| 1. | OPEN MEETING ON THE ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE |
|-----|---|
| 2 | AS IT AFFECTS AMERICAN INDIANS |
| 3 | IN OFF RESERVATION AREAS OF ARIZONA |
| 4 | CONDUCTED BY THE ARIZONA ADVISORY COMMITTEE . |
| 5 | TO THE |
| 6 | U.S. COMMISSION ON CIVIL RIGHTS |
| 7 | November 17-18, 1975 |
| 8 | Flagstaff, Arizona |
| 9 | |
| 10 | |
| 11 | (The following persons were present during the hearing) |
| 12 | COMMITTEE: |
| 13. | Dr. Morrison Warren, Chairperson |
| 14 | Ms. Juana Lyon Mr. Peterson Zah |
| 15 | Ms. Rita Madrid . Ms. Maria Molina |
| 16 | Ms. Grace McCullah Ms. Catherine Palmquist |
| 17 | Mr. Theodore Williams |
| 18 | STAFF: |
| 19 | Dr. Shirley Hill Witt, Regional Director |
| 20 | Dr. Maria Pares Mr. William Levis |
| 21 | Ms. Phỳllis Santangelo Ms. Esther Johnson |
| 22 | |
| 23 | THE ABOVE ENTITLED hearing was held in Flagstaff, |
| 24 | Arizona, on November 17 and 18, 1975, and the following |
| 25 | proceedings were had, to wit: |
| | |

| | <u> </u> | 1 |
|----|--|-----------|
| 1 | INDEX | • |
| 2 | Volume I | |
| 3 | November 17, 1975 | |
| 4 | * | «. |
| 5 | SPEAKER * | PAGE |
| 6 | Dr. J. Lawrence Walkup | 7 |
| 7 | Dr. Peterson Zah | 9 |
| 8 | Ms. Arlene Tuchawena | "· 14 |
| 9 | Mr. John Thompson | 22 |
| 10 | Judge Joseph C. Garcia | 32 |
| 11 | Ms. Rose Benally | 57 |
| 12 | Mr. Ronald C. Wood | 58 |
| 13 | Mr. Tom Gonzalez | 58 |
| 14 | Mr. Fred Croxen | 73 |
| 15 | Ms. Nancy Hicks | 87 |
| 16 | Mr. Thomas Carr | 87 |
| 17 | Mr. Robert Gaylord | 87 |
| 18 | Mr. Bryan Short | 88 |
| 19 | Judge William Brady | 122 |
| 20 | To the second se | |
| 21 | | |
| 22 | | |
| 23 | | |
| 24 | | |
| 25 | The same of the sa | |
| | | 5 |

THE CHAIR: Ladies and Gentlemen, this open meeting of the Arizona Advisory Committee to the U.S. Civil -- to the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights will please come to order.

I am Dr. Morrison Warren, Chairperson of the Arizona Advisory Committee. The other members of this committee are Ms. Rita Madrid, Ms. Juana Lyon, Mr. Ted Williams is out, he will return shortly. And Mr. Peterson Zah.

Other members of the committee not present today are Peter McDonald, Grace McCullah, who will be here tomorrow, Dr. Randolph Gerber, Ms. Catherine Palmquist, Ms. Maria Elba, Mr. Edward Guerrero, Senator Manuel Pena, Senator Diane McCarthy and Dr. John Glass.

Also with us today are Dr. Shirley Hill Witt, who is the director of the Mountain States Regional Office, Dr. Maria Pares, who is outside, Mr. Bill Levis, Ms. Becky Marruho (Phonetic), who I see in the audience, Ms. Esther Johnson, and Ms. Phyllis Santangelo, also from the Denver office.

This meeting is being held pursuant to rules applicable to state advisory committees and other requirements promulgated by the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights.

The Commission on Civil Rights is an independent,

bipartisan agency of the U.S. Government, established by Congress in 1957 and authorized by the Civil Rights Acts, first, to investigate complaints alleging that citizens are being deprived of their right to vote because of their race, color, sex, religion or national origins.

Secondly, to collect and study information concerning legal developments which constitute a denial of equal protection of the laws under the Constitution.

Thirdly, to appraise federal laws and policies with respect to denials of equal protection of the laws.

Fourthly, to serve as a national clearing house for civil rights information. And fifthly, to investigate allegations of voter fraud in elections.

The commission has established 51 state advisory committees like ours in Arizona, to advise the commission of relevant information concerning matters within the jurisdiction of the commission and matters of mutual concern in the preparation of reports of the commission to the President and Congress.

The advisory committee may receive reports, suggestions and recommendations from individuals, public and private organizations and public officials on matters pertinent to inquiries conducted by the state committees, and attend, as observers, any open hearings or conferences which the commission may hold within the state.

This session today is an informal hearing, and not an adversary proceeding or court of law. Individuals have been invited to share with the committee information relating to the administration of justice as it affects

American Indians in off-reservation areas. Each person who will participate has voluntarily agreed to meet with the committee.

During the public meeting today the advisory committee will explore the, regarding the treatment American Indians receive during the administration of justice process in off-reservation areas.

