent nonTribal, right?

20 MR. KEDEM: I think that's absolutely
21 correct.

22 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: So they would be --
23 any services would be for the -- how many? Nine -- nine
24 Indians in the area or 15?

25 MR. KEDEM: Pardon?

1 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: How many non-Indians
2 own land in the western part?

3 MR. KEDEM: It's almost entirely non-Indian
4 in the western part. And for the --

5 JUSTICE SCALIA: Couldn't the Tribe enact
6 ordinances that govern the Indians in the -- in the
7 western part?

8 MR. KEDEM: They could, but if we're talking
9 about the effect on nonmembers, they would have to fall
10 under the one -- one of the two Montana exceptions.

11 JUSTICE SCALIA: Okay. But at least as to
12 Tribal members in the west --

13 MR. KEDEM: That's right. Tribal members on
14 the reservation --

15 JUSTICE SCALIA: -- they would be subject to
16 the Tribe's jurisdiction which they otherwise would not?

17 MR. KEDEM: I think that that's accurate.
18 If I could go to the City of Sherrill argument, which
19 got brought up a lot today. I think this case is
20 extremely different from the City of Sherrill for a
21 number of reasons, but let me give you two big ones.

22 In the City of Sherrill, this Court held
23 that principles of equity restrained the Tribe from
24 trying to resurrect a claim of inherent sovereign
25 immunity.

1 In this case by contrast, first of all,
2 we're not just talking about the Tribe's jurisdiction.
3 We're talking about the jurisdiction of the United
4 States as well.

5 And second of all, we're not talking about a
6 claim of inherent authority. This is authority
7 exercised pursuant to a Federal statute, 18 U.S.C. 1161.
8 And it -- for that reason, principles of equity simply
9 don't apply here.

10 Moreover, in City of Sherrill --

11 JUSTICE SCALIA: I don't understand that.
12 Try -- try it again.

13 MR. KEDEM: Sure.

14 JUSTICE SCALIA: Principles of equity do not
15 apply here?

16 MR. KEDEM: They don't apply in the same
17 way. So in City of Sherrill the Court applied a
18 latches-type reasoning. But latches would not apply to
19 prevent the exercise of authority under a Federal
20 statute, an express delegation of authority under
21 Federal law.

22 JUSTICE SCALIA: Why not?

23 MR. KEDEM: Because that's what the Court
24 said, for instance, in the copyright decision that
25 Justice Ginsburg recently wrote, which is that when you

1 have background principles of equity, they are presumed
2 not to be -- apply and be displaced when there is a
3 substantive law that Congress passes to deal with the
4 same issue.

5 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: The law that
6 authorized the imposition of these taxes in the western
7 part of the reservation.

8 MR. KEDEM: The law authorizes the exercise
9 of this authority if there is a reservation and if the
10 Tribe applies to the Department of the Interior, which
11 has to approve the ordinance.

12 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Well, doesn't that
13 beg the question? The question was whether or not this
14 reservation has been diminished. So it's not the
15 reservation.

16 MR. KEDEM: Well, that's the question with
17 respect to the application of the statute. But when
18 we're talking about City of Sherrill, we're talking
19 about background equitable principles. And I'm simply
20 making the point that those principles don't apply when
21 you have an express congressional statute dealing with
22 the same issue.

23 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: If the City of Sherrill
24 did apply --

25 MR. KEDEM: Pardon?

1 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: If the City of Sherrill
2 did apply, hypothetically -- I'm not nay-saying all the
3 differences you're pointing out -- would you lose?

4 MR. KEDEM: No. Because again --

5 JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR: Explain why not.

6 MR. KEDEM: -- we're not talking about just
7 what the Tribe can do. We're also talking about the
8 jurisdiction of the United States as well. And there's
9 certainly nothing in the City of Sherrill which suggests
10 that the jurisdiction of the United States pursuant to a
11 congressional creation of a reservation can be curtailed
12 by the Tribe's failure to exercise authority in the
13 disputed area.

14 JUSTICE SCALIA: Frankly, I'm more -- I'm
15 more inclined to vote your way if the City of Sherrill
16 does apply than if the City of Sherrill doesn't apply.
17 What you're telling me is, unless you get there through
18 Solem, it doesn't matter whether the State and
19 non-Indians have for generations viewed this land as
20 their own. That's what you're telling me, right?

21 MR. KEDEM: Well, I'm telling you that to
22 the extent City of Sherrill applies, it applies to a
23 very different question, not the question as to where
24 the borders of the reservation are. It applies to the
25 question what can the Tribe as a basis of its inherent

1 sovereignty do? Now, it might under different
2 circumstances if the Tribe tried to repurchase a bunch
3 of land --

4 JUSTICE SCALIA: That's not what city --
5 that's not what Sherrill said. Sherrill said the Tribe
6 had no jurisdiction. It said it had no sovereignty over
7 the area anymore.

8 MR. KEDEM: Again, the diminishment question
9 goes not just to the Tribe's sovereignty but the
10 jurisdiction as well of the United States.

11 And if we're talking about expectations,
12 another point that I would make is that the single best
13 evidence of what these parties could have expected is
14 the retrocession, because that was a unique moment in
15 which the State of Nebraska and the United States talked
16 directly and officially to one another about the burdens
17 and responsibilities for exercising jurisdiction in the
18 reservation. And the United States in the Federal
19 register, as official as can be, said the entire
20 reservation remains intact.

21 And the State of Nebraska, as we point out
22 in our brief, had exactly the same understanding. The
23 assistant attorney general for Nebraska came and
24 testified before Congress that all of Thurston County is
25 within the Winnebago and within the Omaha Reservation.

1 JUSTICE SCALIA: That determines the meaning
2 of the 1882 statute.

3 MR. KEDEM: Not in the least. It goes to --

4 JUSTICE SCALIA: That's what I think.

5 MR. KEDEM: I was simply responding to the
6 point that the expectations here might be all in the
7 same direction.

8 I would also point to 30 years of Nebraska
9 revenue rulings, all of which say, point blank, Pender
10 is still part of the reservation. I would also point to
11 the definition of Thurston County.

12 As my friend pointed out, Pender is the
13 county seat. I think it's implausible to know that
14 the -- to assert that the State of Nebraska wouldn't
15 know that its own law specifies that all of Thurston
16 County is within the reservations of the Omaha and the
17 Winnebagos.

18 I would also like to address, if I could,
19 the tipping point theory that I think emerges from
20 Petitioner's reply brief, and that's the idea that in
21 1872, Congress tried but failed to diminish the
22 reservation because there were only about 300 acres
23 sold. But in 1882, it succeeded because a lot more land
24 was sold. I think there are a lot of problems with this
25 theory.

1 First of all, if that was what Congress had
2 in mind, presumably it would have specified some way to
3 know when the tipping point had been reached: Some
4 percentage of land sales, some other measure of success.
5 There's nothing about that in the text. There's nothing
6 about that in the legislative history.

7 Second of all, the concept that Congress
8 could attempt but fail to diminish a reservation, as my
9 friend said that it did in 1872, is a concept that is
10 wholly foreign to this Court's jurisprudence, which
11 makes clear that Congress has plenary power.

12 And finally, I think this Court should be
13 very reluctant to assume that Congress implicitly
14 transferred any part of its authority to change the
15 borders of an Indian reservation to private parties and
16 made it contingent on what this Court in Dakota referred
17 to as uncertain future sales.

18 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Well, is that saying
19 there's no such thing as de facto diminishment?

20 MR. KEDEM: I think that de facto
21 diminishment, if you think of it as some sort of
22 freestanding alternative path to change the boundaries
23 of a reservation, I do agree that it doesn't exist.

24 But if you're talking about it --

25 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: How is that

1 consistent with the language in Solem that
2 Justice Ginsburg read?

3 MR. KEDEM: I -- I think it's a little bit
4 hard to know exactly what the court meant.

5 This Court has never found de facto
6 diminishment. All seven of its surplus land cases were
7 decided on the basis of congressional intent. And then
8 there were sometimes a few sentences thrown in about how
9 the status quo wouldn't change very much.

