

NOV 2 1959

No. 10 Original

JAMES R. BROWNING, C

IN THE  
**Supreme Court of the United States**

OCTOBER TERM, 1959

---

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, *Plaintiff*

v.

STATES OF LOUISIANA, TEXAS, MISSISSIPPI,  
ALABAMA AND FLORIDA, *Defendants*

---

**APPENDIX TO LOUISIANA'S REPLY BRIEF AND  
MOTION TO FILE WITH SUPPORTING STATEMENT**

---

JACK P. F. GREMILLION  
*Attorney General*

W. SCOTT WILKINSON  
VICTOR A. SACHSE  
EDWARD M. CARMOUCHE  
JOHN L. MADDEN  
BAILEY WALSH

*Special Assistant Attorneys  
General, State of Louisiana*

HUGH M. WILKINSON  
MORRIS WRIGHT  
JAMES R. FULLER  
FRANK B. ELLIS  
MARC DUPUY, JR.  
*Of Counsel*



IN THE  
**Supreme Court of the United States**

OCTOBER TERM, 1959

---

No. 10 ORIGINAL

---

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, *Plaintiff*

v.

STATES OF LOUISIANA, TEXAS, MISSISSIPPI,  
ALABAMA AND FLORIDA, *Defendants*

---

**APPENDIX TO MOTION OF THE STATE OF  
LOUISIANA FOR LEAVE TO FILE REPLY  
BRIEF WITH SUPPORTING STATEMENT**

---

*Alaska Pacific Fisheries v. United States*, 248 U.S. 78, In this case the United States successfully sued Alaska Pacific Fisheries to prevent that company from maintaining a fish trap within a reservation established for Indians. The Act of Congress described the reservation only as "The body of lands known as Annette Islands." The trap was not on any of the islands but in the submerged lands beneath the waters. In pertinent part this Court said:

“The principal question for decision is whether the reservation created by the Act of 1891 embraces only the upland of the islands or includes as well the adjacent waters and submerged lands. The question is one of construction—of determining what Congress intended by the words ‘the body of lands known as Annette Islands.’

“As an appreciation of the circumstances in which words are used usually is conducive and at times is essential to a right understanding of them, it is important, in approaching a solution of the question stated, to have in mind the circumstances in which the reservation was created— \* \* \*

“That Congress had power to make the reservation inclusive of the adjacent waters and submerged land as well as the upland needs little more than statement. \* \* \*

“The reservation was not in the nature of a private grant, but simply a setting apart ‘until otherwise provided by law’, of designated public property for a recognized public purpose— \* \* \*

“\* \* \* It [Congress] did not reserve merely the site of their village, or the island on which they were dwelling, but the whole of what is known as Annette Islands, and referred to it as a single body of lands. This, as we think, shows that the geographical name was used, as is sometimes done, in a sense of embracing the intervening and surrounding waters as well as the upland—in other words, as descriptive of the area comprising the islands.

“This conclusion has support in the general rule that statutes passed for the benefit of dependent Indian tribes or communities are to be liberally construed; doubtful expressions being resolved in favor of the Indians.”