We will hear testimony regarding the jury selection process, arraignments, arrests, bail bond procedures, the legal rights of American Indian defendants, local jail conditions and jurisdictional problems. Related issues such as the availability of local alcoholic reception centers and other rehabilitative facilities will also be discussed.

Since this is an open hearing, the press, radio and television stations, as well as individuals, are welcome. However, no witness shall be televised, filmed or photographed during the informal hearing nor shall testimony be recorded for broadcasting if a witness objects.

We're very concerned that we bring out all of the information relating to the matter under inquiry. We're

also concerned, however, that no individual be the victim of slander or libelous statements. As a precaution against this happening, each person making a statement here today or answering questions, has been interviewed prior to this meeting.

However, in the unlikely event that such a situation should develop it will be necessary for me to call this to the attention of the person making the statement and request that he or she desist in such action. If any persons in the audience today have statements or information they would like to share with the advisory committee, both staff and committee members are available to meet with you individually, particularly Dr. Maria Pares or Bill Levis.

Also, any persons wishing to submit documents into the record of this open meeting may do so within a 30-day period.

Every effort has been made to invite persons who are knowledgeable about the problems and progress in this area. In an effort to present a well-balanced picture of the problems encountered by Native Americans in the administration of justice in off-reservation areas, we have invited panels of law enforcement officials, members of Indian tribes and nations, city, county and state judges, and other interested persons.

The meeting will provide the basis for a written report by the advisory committee, containing findings and recommendations about the issues raised today. As you see, we have a Court Reporter who records the proceedings to insure that we receive, accurately, all statements made by panel participants and witnesses.

On behalf of the advisory committee, let me welcome all of you here today.

We've asked Dr. J. Lawrence Walkup, President of Northern Arizona University, to extend greetings. Dr. Walkup.

DR. J. LAWRENCE WALKUP

A. (By Dr. Walkup) Dr. Warren, after hearing the assignment that you people have here as the advisory committee of the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, I'm quite impressed with the responsibility and the amount of information I'm sure will be forthcoming.

I want to welcome you and to — to the campus and those of you from other parts of the state, to the Northern Arizona University. And I'm sure that from the information and from the intense study and the considerations that you give to each person's problems and points of view, as well as the description of the historical background of how

2

activities and procedures that justice is carried out over the years, that I -- I'm sure there will be some things that will bring about better -- a better and more just way of doing this.

Also, I would like to say to those who have been involved in trying to carry out the law as it's written today, and our law enforcement personnel, our public defenders; our Native Americans and representatives of the state as a whole, I would like to welcome this group and I hope that you people will have a -- and I know you will have a chance to present, as you see this overall involvement and the problems.

So this certainly will give a broad communication to hear from various segments, and I would like to compliment and, as a citizen of Arizona, and thank the advisory committee for taking this time, taking their time to work on this problem.

Now, my closing comments are, if I can be of, or we can be here, at the university, of service in bringing about better communication, helping you in any way, why, we would like to help and be of assistance to your project and your responsibilities.

Thank you very much.

THE CHAIR: Thank you, sir. Thank you very much. We have a further statement by Mr. Peterson Zah.

DR. PETERSON ZAH

A. (By Dr. Zah) Dr. Warren, Dr. Walkup, Ladies and Gentlemen, Committee Members. The Civil Rights of American Indians in the southwest have been a great concern to the United States Commission on Civil Rights in the recent years. The commission held hearings in 1972 and 1973 on issues of concern to Indians in Albuquerque, New Mexico, Phoenix and in Window Rock, Arizona.

The southwest Indian report based on the 1972 hearings dealt with the issue of employment, education, health, water rights and administration of justice. In 1974, the commission's Arizona Advisory Committee conducted a followup investigation of Indian employment problems. And the New Mexico Advisory Committee held a followup hearing in Farmington, New Mexico, on civil rights affecting the Navajo people.

The Arizona Advisory Committee has found that the administration of justice in the areas near the reservation continues to be an issue of grave and widespread concern among the American Indians in the states. Statistics from 1970 census demonstrates that Native Americans continue to be excluded from participation in the sharing of economic wealth of this nation.

For instance, the 1970 statistics indicates that the

or instance, the 1970 statistics indicates

3

compared to a median income of \$6,446.00 for White men, and \$2,330.00 for White women.

Comparable figures for Arizona show the same dis-

median income was \$3,501.00 for Native Americans, men.

Comparable figures for Arizona show the same disparity. The 1970 statistics for Arizona recorded a median income of \$2,247.00 for Native American men, and \$1,283.00 for Native American women, compared to a median income of \$9,484.00 for White population.

Further comparison shows that in 1970, approximately 62% of the Native American population in the nation earned less than \$5,000.00 per year, compared to 18% of the White population. Comparable figures for Arizona reveals that 43% of the Native American population earned less than \$5,000.00, compared to 19% of the White population

The rights of nonreservation Native Americans are protected by the United States Constitution. And those off-reservation Native Americans are protected by the 1968 Civil Rights Act. Since 1924, Native Americans have been a citizen of the United States and the state in which they reside. This entitles them to the same federal and state provisions or protections as any other citizens.