10 I want to leave you with one more point.

11 JUSTICE SCALIA: What about Sherrill?

12 MR. KEDEM: Pardon?

13 JUSTICE SCALIA: What about Sherrill?

14 MR. KEDEM: Sherrill is very explicit, but
15 it is not a diminishment ruling. There's a footnote in
16 City of Sherrill which makes very clear that it is not
17 deciding the diminishment issue or the jurisdiction of
18 the United States.

19 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: What's -- what's
20 vague about the language where non-Indian settlers
21 flooded into the opened portion of a reservation and the
22 area has long since lost its Indian character, we have
23 acknowledged that de facto, if not de jure diminishment
24 may have occurred.

25 MR. KEDEM: I think you have to read that

1 sentence in light of Yankton Sioux, which says that when
2 you're talking about the subsequent treatment of the
3 area and the pattern of settlement, those are relevant
4 only insofar as they bear on the touchstone of the
5 inquiry, which is congressional intent.

6 If I can make one final --

7 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Well, I think if you
8 look at the passage, it goes on, then, to discuss in
9 addition to that, then we look to subsequent demographic
10 history as an additional clue as to what Congress meant.
11 I -- I read those as the two different paragraphs as
12 making two different points.

13 MR. KEDEM: I think you could definitely
14 read it that way if you just had Solem. I think if you
15 read Solem in light of Yankton Sioux, you reach a
16 different result.

17 If I could make one final point about
18 unsettling expectations. There are more than 300
19 Federally-recognized Indian reservations all throughout
20 the United States. The single most unsettling thing
21 that this Court could do would be to suggest that the
22 borders of those reservations depend not on what
23 Congress said about them, but on shifting demographic
24 patterns or who provides what services where.

25 If there are no further questions.

1 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Thank you, counsel.

2 Mr. Smith, you have four minutes remaining.

3 REBUTTAL ARGUMENT OF JAMES D. SMITH

4 ON BEHALF OF THE PETITIONERS

5 MR. SMITH: Thank you, Your Honor.

6 Where do I start?

7 Let's start first with -- pointed out to me
8 by co-counsel that a misstatement I made in response to
9 Justice Kagan. The Eighth Circuit briefs do cite
10 Sherrill in support of the proposition for de facto
11 diminishment. My apology. I hadn't argued at that
12 point, but it is there in the Eighth Circuit.

13 I would cite to the Joint Appendixes so the
14 Court is aware exactly where it can find that
15 undisputed, as far as the demographics, the
16 jurisdictional history, JA 215 to JA 216, JA 318 to JA
17 319, JA 609 to JA 611.

18 The -- the concept that, gee, nothing really
19 big's going to change, having the Tribal police show up
20 in their police vehicles patrolling the streets because
21 it's on Tribal land is going to be a huge disruption of
22 expectations.

23 My background is in criminal law. I know if
24 you have a crime you're investigating, you don't know --
25 not all crimes, you know, there's not a sign saying gee,

1 this was committed by an Indian; this was committed by a
2 non-Indian. You have a lot of who-done-its in which the
3 question is who's supposed to investigate, and you have
4 this overlapping jurisdiction where law enforcement
5 itself is confused as to who's supposed to be
6 investigating when they don't even know, maybe, who the
7 perpetrator is.

8 The idea that a Tribal member of a State
9 governmental authority is somehow shows --

10 JUSTICE SCALIA: Excuse me. Wouldn't --
11 wouldn't the latter be the case with respect to any
12 municipality that's within a reservation? We've been
13 told there are a lot of those. And -- and wouldn't
14 that -- wouldn't that be a problem in all of those,
15 being that you have overlapping jurisdiction of Tribal
16 police and municipal police? And until you know who the
17 perpetrator is, you don't know which one has
18 jurisdiction.

19 MR. SMITH: It's a problem if you know, and
20 chose to live on an Indian reservation. It -- it -- I
21 mean, that exists.

22 What's different in this case is the history
23 is 130 years of people who believe and chose. And they
24 are not living on an Indian reservation; they are living
25 in the State of Nebraska. I call the State patrol. The

1 Tribal police are not patrolling up and down my street.
2 That's the difference. It's the justifiable
3 expectations of the people who live there.

4 JUSTICE BREYER: Their point is, the
5 government says, fine, make that argument. Make it
6 under the rubric City of Sherrill. Maybe you make it
7 when you go down on remand or something, but it is
8 workable to divide the issue into two parts.

9 The first issue is what's the reservation,
10 and the second issue is what can you do on the
11 reservation?

12 When you get to question two, if the Tribe
13 has made no assertion of jurisdiction, nobody even knows
14 about it for 150 years. Maybe it's basically unfair to
15 let them do what they want to do. And that depends on a
16 lot of factors, such as what Congress says.

17 So what do you think of that argument?
18 Let's leave it for later. Nobody's argued it.

19 MR. SMITH: Glad I didn't answer what I
20 thought of that argument.

21 Your Honor, what -- it is still -- invites
22 the litigation over what is the extent of the power.
23 Who's got the power to govern? What is the extent of
24 their power? Uncertainty, when you have expectations,
25 you live in an area where the State governs you, and

1 then to say we can go back and litigate all these issues
2 is -- is just not what the public expects.

3 The people in Pender, this is a big deal.
4 They care about this. They have expectations. It's a
5 big deal whether a Tribe -- Tribal Council has authority
6 over us. We don't get to vote for them. Their
7 Constitution doesn't even allow us to appear at their
8 public meetings.

9 The concept that somehow or other we can't
10 find the right-of-way because it's not on Google is
11 frankly silly. It's very easy to go back, do surveys,
12 find exactly where the right-of-way is.

13 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: Thank you, counsel.

14 MR. SMITH: Thank you, Your Honor.

15 CHIEF JUSTICE ROBERTS: The case is
16 submitted.

17 (Whereupon, at 11:17 a.m., the case in the
18 above-entitled matter was submitted.)
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

