

TITLE 25 - INDIANS**CHAPTER 19 - INDIAN LAND CLAIMS SETTLEMENTS****SUBCHAPTER VII - WASHINGTON INDIAN (PUYALLUP) LAND CLAIMS SETTLEMENT****§ 1773. Congressional findings and purpose****(a) Findings**

The Congress finds and declares that:

(1) It is the policy of the United States to promote tribal self-determination and economic self-sufficiency and to support the resolution of disputes over historical claims through settlements mutually agreed to by Indian and non-Indian parties.

(2) Disputes over certain land claims of the Puyallup Tribe and other matters, including—

(A) ownership of the Commencement Bay tidelands and areas of former Puyallup Riverbed, lands within the Puyallup Tribe's Treaty Reservation, or intended reservation boundaries,

(B) railroad and other rights-of-way,

(C) control of fisheries resource and habitat,

(D) jurisdiction over law enforcement, environment, navigation, and authority and control in the areas of land use,

(E) business regulation and zoning,

have resulted in difficult community relations and negative economic impacts affecting both the Tribe and non-Indian parties.

(3) Some of the significant historical events that led to the present circumstances include—

(A) the negotiation of the Treaty of Medicine Creek in December 1854, by the Puyallup Indians and others, by which the tribes ceded most of their territories but reserved certain lands and rights, including fishing rights;

(B) the Executive Order of 1857 creating the Puyallup Indian Reservation;

(C) the Executive Order of 1873, clarifying and extending the Puyallup Reservation in the Washington Territory;

(D) the March 11, 1891, Report of the Puyallup Indian Commission on allotments and the 1896 report by a second Puyallup Indian Commission describing the problems with sales of allotted lands; and

(E) the 1909 District Court for Tacoma decision of the United States of America against J.M. Ashton and the 1910 Supreme Court decision of United States of America against J.M. Ashton.

(4) It is recognized that both Indian and non-Indian parties enter into this settlement to resolve certain problems and claims and to derive certain benefits.

(5) There is a recognition that any final resolution of pending disputes through a process of litigation would take many years and entail great expense to all parties; continue economically and socially damaging controversies; prolong uncertainty as to the access, ownership, and jurisdictional status of issues in question; and seriously impair long-term economic planning and development for all parties.

(6) To advance the goals of Federal policy of Indian self-determination and to carry out the trust responsibility of the United States, and to advance the Federal policy of international trade and economic development, and in recognition of the Federal policy of settling these conflicts through comprehensive settlement agreements, it is appropriate that the United States participate in the funding and implementation of the Settlement Agreement.

(b) Purpose

Therefore, it is the purpose of this subchapter—

NB: This unofficial compilation of the U.S. Code is current as of Jan. 8, 2008 (see <http://www.law.cornell.edu/uscode/uscpri.html>).

- (1) to approve, ratify, and confirm the agreement entered into by the non-Indian settlement parties and the Puyallup Tribe of Indians,
- (2) to authorize and direct the Secretary to implement the terms of such agreement, and
- (3) to authorize the actions and appropriations necessary to implement the provisions of the Settlement Agreement and this subchapter.

(Pub. L. 101–41, § 2, June 21, 1989, 103 Stat. 83.)

Short Title

Section 1 of Pub. L. 101–41 provided that: “This Act [enacting this subchapter] may be cited as the ‘Puyallup Tribe of Indians Settlement Act of 1989’.”