The fifth and 14th Amendment to the United States

Constitution guarantees that neither the federal nor the

state government will deprive a person of life, liberty or

property without due process of law.

The due process clause requires that the government act fairly and justly when it directly affects persons or their property. The Constitution also guarantees that defendants have a right to an attorney in state and federal criminal proceedings, and the right to free counsel if they can not afford one.

The police may not question any suspect until the suspects have been advised of their rights to remain silent and to have an attorney present. Once arrested for serious offenses, the accused may be brought before a judge for arraignment where they are informed of the charges and given an opportunity to plead guilty or not guilty. The judge must inform the defendant of their constitional rights, including the right to counsel, at this time.

The Eighth Amendment to the Constitution guarantees the right to a reasonable bail except when a defendant is charged with a crime punishable by death or life imprisonment.

Most important, in cases affecting minorities, the 14th Amendment to the United States Constitution prohibits both the state and the federal government from denying any person equal protection of the laws. Even where a law appears impartial, and nondiscriminatory, it violates the Constitution if it is applied in a discriminatory manner. For instance, only against Native Americans.

Arizona courts are bound by all previously discussed United States Constitution requirements in addition to state-approved procedural and substance guarantees within its constitution statutes and rules of criminal procedures. Once arrested, a suspect must be granted a hearing before a magistrate within 24 hours or be released.

At the initial appearance the magistrate may identify the defendant, advise them of the charges, their right to counsel and their right to remain silent, and appoint free counsel if necessary. If a complaint is not filed within 48 hours of the initial appearance, the person also must be released.

At the initial appearance, the magistrate must also determine whether to release a defendant charged with bailable offenses on their own recognizance or to make them post a bond.

In Arizona, the defendants have the fundamental right to counsel unless there is no prospect of confinement after judgment. In addition, counsel must be appointed for those who can not afford an attorney if punishment may result in a loss of liberty or if the interests of the justice requires it. Except in minor traffic cases a judge will accept guilty pleas only if voluntarily and intelligently made in open court.

14.

Before accepting such a plea, the judge must personally address a defendant in open court, inform them of their rights and determine if they understand the nature of the charge, the nature and the range of possible sentences, and the constitutional rights they are waiving, including the right to counsel and the right to plead not guilty.

In 1972, Arizona decriminalized public drunkenness. According to the attorney general, the legislature intended after much research and deliberation, to provide a means for treatment for alcoholism and alcohol-related problems outside the criminal justice system. The act called for the creation of local alcoholism reception centers for evaluation, treatment and prevention of alcoholism and intoxicated persons.

Americans is jury selection. Once placed on the jury list and drawn, a reservation Indian must be subpoensed to serve as a juror. To do otherwise would violate the due process clause of the 14th Amendment to the Constitution, and federal statutes which makes it illegal to disqualify a citizen as a juror because of race.

THE CHAIR: The procedure that we'll use today, we have five panels who will appear before the commission, we'll ask the respective panels to come and to sit, and

1 there are a series of questions that we wish to ask the 2 panel members. 3 I'd like to reiterate the fact that we are a fact-4 finding, data-collecting group, who prepares reports, 5 advise the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights for further 6 action in their reports to the President and Congress. 7 With that as background, is Ms. Arlene Tuchawena 8 and Mr. John Thompson in the audience today? 9 Will you come forward and sit here, please? 10 And Mr. Frank Howard here? 11 For the benefit of Mr. Howard, the first series of 12 questions will be directed at Ms. Tuchawena. 13 First of all, Ms. Tuchawena, will you pronounce 14 your name for me, please? 15 16 17 MS. ARLENE TUCHAWENA 18 19 (By Ms. Tuchawena) That's right, Tuchawena. A. 20 (By the Chair) Thank you. Will you please state Q: 21 your name, your address and your occupation? 22 A. Arelene Tuchawena, my --23 Address, please? Q. 24 Home address is Tuba City Public School Housing, A. 25 and I teach at Tuba City Public School.

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

- Q. Thank you. And public school, elementary school?
- A. Intermediate school.
- Q Intermediate school, thank you.

Ms. Tuchawena, will you please describe your encounter with the Flagstaff Police Department? We face a little problem, too, of being heard, so if you'll throw your voice we'll appreciate it.

- A. Well, I was driving down, I don't remember what street it is, it's the turnoff right at the Green Lawn Mortuary, and, well -- I'm kind of nervous --
 - Q We want you to describe your encounter with the --
- A Okay. Well, what I did was I ran a stop sign, which I didn't intend to do, because prior to that there used to be a yield sign, and I was -- I wasn't fully aware they had changed to a stop sign. And I just ran it.

And just — just to the right of me there was a police car and I knew they saw me, so I pulled right over, and he didn't have to turn on his red lights or anything, so I stopped and he approached the car and asked for my driver's license and I gave it to him. And he asked me if I knew what I had done, and I said I was aware of it. And he says — he looked at my driver's license and he said that I — he says, well, you're from the reservation. I said yes. He says, well, you're going to have to go down to the police station and post bond. And I asked him why?