<p>A</p> <p>a.m 1:13 3:2 54:17</p> <p>above-entitled 1:11 54:18</p> <p>absolutely 15:17 41:20</p> <p>acceded 13:21</p> <p>accurate 42:17</p> <p>acknowledged 8:4 12:2 15:25 49:23</p> <p>acres 23:10 47:22</p> <p>act 3:23 5:4,6 8:1 17:15,17,25 18:1 18:3,8 20:10,11 22:3,5 24:16 26:22 27:9</p> <p>acted 11:11</p> <p>action 20:19 27:8</p> <p>activities 13:24</p> <p>acts 10:15,16,20 17:12</p> <p>addition 50:9</p> <p>additional 9:24 50:10</p> <p>address 47:18</p> <p>administered 39:7</p> <p>administering 40:10</p> <p>admitted 16:2 28:18</p> <p>adverse 5:19 6:22</p> <p>agencies 16:3</p> <p>agency 9:6 18:15 40:10,14</p> <p>ago 3:19 10:19 19:11,19,20</p> <p>agree 7:7 18:21,25 20:23 48:23</p> <p>agreement 32:20 32:23 41:11</p> <p>agreements 33:14</p> <p>AL 1:3,6</p> <p>alcohol 32:10 36:18 41:6</p> <p>alcoholic 8:11,12 31:17</p>	<p>alike 38:22</p> <p>ALITO 12:5 33:21 33:24 34:19</p> <p>ALLON 1:19 2:9 38:8</p> <p>allotment 23:23 24:23 25:2,4,23 25:25</p> <p>allotments 22:22 23:1,2,12,15,22 24:1,9,19,22 25:3 25:9,13,16,19</p> <p>allow 23:21,23 54:7</p> <p>allowed 23:16 25:13,15</p> <p>alternative 27:7 28:5 29:4 48:22</p> <p>ambiguity 13:7,9 15:4</p> <p>amici 28:16</p> <p>analysis 10:17</p> <p>animal 10:16 40:11</p> <p>answer 15:10 25:1 53:19</p> <p>anymore 46:7</p> <p>apology 51:11</p> <p>appear 54:7</p> <p>APPEARANCES 1:14</p> <p>Appendix 35:18</p> <p>Appendixes 51:13</p> <p>application 44:17</p> <p>applied 43:17</p> <p>applies 7:3 19:13 44:10 45:22,22,24</p> <p>apply 4:5 29:13 43:9,15,16,18 44:2,20,24 45:2 45:16,16</p> <p>Appreciate 17:23</p> <p>apprehended 35:21</p> <p>approval 9:1 14:12</p> <p>approve 44:11</p> <p>approved 8:22 9:5</p> <p>area 3:11,17,18,23 4:12 5:21 6:16</p>	<p>8:3 9:20,25 10:15 11:25 12:11,24 16:23 17:5 18:4,5 18:8,9,12,20 24:4 26:25 30:12 32:12 35:7,11 38:15,24 41:19,24 45:13 46:7 49:22 50:3 53:25</p> <p>areas 18:4</p> <p>argue 21:13</p> <p>argued 51:11 53:18</p> <p>arguing 4:11 6:21 6:21,24</p> <p>argument 1:12 2:2 2:5,8,11 3:3,6 7:7 7:12 21:2,4,4,16 21:23 23:18,19 28:12,13,15,18,19 38:8 39:22 40:6 42:18 51:3 53:5 53:17,20</p> <p>arguments 7:10</p> <p>arising 36:21</p> <p>aside 38:13</p> <p>asked 20:22 33:7</p> <p>asking 4:1,4,5</p> <p>aspect 36:6</p> <p>assert 5:17 6:4 31:9 47:14</p> <p>assertion 28:7 53:13</p> <p>assistant 1:19 46:23</p> <p>assume 31:15 48:13</p> <p>assumption 6:16 24:11</p> <p>attempt 11:4 48:8</p> <p>attempted 4:14</p> <p>attorney 46:23</p> <p>auspices 39:7</p> <p>authorities 33:19 35:23 37:22</p> <p>authority 4:15 6:5 9:7 10:1 11:23,25 12:1,2,3,7 13:7,8</p>	<p>13:12,18 14:15 15:1,3,5,15,18 19:24 21:15 28:8 32:4,17 33:3,11 33:25 34:3 35:4,7 35:9 36:12,19,22 37:3,12,22 41:4 43:6,6,19,20 44:9 45:12 48:14 52:9 54:5</p> <p>authorized 44:6</p> <p>authorizes 44:8</p> <p>available 25:3</p> <p>aware 41:15 51:14</p> <p>awfully 14:2</p> <p>B</p> <p>back 10:3,18 19:10 19:11 30:9 41:7 54:1,11</p> <p>background 44:1 44:19 51:23</p> <p>Bancroft 39:2</p> <p>Bancroft-Rosalie 39:6</p> <p>Bartlett 38:12</p> <p>based 7:20</p> <p>basic 10:23</p> <p>basically 53:14</p> <p>basis 39:15 45:25 49:7</p> <p>bear 50:4</p> <p>beg 44:13</p> <p>behalf 1:16,17,20 2:4,7,10,13 3:7 21:24 38:9 51:4</p> <p>belatedly 6:4</p> <p>believe 7:13 10:15 13:16,16 40:17 52:23</p> <p>best 17:22 46:12</p> <p>beverage 8:11 30:24 31:17</p> <p>beverages 8:12</p> <p>Beyond 41:6,13</p> <p>big 11:13,16,22</p>	<p>27:16,20,23 28:1 42:21 54:3,5</p> <p>big's 51:19</p> <p>bisected 23:24</p> <p>bit 10:6 49:3</p> <p>blank 47:9</p> <p>block 38:13,15</p> <p>border 24:23</p> <p>borders 45:24 48:15 50:22</p> <p>boundaries 22:4,8 34:15 48:22</p> <p>boundary 22:20 23:20,24 24:21 26:5 30:18,20 34:23 38:1</p> <p>BREYER 53:4</p> <p>brief 4:10 7:14 46:22 47:20</p> <p>briefs 51:9</p> <p>bring 7:21 13:12 28:17</p> <p>broad 15:9</p> <p>brought 42:19</p> <p>bullpen 18:13</p> <p>bunch 46:2</p> <p>burdens 46:16</p> <p>businesses 16:1</p> <p>buy 19:10</p> <p>buying 33:1</p> <p>buys 36:15</p> <p>C</p> <p>C 2:1 3:1</p> <p>call 5:2 12:16,19 21:6 35:22 52:25</p> <p>called 12:20 39:2,3 39:6</p> <p>care 54:4</p> <p>case 3:4 4:22,25 5:1 6:5,7,8,11,15 7:2 7:4 15:12 22:2 26:12 28:14 29:10 30:8 31:18 32:1 35:1 36:21 41:16 42:19 43:1 52:11</p>
---	--	---	---	---

52:22 54:15,17 cases 28:5 35:2 49:6 cast 33:10 cattle 12:16 cause 37:22 cede 17:21 ceded 9:14 34:7 centuries 10:19 century 3:10 certainly 28:12 45:9 change 38:19 48:14 48:22 49:9 51:19 character 3:19 8:4 19:20 49:22 checkerboard 18:6 Chief 3:3,8 7:5,9 15:14 16:6,9 20:22 21:18,21,25 23:4,7,11,25 24:4 24:8 25:1 28:20 29:2 35:6,10,25 36:4,7 38:6,10 39:18,21 40:13 41:17,22 42:1 44:5,12 48:18,25 49:19 50:7 51:1 54:13,15 chose 25:4 52:20,23 chosen 24:5 Circuit 51:9,12 Circuit's 21:5 circumscribed 9:11 circumstances 4:7 4:18 11:7 46:2 cite 20:24 27:10 28:14 37:15 51:9 51:13 cited 21:14 27:15 citing 7:15 citizens 39:16 40:3 city 7:6,11 12:8 13:11 14:17,19,20 16:25 18:22 19:4 20:21,24 21:1,10	28:8,17,19 33:21 33:24 36:4,5 42:18,20,22 43:10 43:17 44:18,23 45:1,9,15,16,22 46:4 49:16 53:6 civil 34:7,16 35:4 claim 6:4 42:24 43:6 classic 22:11 clear 16:11 17:5 22:5 25:22 34:7 48:11 49:16 clearly 15:23 28:4 39:4 Clement 1:17 2:6 21:22,23,25 23:6 23:8,13 24:3,7,10 25:6,11,15,20,22 26:8,11,13 27:12 27:17,21,25 29:1 29:15,19 31:3,6 31:19,22,25 32:8 32:13 33:13,22 34:2,24 35:8,14 36:3,5,9,17 37:1 37:10,17 cloudy 32:2 clue 50:10 co-counsel 51:8 coextensive 28:6 38:2 come 12:17 16:20 comes 15:12 16:20 committed 52:1,1 common 34:25 35:5 compatible 27:2 compelling 4:6,25 complain 20:3 concept 6:3 10:20 11:10 48:7,9 51:18 54:9 conception 24:11 concerned 17:3,16 concluding 4:20	conclusion 19:19 26:18 29:7 conduct 15:7 conflict 36:8,10,10 confronted 35:2 confused 52:5 Congress 3:22 5:5 5:6,9,10,11 8:19 10:19,22,24,25 11:2,5,11,20 17:6 17:8,11,17 20:6 20:16,19 22:3,5 22:19 23:19 24:12 26:23 27:1 29:23 38:16 41:5 44:3 46:24 47:21 48:1 48:7,11,13 50:10 50:23 53:16 congressional 17:8 20:18 27:8 44:21 45:11 49:7 50:5 considerations 22:4 considered 18:17 consistent 6:3 20:13 25:24 26:2 27:6 49:1 Constitution 54:7 contacted 33:19 contemporaneous 30:15 context 3:22 9:18 10:13,18 20:7 contingent 48:16 continue 13:4,5,13 32:20 contrary 5:22 contrast 3:16 43:1 control 7:17 13:11 16:23 30:25 31:17 cooperative 33:14 copyright 43:24 correct 8:20 9:2,4 25:5 30:22 31:14 40:9 41:21 correctly 4:1	council 13:11 16:25 20:4 38:3 54:5 counsel 18:21 38:6 51:1 54:13 county 13:1 30:11 37:23,24,25,25 38:4 46:24 47:11 47:13,16 course 33:3 court 1:1,12 3:9 4:5 4:20 7:1,3 11:2 19:18 22:1,11 26:15,24 28:14,17 29:8,13,16 30:6 33:23 34:25 35:1 36:21 37:19 38:11 38:12,19 41:15 42:22 43:17,23 48:12,16 49:4,5 50:21 51:14 Court's 4:23 10:14 11:1 48:10 courts 21:2,3 33:20 create 13:15,17 18:6 36:7 created 36:9 creates 6:18 creating 22:12 creation 45:11 creatures 13:14 credited 10:12 Creek 40:18 crime 51:24 crimes 51:25 criminal 9:15 34:9 37:8 51:23 critically 28:10 curtailed 45:11	de 4:11,17,21 5:18 6:8 7:1,21 8:4,5 21:4,8,12,16,17 26:16,16 28:21,23 29:3,3,5,25 30:1 48:19,20 49:5,23 49:23 51:10 deal 27:16,20,23 28:1 44:3 54:3,5 dealing 10:9 44:21 decades 20:10,10 decide 15:13 28:4 decided 6:15 49:7 deciding 7:25 49:17 decision 4:21 36:11 37:19,20 43:24 defined 38:1 definitely 50:13 definition 47:11 delegation 41:4 43:20 demographic 50:9 50:23 demographics 51:15 deny 18:22 Department 1:20 8:22 44:10 depend 50:22 depends 53:15 descendants 19:22 determine 10:25 11:5 determines 47:1 difference 31:2 53:2 differences 45:3 different 5:9 17:11 17:12 18:7,8 26:21 42:20 45:23 46:1 50:11,12,16 52:22 diminish 10:24 17:7,14 22:5 27:1 29:24 47:21 48:8 diminished 3:24
---	--	---	---	--