And he says, well, you're from the reservation, so all reservation Indians, you know, need to go down to post bond whenever they get caught for something.

And I told him well, this is just a traffic violation. Couldn't I just be issued a citation? And he said no. And he — he ordered me to get into the police car. And I told him I didn't — I wasn't going to. And, well, we had a little conversation there, and he started — well, he says, if you don't get into the car I'm going to have to force you. And I told him, well, could I follow you down to the police station? And I was with my — my daughter and my niece and a cousin of mine: And I didn't want to leave them there alone.

So I asked him, I said, could I follow you to the police station? And he says no, you're going to have to ride in the police car. And I kept insisting that I wouldn't. And he just opened the door, he says, you know, do you want me to force you? And I had no choice but to get out and get to the police car.

Q Okay. Let me ask you some specific questions to help bring out.

Could you -- was this quite upsetting to you?

- A It was.
- Q Could you identify factors that made it so?
- A Well, I'm -- I'm teaching and, you know, I don't want

I don't like for my kids to see me in the situation like that. And it was during the Pow Wow, and, you know, you expect most of your students or other teachers to be around. And that's -- that's what I didn't like.

- Q Can you give us the approximate date, during the Pow Wow?
- A It was the day -- I'm not too sure of the date.
 July 5th, I think.
 - Q In the neighborhood of July 4th?
 - A Yes.
- Q Okay. Why did the police officer ask you to post bond for a minor traffic violation? Was that ever clarified for you?
- A Well, he said I was a resident of the reservation, I wasn't a resident of Flagstaff, and I told him, I was a resident of Flagstaff because at the time I was residing on campus going to summer school. And I said I live here on campus. Doesn't that make me a legal resident? And he said, it doesn't show it on your driver's license. He says, when you have a change of address you should show it on your driver's license. And I told him that I'm only here for the summer, I don't need to -- to get a change of address on my driver's license. Because my driver's license showed my Tuba City address.
 - Q. Now, were you released?

1 A. No, I was taken to the police station. 2 Q. You were taken. Now, what was the nature of your 3 protest or the intensity of your protest? How did you protest? 5 Well, I -- I didn't think I --A. 6 Would you describe it? Q. 7 I didn't think I should have been taken to the A. 8 police station. If I -- if I was to go there I would have 9 gone on my own. I would have followed him, and nothing .10 would have happened. 11 Now, did you post bond? 12 A. I posted bond, \$12.00. 13 And was that returned to you? Q. 14 That was returned just about ten minutes after I A. 15 paid it. 16 Q. Now, are we correct in thinking that a second 17 police officer intervened in the process of your being --18 Yes, after I was putting up a big fuss about being 19 brought in, and a second policeman came around and he 20 asked what the commotion was about and I told him. 21 then he says that I shouldn't have been brought in, that 22 I was a resident of Flagstaff and no residents of Flagstaff 23 should be brought in to post bond, just -- just have a ci-24 tation written out.

25

Q.

Now, the fact that you were grieved, did you follow

1 up with any public official regarding your arrest? 2 were you arrested? That's a form of arrest, I would 3 suspect. 4 A. Yes. 5 Did you follow up on the process, complain to any 6 other official? 7 I went to Judge Brady? Judge Brady? A. I went to 8 see him about it, and he got, I guess he got upset about it so he went down to Maxwell, Chief of Police Maxwell, 10 we went down to see him, and I told him what had happened, 11 and he said he was going to have a talk with the officer. 12 And I don't know what happened after that. 13 (By Mr. Zah) - I want to make sure that I understand 14 There is a second policeman that intervenes, 15 did that happen at the time of your arrest? 16 A. No. 17 On the road or back at the jail? Q. 18 A. At the police station. 19 At the police station. Q. 20 Second question is, what happened to the parties 21 that you were with? 22 A. Well, my cousin had just -- she had a driver's 23 license so they said she could follow us back and she did 24 follow us to the police station. 25 How long did you stay at the jail? Q.

A. About 30 minutes.

د تور

Q (By the Chair) Has there been any followup, Ms.

Tuchawena, any notification from the police department
in the form of an apology or any statement regarding what
steps will be taken to prevent this kind of practice from
continuing? Has there been any followup at all?

A. No. Only -- only Chief of Police Maxwell said that he would have a talk with the officer and that s the last I heard of it.

Q And that was the night of the encounter or the time of the encounter?

A. Uh-huh.

Q Now, the next statement can help us kind of conceputualize this whole process, and having been involved, we'd be very interested in your comments, and that is, in your opinion, what should be done to prevent similar type incidents in Flagstaff?

A. Well, for one thing, the officer didn't know -well, he didn't know the rules and regulations of the
department. Because as the other officer said, NAU
residents, whether it be summer or full time resident -students are legally residents of Flagstaff. And this
officer didn't seem to know that.

THE CHAIR: Fine. Anyone else have any other questions of Ms. Tuchawena that you wish to raise?