5:7,12 8:1 17:17 20:15 22:3 44:14 diminishing 10:21 10:21 diminishment 4:12 4:17,21 5:18 6:1,9 6:12,12,22 7:21 8:5 11:10,12,13 11:21 14:23 17:6 17:20,24 21:5,8 21:13,17 22:13,17 26:17,18,22 27:8 28:4,21 29:5,7 30:1 35:2 46:8 48:19,21 49:6,15 49:17,23 51:11 direct 15:8 directed 31:11 direction 47:7 directly 46:16 disagree 19:2 discharges 40:17 discuss 50:8 discussion 30:2 displace 12:10 35:6 displaced 44:2 dispositive 5:16 31:20 dispute 23:9 disputed 3:11,17 3:18,23 9:20 16:23 18:12,20 38:24 45:13 disputing 15:6 disrupted 9:20 disruption 51:21 distinction 18:10 distinguish 5:2 district 39:5,6 divide 53:8 doctrine 5:18,25 doing 5:6 10:20 15:13 16:24 Dollar 37:19 41:15 doubt 33:10 draw 22:20 23:19	drawn 24:20 drops 12:15 <hr/> E E 2:1 3:1,1 earlier 5:11 earliest 35:2 east 15:22 18:9 22:22 30:25 31:2 34:14 38:24 39:9 40:4,18 eastern 15:23 16:10 16:12,14 31:11 39:4 easy 5:2 54:11 economic 15:8 educate 34:19 effect 8:24 15:8 18:6 42:9 effort 30:19 efforts 31:10 Eighth 21:5 51:9 51:12 eighty 20:16 elected 20:1 element 4:17,24 19:5 eliminates 36:10 emerges 47:19 emphasizes 20:9 enact 42:5 enacted 5:11 enactment 4:19 ended 18:19 enforce 15:22 16:14 enforcement 52:4 enjoyed 34:8 entered 41:12 entire 4:5 38:15 46:19 entirely 26:21 42:3 environment 12:12 13:21 environmental 12:10 40:7,9,13	equitable 18:23 19:13 44:19 equities 32:15 equity 42:23 43:8 43:14 44:1 especially 39:17 ESQ 1:15,17,19 2:3 2:6,9,12 essentially 5:7 23:23 30:8 ET 1:3,6 events 5:3 everybody 36:15 evidence 35:17 46:13 evolves 11:4 exactly 29:15 30:1 46:22 49:4 51:14 54:12 example 12:14 37:6 39:1 exception 34:10 36:18 exceptions 41:14 42:10 excuse 34:21 52:10 exercise 4:14 12:6 14:17,22,24 15:15 43:19 44:8 45:12 exercised 3:14 7:17 10:1 15:2 19:20 30:24 31:15 43:7 exercises 15:18 exercising 13:11 46:17 exist 13:4,5,14 48:23 existing 22:7 25:12 33:11 exists 52:21 expect 16:4 expectation 16:4 expectations 6:18 9:19,21 14:18 46:11 47:6 50:18 51:22 53:3,24	54:4 expected 12:13 13:10 46:13 expects 54:2 Explain 45:5 explained 38:12 explicit 49:14 explicitly 38:16 express 41:4 43:20 44:21 extent 13:7,8 45:22 53:22,23 extremely 42:20 eye 35:15 <hr/> F facility 40:17 fact 4:4 7:17 16:22 23:16 26:18 31:14 34:25 36:20 39:8 39:10 facto 4:11,17,21 5:18 6:8 7:1,21 8:4 21:5,8,12,16 21:17 26:16,16 28:21 29:3,5 30:1 48:19,20 49:5,23 51:10 facto/de 29:25 factor 4:7 5:16,24 19:1,3 22:10 26:15 27:3,7 29:18,21 30:3 32:1 factors 15:6 18:18 29:22 53:16 facts 7:2 28:24 fail 48:8 failed 47:21 failure 45:12 fair 17:10 fairly 5:2 32:6 fall 41:13 42:9 far 5:3 6:10,15 9:21 15:7 20:8 21:4 51:15	farmer 12:14 farming 12:11 favor 30:7 fearful 14:4 Federal 1:21 2:10 9:2,6,14 35:2 36:19,22 38:9 40:14,15,15 43:7 43:19,21 46:18 Federally-recogn... 50:19 feed 12:16 40:11 final 22:18 50:6,17 finally 48:12 find 5:25 7:1 19:23 27:8 51:14 54:10 54:12 finding 22:16 26:21 fine 53:5 finish 37:23 first 3:4,12 9:22 22:9 26:25 29:22 34:3 38:20 40:9 43:1 48:1 51:7 53:9 fit 4:17 7:2 26:12 fits 4:22 flooded 8:2 49:21 focus 5:4 7:19 following 3:10 footnote 35:20 49:15 foreign 48:10 forfeited 5:21 6:19 form 16:17 18:2 found 21:5 49:5 four 51:2 frankly 11:1,23 45:14 54:11 freestanding 48:22 friend 26:8 28:11 47:12 48:9 friend's 40:6 front 37:20 fuel 32:23 41:9,9,11 further 21:19 50:25
---	---	---	--	--

future 48:17	14:12	hundred 6:5 20:13	35:16 36:14 41:24	29:25 49:23
G	governmental 16:2	hypothetically 45:2	42:6	jurisdiction 3:15
G 3:1	18:19 19:24 52:9	I	indicated 31:8	5:19,21 6:16 7:18
gas 33:2	governs 9:23 53:25	idea 11:10 16:22	indicates 38:17	12:10 30:24 31:16
gasoline 33:1	granted 26:4	17:7 22:19 26:2	individual 38:15	33:11 34:8 36:1
gathered 4:10	granting 9:7	47:20 52:8	industries 16:1	36:24 37:9 40:19
gee 51:18,25	greater 3:13 11:7	identified 22:11	inform 29:6	42:16 43:2,3 45:8
general 1:15,19	19:1	immediately 20:10	inherent 15:4 42:24	45:10 46:6,10,17
25:19 29:16,24	greatly 9:12	20:11	43:6 45:25	49:17 52:4,15,18
37:20 41:15 46:23	ground 21:11,13	immunity 26:16,21	inquiry 50:5	53:13
generally 10:9 11:3	28:25 37:2	42:25	insofar 50:4	jurisdictional 4:8
25:3	grounds 4:21	implausible 47:13	instance 43:24	30:20 51:16
generations 45:19	guess 5:2 10:19	implement 14:4	intact 38:20 46:20	jurisdictions 8:25
Ginsburg 4:9 6:11	18:25 20:3	implicitly 48:13	integrity 15:8	31:9
7:20 8:9 11:9,18	guide 17:13	imply 4:5	intended 11:1 20:6	jurisprudence
26:7,10,14 27:22	guy 12:14	important 5:24	intent 3:22 5:5 11:5	48:10
29:12,17 32:7,9	H	12:12,13 28:11	17:8 20:18 49:7	Justice 1:20 3:3,8
32:14 33:7 36:13	Hagen 18:1	30:6 34:13	50:5	3:25 4:9 5:9,15
39:12 41:8 43:25	half 39:2	importantly 23:1	interesting 26:3	6:10,11,20 7:5,9
49:2	handled 33:20	impose 8:12,15	Interior 8:21 44:10	7:20 8:9,18,25 9:9
give 12:14 19:1	happen 13:3 20:6	imposed 8:18 36:14	interpreting 10:10	10:2,3 11:9,18
39:1 42:21	33:2	36:15	introduced 15:1	12:5,21 13:3,13
given 24:11	happened 3:21,21	imposition 44:6	introducing 9:24	13:20 14:2,10,16
Glad 53:19	20:5,9	impractical 31:9	investigate 52:3	15:14 16:6,9 17:2
go 12:6 26:22 30:9	happens 38:14	impression 40:6	investigating 51:24	18:21 19:7,12,15
32:15 34:1 39:11	hard 49:4	inclined 19:1 45:15	52:6	20:21,22 21:7,18
41:7 42:18 53:7	harmful 14:18	including 26:1	invites 53:21	21:21,25 23:4,7
54:1,11	headquarters	40:11,16	involve 4:23 6:11	23:11,25 24:4,8
goes 46:9 47:3 50:8	18:19,19	inconsistencies	involves 9:7	24:25 25:9,14,18
going 13:6,9,25	health 15:9	20:12	issue 6:12 11:16,22	25:21 26:7,10,14
14:3,7 16:20,21	hear 3:3	inconsistent 11:3	11:23 13:17,25	26:14 27:10,14,19
20:3 32:24 39:24	heard 41:5,8	22:19	14:15 15:16 28:4	27:22,22 28:20
51:19,21	held 27:14 42:22	incorporate 34:22	32:19 44:4,22	29:2,12,17,21
good 17:13 28:14	highly 10:6	incorporated 34:16	49:17 53:8,9,10	30:21 31:4,7,13
Google 30:12 54:10	highways 37:3	independent 21:10	issues 54:1	31:21,23 32:7,9
govern 11:23 42:6	historical 25:25	21:13 28:13,15	issuing 40:7,8	32:14 33:6,7,21
53:23	history 4:8 10:5,8,9	Indian 3:19 8:4	J	33:24 34:19 35:6
governance 32:12	11:6 20:8 26:5	10:16 13:15 18:24	JA 51:16,16,16,16	35:10,25 36:4,7
governed 3:17	48:6 50:10 51:16	19:19,23 24:13	51:17,17	36:13,23 37:5,14
governing 4:15	52:22	25:1,4 34:23	JAMES 1:15 2:3	38:6,10 39:12,18
29:23	Honor 4:3,16 8:17	36:20,23 37:6,15	2:12 3:6 51:3	39:21 40:13,20
government 9:2,6	9:4,17 17:23 38:5	38:13 48:15 49:22	January 1:9	41:1,8,17,22 42:1
9:15 16:18 34:17	51:5 53:21 54:14	50:19 52:1,20,24	Joint 35:18 51:13	42:5,11,15 43:11
53:5	horrible 14:8	Indians 5:20 8:20	judgment 31:10	43:14,22,25 44:5
government's 14:6	huge 51:21	14:21 32:16 33:15	jure 8:5 28:23 29:3	44:12,23 45:1,5
				45:14 46:4 47:1,4

48:18,25 49:2,11 49:13,19 50:7 51:1,9 52:10 53:4 54:13,15 Justice's 25:1 justifiable 6:18 9:19,21 53:2	land's 4:7 land-use 18:14,15 lands 7:25 36:24 language 17:11,13 17:15,16,19,25 22:11,16,17 26:11 26:13 49:1,20 latches 14:24 43:18 latches-type 43:18 Laughter 27:24 law 14:19 17:5 26:19 28:24 34:6 34:20 43:21 44:3 44:5,8 47:15 51:23 52:4 laws 16:14 34:11 40:2 laying 29:21 leave 49:10 53:18 left 30:17 40:5 legal 11:10 33:9,9 legislative 10:8,17 11:6 20:8 48:6 let's 31:15 51:7 53:18 level 7:23 license 8:11,11,16 licensing 8:13 light 50:1,15 limited 12:2 32:6,7 32:18 37:12 41:16 limits 12:7 15:4 36:11 Lincoln 1:16 liquor 8:10,16 12:8 36:13,15 literally 30:16 litigate 54:1 litigation 15:12 53:22 litigations 15:5 little 10:6 49:3 live 9:19 52:20 53:3 53:25 lived 19:22 living 52:24,24	load 12:15 local 13:11 16:3,22 16:25 logical 24:11 Logon 40:18 long 3:19 6:19 7:17 8:3 19:11,19,20 36:20 49:22 long- 5:22 long-accepted 5:22 long-standing 6:15 longer 6:25 30:10 look 17:7 27:4 30:12 50:8,9 looked 17:12 looking 5:5,5 17:25 27:4 31:8 looks 20:7 lose 9:10,13 45:3 losing 9:16,16 loss 7:16,16 lost 3:19 8:3 19:11 19:19 49:22 lot 7:9,10 33:2 42:19 47:23,24 52:2,13 53:16 lots 40:12 lower 21:2,3	26:7,8,10 31:4 34:3 52:21 meaning 47:1 means 21:8 29:5 meant 49:4 50:10 measure 48:4 meetings 54:8 member 35:21 38:4 52:8 members 20:4 22:21,25 23:14,21 24:18 25:12,24 33:1,4,18 38:3,3 38:22 39:10,11,17 41:2 42:12,13 mentioned 3:20 middle 24:24 mind 32:3 48:2 mineral 18:16 minor 36:25 37:8,8 minutes 51:2 misinterpreted 33:8 misstatement 51:8 mistaken 31:5 MITCH 1:6 moment 46:14 money 16:21 39:24 Montana 15:6 32:4 36:11 37:18 41:14 42:10 morning 3:4 motor 34:10 moved 7:24 multiple 22:4 municipal 52:16 municipalities 12:21,23 13:1,15 13:17 16:19 34:22 municipality 33:12 34:16 35:13 36:1 52:12	nay-saying 45:2 Neb 1:16 Nebraska 1:3,15 3:4,17 8:17 12:17 12:19 13:10 16:16 16:17,19 33:15 34:7,17 37:2 38:23 39:8 46:15 46:21,23 47:8,14 52:25 need 5:17,25 14:11 19:3 needing 35:16 never 3:14 15:2 16:15 19:20 20:1 49:5 new 22:20 23:19,24 24:20,23 26:5 nice 14:10 nine 23:7 41:23,23 ninety-six 20:16 Nobody's 53:18 non- 36:12 non-Indian 3:12 6:17 8:2 32:5 37:7,9 42:3 49:20 52:2 non-Indians 4:13 25:10,12 32:16,17 35:9 36:25 37:13 42:1 45:19 nonmembers 38:22 40:3 42:9 nonTribal 41:1,19 normal 10:17 notwithstanding 39:8,10 number 12:20 22:25 23:2,4,5 42:21 numbers 23:17
K Kagan 10:2 17:2 20:21 21:7 51:9 Kedem 1:19 2:9 38:7,8,10 39:15 39:20 40:1,15,25 41:3,10,20,25 42:3,8,13,17 43:13,16,23 44:8 44:16,25 45:4,6 45:21 46:8 47:3,5 48:20 49:3,12,14 49:25 50:13 keep 32:3 KENNEDY 3:25 24:25 25:9,14,18 25:21 30:21 31:4 31:13,21,23 33:6 36:23 37:5,14 40:20 41:1 kind 10:5 17:20 know 5:10,19 10:3 23:15 34:3,20 35:16 47:13,15 48:3 49:4 51:23 51:24,25 52:6,16 52:17,19 knows 53:13	L land 3:19 6:6,17 8:1 10:15,16,20 13:19 18:11,24 19:10,19 20:15 24:16 27:9 38:13 39:9,23 42:2 45:19 46:3 47:23 48:4 49:6 51:21	M main 24:12 major 18:10 making 23:18 37:8 44:20 50:12 manure 12:15 map 30:12 market 27:9 Marshal 26:14 Marshall 29:21 matter 1:11 12:6 26:19 32:13 33:8 33:9,10,20 34:12 35:21 38:14 40:22 45:18 54:18 mean 5:10 13:9,14 14:10 21:8,9,9	N N 2:1,1 3:1 name 16:17	O O 2:1 3:1 obliged 39:13,14 obviously 4:19 13:2