1 MR. LEVIS: I have one or two. 2 (By Mr. Levis) Ms. Tuchawena, was there ever any O. 3 explanation given to you as to why there is such a dis-4 tinction between reservation and nonreservation residents? .5 Yes, the second officer said it was hard to bring 6 reservation Indians in for court, that it was better for 7 them to pay the bond because, you know, they can't go out 8 to the reservation to bring in the person. 9 had committed an offense. 10 Even though residents of the reservation and Tuba 11 City are also residents of the State of Arizona? 12 Yes. 13 So all reservation Indians must post bond? Q. 14 Α. Yes. 15 And this is not Q. 16 That's what I understood. A. 17 Now, why did the officer who intervened release 18 you without posting bond or refunded your bond? 19 I don't know. Well, he said that -- that I shouldn't A. 20 have been brought in. That I was -- that I should have 21 just been issued a citation. And not be required to pay 22 -- to post bond. 23 Q. Are you aware of any similar incidents that have 24 occurred to your friends or anyone else? 25 A. No.

°,

1 0. Did you receive a formal apology or --2 A. NO. 3 THE CHAIR: Any other questions by any commission 4 member? 5 If not, thank you very much, Ms. Tuchawena. 6 The next questions will be directed at Mr. Thompson. 7 Will you please state your name, your address and your 8 occupation, Mr. John Thompson, please? 9 10 MR. JOHN THOMPSON 11 (Mr. Frank Howard served as interpreter) 12 13 (By the Interpreter) My name is John Thompson. My 14 address is Box 52 Star Route, Winslow, Arizona. 15 Q. (By the Chair) Mr. Thompson, could you describe 16 your experience of May 3, 1975, with the Flagstaff police? 17 The incident happened on that date that was mentioned, A. 18 he was driving, himself and his wife been driving from the 19 K-Mart shopping area across the main thoroughfare, was 20 crossing that to another shopping area which is called 21 Green Lawn shopping area. 22 He was crossing, going across there when he stopped 23 before he crossed the main thoroughfare. As he stopped, 24 there was some traffic going from the west and some coming 25 from the east. As he noticed that he stopped, there was a

patrol car coming from the east side. And then there was some traffic went through from the west side, then, after that was, he passed across to Green Lawn shopping area.

As he did so, the traffic, patrol car made a signal, had his spotlight on him, or the blinking lights over the car to stop. So he had to stop the -- just right close by that Chinese Cafe in the Green Lawn area shopping center area. And the policeman stopped him and he walked, and the policeman walked up to him and told him that he was driving on the wrong side.

So he, the policeman told him to move his -- drove up about a 100 yards from where he stopped, and so he did so. He drove up another 100 yards and he stopped. Then the policeman walked up to him, he left his patrol car at the place where he stopped him.

side my pickup, he inquired about my driver's license and also the pickup's title, the car title. So I produced the driver's license and also the car, the pickup title, which I had in the car. So the policeman checked both of them and he told me that the reason why he stopped him was he was driving on the wrong side of the road.

At that time there was no citation written out, and the officer told me to produce \$12.00 in order that he would be let -- let go. So the officer told me to produce

\$12.00 so I took my pocketbook out. The only cash I had was only \$7.00. That was between us two.

I showed the \$7.00 to the officer, that's all I had in my pocket. But the officer insisted that I should pay him the \$12.00 right that minute. And the officer said, your wife might have some money. And my wife's answer was that she don't have any — any money also. So the officer stated that within the — if you don't produce the \$12.00 within five minutes, I'm going to take you to the jail. So there was no way that we could produce the \$12.00, all that we had was \$7.00. So the officer took me to his patrol car and he locked me in, inside the patrol car. And he went back to the pickup and there was some — some other things behind the pickup in the back, he throw that in the front seat and locked the pickup on both sides.

So my wife had to go walk back to K-Mart shopping center, trying to find somebody that he would -- she would recognize that, where she can borrow some money.

It so happens that there was a party there at the shopping center that she knew. And she went to the party and requested for some money. To borrow some money in order to pay the \$12.00 bail. It so happens that the party didn't have any cash on hand so they had to write a check for \$5.00. When this check was presented to the

officer, the officer said he doesn't want no check, he wants cash. So if the officer can not take the check, besides the \$7.00 already on hand, so he was taken to the -- to jail, to the city jail.

So his wife, on his own, had to go on the west side of town to see her brother, residing on the west side of town. By the name of John K. Thompson. Together with the brother they went to the police station where the cash payment of \$5.00 was made, including the \$7.00 that was on hand. So he was let go by the policeman after this was done.

THE CHAIR: I have a series of brief questions.

A I forgot to mention, I skipped a part of his statement. At the time when the officer came to his pickup
when he was sitting in the pickup, then requesting for
the driver's license and car title, the officer wanted
\$12.00 cash right that minute. When this was not done,
the officer grabbed his left hand, his left wrist, without
any warning the officer opened the door and jerked the
door open and grabbed his wrist and tried to throw him out
bodily. But at the same time he grabbed the steering wheel
and held on.

But he had the -- previously injured his left ankle, so he -- he was only -- he was not wearing a shoe. He was wearing one of these shoe that -- bedroom slippers, the

ones that he's wearing now. He was wearing one of those at the time. Because of the injury to his knee.

So the officer --

THE CHAIR: His knee or his foot, Mr. Howard, please?

His left ankle.

THE CHAIR: Thank you.

A So maybe after several minutes the officer threw him out of the car to the pavement. So that was where he reinjured his left injured ankle.

So the -- he was in pain, and right at that moment when he was in pain, while the officer was trying to drag him toward the patrol car, and right at that time when he reinjured his left ankle, he called out to the officer that he -- his ankle was hurting him, that his ankle was paining him, so right at that time the officer just stopped, stopped him, dragging him.

I skipped that part of his statement.

THE CHAIR: Thank you, sir.

Peter?

Q (By Mr. Zah) I think what I'll do is, you know, ask the question in English and then ask it again in Navajo and then you can respond in the English or interpret his response.

What is your occupation? And then did you ever have any experience with the police like this during your life?

1 In response to the two questions that were posed A. 2 by Mr. Zah, my job for 25 years that I've been working for the Santa Fe Railroad just north of Winoma, where 3 4 there's a cinder, gravel pit. I've been working there 5 for at least 25 years. And also at the same time, I've been a member of the church for at least 28 years, going 6 7 on 29. And also I preach in the church to my people. 8 Within all that years. And never that I have had any 9 problem or trouble with any policeman in the past, such 10 as what had happened to me. I never had any problems 11 with -- previously with any police or law enforcement 12 officer. So that's the way I'm situated at the present. 13 THE CHAIR: There's a statement that Mr. Zah is 14 going to check, Mr. Howard, to see if Mr. Thompson is 15

in agreement with it, and if he has any changes in it and then this will complete our testimony.

MR. ZAH: Dr. Warren, I'm a very slow reader and you might want to ask some other questions while I go over this.

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

THE CHAIR: Well, I think they're all included there.

- Q. (By Mr. Levis) Mr. Thompson, do you live on or off the Navajo reservation?
 - A. Yes, I reside on the Navajo reservation.
 - Was this the reason given to you for a bond of \$12.00 Q.

by the police officer?

- A. He never mentioned that.
- Q Was the only reason he pulled you over because he said you were driving left of center of the road?
 - A. What do you mean?
- Q Was there any other reason besides driving -was there any other reason given besides supposedly
 driving left of center of the road for the police
 officer stopping you?
- A There was no other reason besides the alleged charge of driving on the wrong side of the road. That was the only reason why he was forcibly thrown out of his own pickup. But this has come to the judge, there was a hearing been made on this, on this problem, where myself and my wife had testified before the judge and also the officer that made the charge against me also testified before the judge.

And the judge's ruling at that time was that the officer was in the wrong, so for that reason, the judge has dismissed the case on that incident.

- Q. What was the judge's name?
- A. He doesn't know the judge's name. He's kind of elderly person.
- Q Does he know if it was justice of the peace court or city court?

0

A I think it's the city that's --

Q (By Mr. Zah) Mr. Thompson and Interpreter Frankie Howard, I want to show this letter to Mr. Thompson and see if he can identify the letter and then, you know, ask him one other question in so far as the content of the letter.

A. He's unable to read the letter so he's not very familiar with it.

Yes, he's aware of this letter, and he was given a carbon copy of it, and he left his copy at home.

THE CHAIR: Has it been interpreted to him, Mr. Howard? Did he know and understand what the contents of the letter was?

- A Yes, he understood the letter.
- Q. Was he in substantial agreement with the letter?
- A. Yes, he's in agreement with this letter, but also there was a return letter made from the officer which states that the incident happened at night, that was the officer's statement in the letter that was returned to the attorney that wrote the letter.
- Q (By Mr. Zah) Mr. Thompson, that letter contains everything that you have said, you know, up to now, except there's one discrepancy. And in that letter it states that the arresting officer also made some accusation in so far as you, you know, being intoxicated at the time of

you know, of your arrest. And I would like for you to make maybe one short comment on that. Did that happen or did it not happen?

A. In response to the question, at the time when the police officer arrested him, the officer has mentioned or stated to him that he was under the influence of alcohol. But John's wife stated in answer to the officer that it may have been so about 28 years ago, my husband used to use that, but that was long time ago. That was the answer given back to the officer.

THE CHAIR: Mr. Howard, does Mrs. Thompson speak or understand English?

A. I believe so.

Q (By the Chair) And the question that I'm getting at, at the time of the encounter between the police officer and Mr. Thompson, if he does not speak or understand English, how did he know that he was being asked for \$12.00?

A Well, even though he don't have any education at all, but he understands what — what the officer was saying, he knows the meaning of what — he understood, but at the time when the hearing was going on before the judge, he — he spoke up for himself, even though if — using his broken English maybe, the judge understood.

THE CHAIR: Are there any other questions?