37:19 occasional 35:19 occurred 8:5 49:24 odd 23:21 24:1 odder 23:22 offense 37:8 offenses 36:25 office 17:1 20:2 officer 35:22 offices 16:1 official 46:19 officially 46:16 oh 40:22 Okay 42:11 Omaha 22:3 36:21 46:25 47:16 Omak 35:3 once 14:15 38:13 ones 17:12,14,14 42:21 open 6:6 7:24 25:9 25:19 opened 22:6 24:5 49:21 opening 8:2 22:12 26:20 opens 24:16 opinion 7:22 21:6 26:24,25 30:4 opposed 4:20 opposing 12:8 oral 1:11 2:2,5,8 3:6 21:23 38:8 ordinance 8:23,23 9:5 30:25 31:17 41:6 44:11 ordinances 15:21 15:22 16:13,14 42:6 ought 19:2 outer 12:7 outset 3:20 outside 13:12 24:9 overlapping 36:1 37:21 52:4,15 overrule 4:1,4	overwhelmingly 4:13 ownership 24:13 24:13 <hr/> P <hr/> P 3:1 page 2:2 7:22 20:24 pages 7:14 paragraphs 7:14 50:11 Pardon 41:25 44:25 49:12 Parker 1:6 3:4 part 6:25 11:16,24 12:1,3 15:11,15 15:18,18,20,20,23 16:7,8,10,12,15 16:15 20:15 27:5 29:16 39:5 42:2,4 42:7 44:7 47:10 48:14 particular 4:6 5:1 5:12,21 18:2,22 28:7 particularly 4:25 parties 23:9 30:8 46:13 48:15 parts 53:8 party 6:3 passage 29:9 50:8 passes 44:3 passing 24:22 path 48:22 patrol 35:12 52:25 patrolling 35:17 51:20 53:1 patrols 35:19 pattern 50:3 patterns 27:5 29:6 30:2 50:24 PAUL 1:17 2:6 21:23 Pender 12:8 33:16 33:19,24 34:1,1 34:14 35:19,22	36:16 37:11,24 47:9,12 54:3 people 12:13 13:9 16:23 17:3 52:23 53:3 54:3 percent 3:13 20:13 23:15 41:19 percentage 48:4 perfect 24:18 perfectly 19:18 27:2 permission 14:6 permit 40:12,16 permits 40:7,11 permitted 8:20 perpetrator 52:7 52:17 person 35:24 Petitioner's 47:20 Petitioners 1:4,16 2:4,13 3:7 28:18 30:8 51:4 picked 8:6 place 5:4 places 31:9 please 3:9 22:1 30:22 38:11 plenary 48:11 plots 38:15 point 9:3 11:18 20:17,22 30:6 31:24 34:20 37:21 37:23 44:20 46:12 46:21 47:6,8,9,10 47:19 48:3 49:10 50:17 51:12 53:4 pointed 4:12 47:12 51:7 pointing 45:3 points 50:12 police 35:12,22 36:24 51:19,20 52:16,16 53:1 pond 12:15 populated 4:13 population 3:12	6:17 25:19 portion 8:2 22:6 24:17 30:23,25 31:11,16 32:25 49:21 position 4:1 25:6 possession 5:19 6:22 potential 32:20 power 14:3,11 48:11 53:22,23,24 powers 9:11,12,15 14:18 practical 12:6 31:7 32:13 33:8 34:12 35:21 40:22 pragmatic 7:23 precedent 4:23 7:15 10:14 11:2 preexisting 25:16 preliminary 8:10 presence 15:25 presented 29:13 preserve 30:19 presumably 48:2 presumed 44:1 pretty 10:7 17:4,13 prevail 7:4 33:10 40:21 prevent 43:19 primarily 6:17 principal 32:5 principle 6:14 7:16 9:23 10:23 26:25 29:23,24 principles 6:8 19:14 28:9 29:14 29:16 42:23 43:8 43:14 44:1,19,20 private 1:18 2:7 21:24 48:15 probably 22:9 35:14 problem 10:25 52:14,19 problems 47:24	program 30:11 proposition 7:11 18:23 37:16 51:10 prosecution 9:15 Protection 40:9,14 proves 36:18 provide 15:21 16:13 38:21 39:14 39:16 41:18 provided 16:3,16 16:18 provides 38:23 50:24 providing 40:11 proviso 22:18,21 25:23 public 16:4 19:21 34:6 54:2,8 pulled 30:16 purchase 24:6 purchases 33:16 purposes 18:16 pursuant 28:24,24 43:7 45:10 put 10:23 <hr/> Q <hr/> question 8:10 10:3 11:14,16 12:5 14:16 18:24 22:2 25:1 33:7,9 38:19 39:19 44:13,13,16 45:23,23,25 46:8 52:3 53:12 questions 21:20 40:20 50:25 quite 21:7 34:25 35:5 quo 49:9 <hr/> R <hr/> R 3:1 railroad 15:23 18:8 18:9,12 30:10,16 Rails-For-Trails 30:11
--	---	---	---	---