MR. ZAH: One other thing, I think in the translation the judge asked the same question as you asked, he says.

THE CHAIR: Any other questions by any other member of the commission?

MR. LEVIS: Just for the record, Dr. Warren, if we could have this piece of paper we've been referring to, marked as Exhibit Number 1 for the record, so anyone who would like a transcript or like to know what it refers to, it will be easier for the Court Reporter

(Whereupon Exhibit Number 1 was marked for identification)

THE CHAIR: This concludes your testimony, we want to thank you, Ms. Tuchawena and Mr. Thompson. Thank you very much.

Is Mr. Joseph Garcia in the audience?
Will you come forward, sir, please?

Mr. Garcia, there is a series of questions that we wish to ask and I think before you came, in the opening statement, I indicated that we are a fact-finding, datagathering group. 51 such groups in America, one from each state. And we have a responsibility of reporting to the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights. Which is a bipartisan

group who makes recommendations to the President, which is operationalized in laws regarding the civil rights of persons in America, particularly minorities and women.

And I also, and I wanted to reiterate, this is a nonadversary enterprise. We also indicated that persons are here voluntarily, and we're very sensitive to any comments that you may make to clarify the civil rights, particularly of Native Americans as it relates to off-reservation persons in the administration of justice.

Will you state your name and your address and your occupation, please?

JUDGE JOSEPH C. GARCIA

- A. (By Mr. Garcia) Okay, Joseph C. Garcia, my residence is 1708 Northwest Street, Flagstaff. That's my residence. My office is at Coconino County Courthouse, Im a justice of the peace for the Flagstaff Precinct, Coconino County, State of Arizona.
- Q (By the Chair) Fine. Judge Garcia, will you identify the types of offenses that your court hears?
- A Well, we handle just about everything from misdemeanors, felonies, on the criminal aspect, also traffic, also civil, what you call small claims court, civil actions.

Q Can you tell me what the maximum and the minimum amount set for bail that you handle in your court?

A. Well, when you talk about, because you mean on criminal cases or are you talking misdemeanors or felonies?

- Q Any, or else you may categorize them and then specify --
- A. Well, you have guidelines of not only the revised statutes but also by the supreme court, on misdemeanors the maximum bail you can set is \$300.00 plus the applicable surtax, on felonies it depends on the offense and on the individual accused of the offense. And their ability to be responsible for appearances in court.

If you know they're going to appear, then you're supposed to release them on their own recognizance. By the other token, if it's a transient and you have no guarantee he will stick around for trial, then you can set an appropriate bond that will meet with his ability to post the same.

- Now, you've alluded to some criteria that you use in the determination of bail amounts. Can you specify for the commission what those criteria are or --
- A. Yes, I did not include -- I said his ability to appear, if -- it's quite intensive, nothing you can put down in two words, in fact, we use about three legal-sized pages of questions from the defendant and from the law

1 enforcement officer also to make a determination as to what amount of bail you're going to set on this person. 3 Because bail is not set -- is not used as a punishment, 4 only to guarantee the appearance of the defendant, which 5 would mean different bails for different defendants. 6 0. So you have some discretion? 7 A. You have to have, yes. 8 It's a discretionary thing, okay. And could you O. 9 specify again, I'm not quite clear what those criteria 10 are? 11 A. Okay, the guarantee to the court that he will 12 appear for trial. If he will appear without any bond what-13 soever, and you are sure of this --14 Q. Now, are there some questions that you can -- you 15 raise that helps you to make that determination? 16 Oh, yes, sir, there's a -- I'd say 35, 40, 50 A. 17 questions. 18 Q. Now, is ethnicity one of those questions? 19 A. What? 20 What one's ethnic, the fact that a person is a Q. 21 Navajo? 22 The only thing would be you're unsure A. Oh, no, no. 23 that he will appear and that you will not have any prob-24 lems, extradite him, say from another state or from the 25 reservation or from another country, whatever.

like I say, the purpose of bail is to guarantee appearance.

- Q And the judgment, after asking the question in the judgment of the judge, then an equitable amount --
 - A. Right, just to guarantee his appearance.
 - Q Fine.

Would you please give an estimate of the percentage of cases you hear which involve Native American defendants?

A It would have to be a rough estimate, since I don't keep any files on how many Mexicans, how many Native Americans, how many Anglos, to me they're all the same and we don't keep any segregation as far as records and files and all this, they're all treated by the same criterias and we don't keep records for this. You like just an estimate on my part I think I can give you a rough estimate.

- Q Okay. Your rough estimate?
- A I would say percentage-wise, 20%, if you include everything, including traffic, criminal, and civil.
- Q Twenty percent who appear before you. Now, are there some charges, in this case drunkenness --
 - A There's no law against drunkenness, sir.
 - Q There's no law, okay. As of when?
 - A. Oh, over a year ago.
 - Q Decriminalization, okay. Thank you.