<p>raise 7:6</p> <p>raised 7:12 28:12</p> <p>reach 19:18 50:15</p> <p>reached 48:3</p> <p>reaching 4:20</p> <p>reaction 27:9</p> <p>read 26:11,23 30:4 49:2,25 50:11,14 50:15</p> <p>reading 31:5</p> <p>reaffirmed 36:22</p> <p>reality 11:1</p> <p>really 10:22 11:4 15:2 17:9 24:20 26:6 27:11 29:8 30:3,15 35:15 36:9 51:18</p> <p>reason 3:21 10:11 41:17 43:8</p> <p>reasonable 19:18</p> <p>reasoning 43:18</p> <p>reasons 17:4 42:21</p> <p>REBUTTAL 2:11 51:3</p> <p>recall 20:4 27:11 27:12</p> <p>recognition 20:5</p> <p>recognize 28:22</p> <p>recognized 7:24 21:17</p> <p>recognizes 10:15</p> <p>recollection 8:21 21:14</p> <p>reconstruct 30:9</p> <p>record 20:13 22:24 30:22 31:5,14,15 35:17</p> <p>redrew 22:4</p> <p>reference 37:15</p> <p>referred 48:16</p> <p>referring 6:14</p> <p>reflect 20:19</p> <p>reflection 37:12</p> <p>reflective 5:6</p> <p>reflects 22:24</p> <p>refuse 39:16</p>	<p>register 46:19</p> <p>regulate 15:7 34:1 41:1</p> <p>regulation 12:12</p> <p>regulations 12:11 12:18</p> <p>regulatory 40:1</p> <p>relevant 7:25 31:17 31:21,22,24 32:1 50:3</p> <p>relief 18:23</p> <p>religious 18:15</p> <p>relinquish 17:21</p> <p>reluctant 48:13</p> <p>remainder 21:19</p> <p>remaining 51:2</p> <p>remains 46:20</p> <p>remand 53:7</p> <p>remedy 14:19</p> <p>remember 35:8</p> <p>remove 17:1</p> <p>replaced 12:18</p> <p>reply 47:20</p> <p>repudiate 18:23</p> <p>repurchase 46:2</p> <p>request 8:22 9:4</p> <p>required 18:2</p> <p>requirement 8:13</p> <p>requirements 8:13 8:16</p> <p>reservation 3:24 5:8 6:25 7:25 8:1 8:3 10:21,24 11:17,24 12:1,4 15:11,15,19,20 18:4,5,14,14,16 20:16 22:3,6,7,12 22:20 23:20,22 24:9,14,17,19,21 25:2,4,17 26:1,4 27:1 28:9 30:18 31:11 32:6,16,17 32:25 33:25 34:15 34:18,23 35:5 36:22,23 38:2,14 38:16,20,23 39:5</p>	<p>39:22,23,25 40:3 40:11 42:14 44:7 44:9,14,15 45:11 45:24 46:18,20,25 47:10,22 48:8,15 48:23 49:21 52:12 52:20,24 53:9,11</p> <p>reservations 9:12 13:15 33:4 36:19 36:20 47:16 50:19 50:22</p> <p>reserve 21:18</p> <p>reserved 18:11,12</p> <p>respect 17:5 29:9 38:21 40:2 44:17 52:11</p> <p>Respondent 1:21 2:10 38:9</p> <p>Respondents 1:18 2:7 21:24</p> <p>responding 47:5</p> <p>response 12:19 51:8</p> <p>responsibilities 46:17</p> <p>restrained 42:23</p> <p>result 50:16</p> <p>resurrect 42:24</p> <p>retains 38:16 40:1</p> <p>retroceded 37:3</p> <p>retrocession 34:6,9 34:10 46:14</p> <p>revenue 41:9,11 47:9</p> <p>revenue-sharing 32:20,23</p> <p>rife 20:12</p> <p>right 19:12 20:2 22:22 25:14,18 29:15 30:3 36:15 41:10,19 42:13 45:20</p> <p>right-of-way 22:23 23:1,3 25:8 26:1,3 30:9,13,17 39:3 54:10,12</p>	<p>rights 18:14,15,16</p> <p>road 12:15</p> <p>ROBERTS 3:3 7:5 7:9 15:14 16:6,9 21:21 23:4,7,11 23:25 24:4,8 28:20 35:6,10,25 36:4,7 38:6 39:18 39:21 40:13 41:17 41:22 42:1 44:5 44:12 48:18,25 49:19 50:7 51:1 54:13,15</p> <p>Rosalie 39:4</p> <p>roughly 23:14</p> <p>route 26:21 27:8</p> <p>routes 29:4</p> <p>rubric 53:6</p> <p>rule 4:6 30:7 36:18 38:19</p> <p>ruling 9:10 49:15</p> <p>rulings 47:9</p> <p>rural 12:11</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">S</p> <hr/> <p>S 2:1 3:1</p> <p>sales 8:11,14,17 32:10 48:4,17</p> <p>saying 6:25 25:8 26:15 31:12 48:18 51:25</p> <p>says 7:6,23 14:17 14:20 19:7,8,9 26:25 35:20 50:1 53:5,16</p> <p>SCALIA 5:9,15 6:10,20 12:21 13:3,13 18:21 19:7,12,15 27:10 27:14,19,22 42:5 42:11,15 43:11,14 43:22 45:14 46:4 47:1,4 49:11,13 52:10</p> <p>Scalia's 10:3</p> <p>school 39:5,6,11</p>	<p>schools 16:1 18:15 39:14,24</p> <p>scope 37:18</p> <p>scuffle 33:18 37:6,7</p> <p>seat 37:24 47:13</p> <p>second 3:14 34:12 43:5 48:7 53:10</p> <p>secondly 22:14</p> <p>section 22:18 25:23 29:25 35:20</p> <p>security 15:9</p> <p>see 19:3 39:15</p> <p>seeing 35:15</p> <p>self-governing 12:22,23,25</p> <p>sense 5:13 24:18 29:10</p> <p>sentence 50:1</p> <p>sentences 49:8</p> <p>services 14:5 15:21 16:2,13,16,18,21 38:21,21,24 39:16 41:18,23 50:24</p> <p>set 38:13</p> <p>settled 14:18 17:5</p> <p>settlement 6:6 22:7 22:12 24:17 27:4 29:5 30:2 32:5 50:3</p> <p>settlers 8:2 25:11 49:20</p> <p>seven 49:6</p> <p>Seymour 35:1</p> <p>share 41:11</p> <p>sharing 41:9</p> <p>Sherrill 6:7 7:6,15 8:7 14:17,20,21 18:22 19:4 20:22 20:24 21:2,10,14 27:11,15,19 28:8 28:17,19 42:18,20 42:22 43:10,17 44:18,23 45:1,9 45:15,16,22 46:5 46:5 49:11,13,14 49:16 51:10 53:6</p>
---	--	--	---	--

Sherrill-type 7:11 shifting 50:23 show 19:21 51:19 shows 31:15 52:9 side 7:6 26:9 28:11 38:25 39:9 40:4,4 40:10,18 sign 51:25 significance 11:8 significant 18:7,17 22:10 30:14 36:10 significantly 9:20 silly 54:11 simply 14:13 15:10 22:6 24:16 43:8 44:19 47:5 single 46:12 50:20 Sioux 50:1,15 situation 32:2 smack 24:24 small 14:3 23:17 35:9 Smith 1:15 2:3,12 3:5,6,8 4:3,16 5:14 6:2,13,24 7:8 7:13 8:8,15,21 9:3 9:17 10:2,14 11:15,22 12:9,25 13:5,16,25 14:9 14:13,25 15:17 16:8,11 17:2,23 19:4,9,13,17 20:21 21:3,12 51:2,3,5 52:19 53:19 54:14 sold 47:23,24 Solem 4:2,4,6,18,23 5:1,3 7:2,3,21,21 8:7 10:6 11:4 18:1,10,17,20 20:7,9,11 21:9,9 21:16 26:11 27:11 28:3,20 29:8 30:3 32:1 38:12 45:18 49:1 50:14,15 Solicitor 1:15,19	somebody 20:3 sorry 12:19 13:20 16:11 26:16 sort 5:18 26:17 29:24 30:19 34:16 48:21 sorts 13:22 27:4 Sotomayor 8:18,25 9:9 13:20 14:2,10 14:16 31:7 44:23 45:1,5 sound 7:10 sovereign 6:4 7:16 9:8,24 10:1 14:21 42:24 sovereignty 6:19 7:16 13:21 14:22 18:24 19:8,10,11 19:16,21 39:19 40:2 46:1,6,9 speak 6:23 18:13 specific 22:15 39:1 specifically 18:1,9 22:18 specified 48:2 specifies 47:15 spend 39:24 split 39:2 stake 32:15 standalone 27:7 standard 17:24 start 9:22 15:5 38:18 40:8 51:6,7 starting 29:22 starts 17:25 26:24 state 3:16 5:20 6:16 7:3,17 8:12,15,17 12:10,12,16,19 13:10,14,15,16,21 16:3,16,17,18 32:10,21,21 33:15 33:22 34:22 37:25 38:23 39:7,13,13 39:15,20,23,25 40:1,6,14,21 41:6 41:12 45:18 46:15	46:21 47:14 52:8 52:25,25 53:25 State's 13:24 stated 8:7 statement 11:20 States 1:1,12 38:21 43:4 45:8,10 46:10,15,18 49:18 50:20 stations 33:2 status 21:1 24:14 38:16 49:9 statute 5:12 8:19 10:10 17:19 22:10 22:15,16,17 37:8 37:25 43:7,20 44:17,21 47:2 stipulated 15:19 stop 40:7 stopped 15:13 story 3:18 straddled 23:3 strange 24:22 street 53:1 streets 51:20 stretch 10:8 strong 4:25 students 39:11 subject 42:15 submitted 54:16,18 subsequent 4:7,18 10:5,8,9 11:6,7 20:17 26:5 50:2,9 substantially 36:11 substantive 44:3 substitute 14:5 succeeded 47:23 success 48:4 sudden 40:8 suddenly 19:23 suggest 17:17 50:21 suggesting 17:13 suggests 17:20 45:9 support 26:17 51:10 supportive 6:8	supports 22:16 26:6 suppose 37:6 40:21 41:17 supposed 17:7 52:3 52:5 Supreme 1:1,12 sure 21:7 34:5 43:13 surplus 8:1 10:15 10:16,20 24:16 27:9 49:6 surveys 54:11 <hr/> T <hr/> T 2:1,1 take 9:18 10:2 13:23 14:20 16:21 20:18 22:22 23:21 23:23 24:8,18,22 24:23 25:3,7,13 25:15,24 26:13,20 29:19 30:12 35:23 36:24 taken 24:1 takes 11:7 talk 17:18 28:21 29:2,3 talked 21:10,12 46:15 talking 8:10 17:4 25:19 28:23 35:11 36:14 42:8 43:2,3 43:5 44:18,18 45:6,7 46:11 48:24 50:2 talks 5:3 20:12 tax 8:11,14,18 9:1 12:8 14:5 16:20 32:10,10 33:4,15 36:13 taxation 9:2 14:11 taxes 8:17 32:23 44:6 tell 27:25 28:1 30:13 31:1 40:18	telling 22:14 28:1 45:17,20,21 terms 11:11,20 17:9 test 4:12,18,24 7:3 11:4 14:14 17:25 testified 46:24 text 22:10 48:5 Thank 21:21 25:21 38:5,6 51:1,5 54:13,14 theme 8:6 theory 15:1 32:11 32:22 47:19,25 thing 9:22 26:3 29:25 32:19 33:17 34:12 48:19 50:20 things 3:11,20 13:22 14:4,8 20:5 27:4 28:2 32:3,14 34:1,4 41:3 think 4:16,22 7:2 7:14 10:4 11:3 14:3,9,13,14 17:9 19:2,17 22:4,14 22:17 23:8,10,14 23:16 24:7,10,12 24:15,15,20,21 26:5,23 27:5,17 27:21,21,23 28:6 28:6,10 29:2,8,10 29:21 30:3,6,14 30:18 31:6,19,20 31:25 32:13 34:13 35:14 37:1,10,11 40:5 41:20 42:17 42:19 47:4,13,19 47:24 48:12,20,21 49:3,25 50:7,13 50:14 53:17 thinking 11:11,20 24:12 28:5 third 3:16 4:6,17 4:24 5:16,24 19:1 19:3 26:15 27:3,7 29:18,21 30:2
---	---	--	---	--

<p>32:1 thought 10:5,22 11:19 27:19,23 28:16 33:8 53:20 threatened 13:23 threatens 15:7 three 3:10,20 23:15 thrown 49:8 Thurston 30:11 37:23,24,25 46:24 47:11,15 tied 29:18,20 ties 30:1 time 11:6,19 21:19 22:15 24:12 times 3:23 10:18 20:7 tippling 47:19 48:3 title 38:14 today 42:19 told 52:13 total 20:13 totally 29:4 touchstone 50:4 town 33:25 34:14 34:14 39:2,3 township 35:3,4 tracks 30:17 transactions 32:24 33:5 transferred 48:14 treatment 40:17 50:2 treats 18:8 Tribal 13:18 16:1 18:15,18 20:4 22:21 23:13,21 24:13,18 25:12 28:7 32:17,25 33:4,18,19,20 35:7,9,12,12,21 35:23 36:24 38:2 38:4 42:12,13 51:19,21 52:8,15 53:1 54:5 tribe 3:14 8:19,19</p>	<p>9:4,24,25 11:25 12:6 13:19,20 14:2 15:1,15,17 15:24 16:3,12,19 16:24 18:11 19:5 19:7,9,16,24 22:25 25:24 26:4 30:23 31:8,15 32:4,11,22 33:3 33:10 35:19 36:2 37:9,13 39:11,17 40:8,23,24,24,25 41:3,6,13,13,18 42:5,23 44:10 45:7,25 46:2,5 53:12 54:5 tribe's 8:22,23 13:8 15:8 36:12 42:16 43:2 45:12 46:9 tribes 9:1,11 37:15 38:22 tried 46:2 47:21 true 3:11 5:23 6:13 9:7 37:2,14 39:8,9 40:3,4 try 14:17 43:12,12 trying 19:5 23:17 42:24 turn 10:18 37:18 turns 29:13 two 10:19 18:3 28:2 29:2,4 32:14 33:18 34:4 41:14 42:10,21 50:11,12 53:8,12</p> <hr/> <p>U</p> <p>U.S.C 43:7 ultimate 29:7 ultimately 26:17 37:17 unambiguously 34:15 uncertain 48:17 Uncertainty 53:24 understand 3:25</p>	<p>6:21 17:3 20:17 20:19 24:25 28:13 29:1 30:7 34:9,13 43:11 understanding 5:7 25:25 30:15,23 31:7 46:22 understood 20:14 undiminished 28:9 undisputed 39:4 51:15 unfair 53:14 unhappy 16:24 unilaterally 19:5 unique 10:16 36:19 46:14 United 1:1,12 43:3 45:8,10 46:10,15 46:18 49:18 50:20 unsettling 50:18,20 usage 5:22 use 10:8 17:11 uses 22:10 usual 17:20 usually 10:4</p> <hr/> <p>V</p> <p>v 1:5 3:4 29:3 38:12 vague 49:20 vehicle 34:10 vehicles 51:20 versus 13:7 view 4:24 27:6 29:20 viewed 45:19 village 13:24 33:18 35:22 37:11 villages 13:1 violates 28:8 volume 23:18 voluntarily 41:12 vote 16:25 20:2 45:15 54:6</p> <hr/> <p>W</p> <p>waived 20:23</p>	<p>Walthill 34:14 want 12:17,17 37:20 49:10 53:15 wanted 25:2 28:16 Washington 1:8,17 1:20 35:3 wasn't 11:20 16:11 wastewater 40:12 40:16 way 14:18 26:23 28:3,5 29:3,5,10 30:4 32:11 43:17 45:15 48:2 50:14 ways 29:2 we'll 3:3 27:4 we're 8:10 10:9 16:20,20 17:7,15 20:3 25:18 27:3 35:11 36:14 39:24 42:8 43:2,3,5 44:18,18 45:6,7 46:11 we've 9:11 14:25 17:6,12 18:3 19:23 20:1 41:5 52:12 wealthy 31:8 Wednesday 1:9 weight 19:1 welfare 15:9 well-defined 18:5 went 24:13 28:3 weren't 11:11 14:21 west 15:24 18:4,8 18:11 22:22 23:1 24:22 25:7 26:1 30:23 31:2 40:4 40:10 42:12 western 16:7,8,15 22:20 23:20 31:16 32:24 38:1 42:2,4 42:7 44:6 who-done-its 52:2 wholly 48:10 winds 29:24</p>	<p>Winnebago 34:18 46:25 Winnebagos 47:17 witness 26:16 wondering 10:11 17:18 words 18:2 28:24 workable 53:8 world 27:6 worry 40:23 wouldn't 39:13,14 47:14 49:9 52:10 52:11,13,14 writing 26:14 written 10:7 wrong 4:11 12:20 30:22 wrote 27:22 43:25</p> <hr/> <p>X</p> <p>x 1:2,7</p> <hr/> <p>Y</p> <p>Yankton 50:1,15 years 6:6 9:25 13:10 19:23 20:17 47:8 52:23 53:14</p> <hr/> <p>Z</p> <hr/> <p>0</p> <hr/> <p>1</p> <hr/> <p>10 23:9 10:19 1:13 3:2 11:17 54:17 1161 43:7 130 9:25 13:10 19:22 52:23 14-1406 1:4 3:4 15 23:6,8,9 41:24 150 53:14 18 43:7 1800s 10:19 1872 47:21 48:9 1882 3:23 11:20 22:2 47:2,23</p>
--	---	--	--	---

1911 36:21
1922 38:1
1950s 30:16
1960s 30:16
1970 37:4

2

20 1:9
2016 1:9
21 2:7
215 51:16
216 51:16
22 7:14
25 7:14 20:24
280 34:6,8

3

3 2:4
30 47:8
300 47:22 50:18
300-plus 23:14
318 51:16
319 51:17
371 35:18
372 35:18
38 2:10

4

471 7:22

5

51 2:13

6

609 51:17
611 51:17

7

8

8 22:18 25:23
850 23:9

9

900 23:9
98 3:13
98-point-whatever
41:19