 Can you give an estimate on what percentage of

*4,30

1 Native Americans appearing before your court are released on their own recognizance? 2 3 A. Oh, I'd say better than 50%. Roughly. 4 Does this differ from the percentage of Anglos or Q. 5 Spanish-speaking? A. I think it's greater. 6 Greater release record? 7 Yes, sir. 8 9 How do you account for that? Q. 10 Because in our Anglo section, our Anglo population, A. 11 lot of them are transients going through, highway I-40, 12 I-17, whereas in our Native Americans they're mainly 13 people from the reservation or they live here in, close in, 14 and therefore your guarantee of appearance will be in 15 their favor that they have been here a number of years and you won't have any problem getting them back. 16 17 Whereas your transient they might be out in New 18 York, New Jersey, California, places we have to extradite 19 or we might not even be able to find, so we must have some 20 guarantee that they will be here. 21 Q. And that figure is 50%? 22 I'd say it was higher in our Native Americans. A. Of Native Americans. Is there jurisdictional 23 problems related to --24

25

There was at one time, up till efforts were made,

particularly by myself, but I did get a backup from Judge Brady from the city courts and he did accompany me up to Window Rock, and we met with Chief Roland Dart, we had an appointment to meet with Chief Justice Allen and some members from the tribal council which did not even show us the courtesy to show up. So we just met with Roland Dart. And after he gave us his guarantee and his assurance of cooperation, I haven't had any problems whatsoever. If we do have some all I got to do is call Mr. Dart and he has helped us in many, many ways. Where I feel that the problem has been solved and we're very pleased with it, hope it continues that way.

- O Does your court, sir, attempt to extradite Native
 Americans from the reservation through tribal officials?
- A In your major cases, yes, they have to go through the tribal officials. In your minor cases, like Mr. Dart said, they will bypass and delay the extradition procedure and this is another reason we're releasing more on their own because we're getting cooperation from the police.
- Q Now, could you discriminate for me the differences between major and a minor?
- A Yes, sir, I would say any felony case punishable
 by five years in the state penitentiary or more, I would
 consider in the major. Any lesser offenses that might
 receive a year or less in jail, I would consider fairly minor.

- Q Yes. Now, can you, for my information, give me the percentage of cases that relate to Native Americans that would fall on the major and minor within the last two years?
 - A Well, like I say, I don't keep records by race --
 - Q Well, in your best judgment?
 - A It would just be a rough estimate.
 - Q Handled before your court?
- A. I would say only at the very most 10% in your major cases would involved Native Americans.
 - Q. And the rest are minor cases?
- A For a lot of reasons. For one reason is that most of the major crimes that do occur, occur in the reservation, and most of them are Native American against. Native American, the victim and the defendant both being Native Americans, in this case they go through FBI jurisdiction, do not come through my courts, they go through federal magistrates and are prosecuted in the federal courts, not our courts.
- Q Could you clarify for me or give me a picture of the nature of the minor offenses that Native Americans may have committed who appear before you?
- A Yes, I understand that. I feel that, you know, anybody without even thinking about it, you're DWI, driving under the influence would be your major.
 - Found driving under the influence?

- A. That would be the biggest percentage.
- Q What percentage, roughly?
- A. Say probably close to 90%.
- Q Ninety percent. Well, let me restate this so 90% of Native Americans who appear before your court, who constitute probably 20% of persons who appear before you, are before you because of DWI cases?
 - A. I would say I'm pretty accurate on that.
- Q And the amount of bond, is there a standard bond for DWI?
- A. No, sir, it isn't because, like I say, there again you got to go through the individual and how reliable is he, like this gentleman that just said here, 25 years, same job, I'd release him on his own because he's not going to go anywhere on a minor charge, he'll be there tomorrow if you need him, same token if the man is from Utah or somewhere else, what's to keep him from fleeing the jurisdiction and then we can't extradite out of another state on a misdemeanor, so we always have some kind of a bond probably equivalent to the amount of fine, this way if he fled the jurisdiction, did not appear for trial, we forfeit the bond, close the case, and he would have paid his medium fine, not the maximum, not the minimum but a medium.
 - Q. Can you give me some indication of the range of those

.25

A Well, this is for everybody, though, what I would say on a bond where you feel the defendant would not show up for trial and that he's going to wind up forfeiting the bond and not appearing, \$150.00 for DWI on a first offense. Which is half-way between the maximum and \$100.00 minimum.

We're here, Judge Garcia, because of one of the assumptions that the administration of justice for Native Americans in urban areas off the reservation can be improved. And we would be interested in your feelings about the method or recommendations of processes that could be instituted to improve the administration of justice for Native Americans and off-reservation, do you have any suggestions?

A. Yes, only one, really, because I have received cooperation since I've taken steps to do something about it, I've taken trips to Tuba City and Window Rock and always been treated pretty well, had some good cooperation.

The thing I think we lacked that I would like to see is some sort of an interpretation of programs so that we make sure of good communication between the defendant and the court. I run across it sometimes where we have to use trustees from the jail to interpret or something like this and they're not really qualified interpreters. So

sometimes you have a little bit of a communication problem, particularly when we put somebody on probation or on some kind of a program to rehabilitate him or treatment deal, we sometimes lack the ability --

- Q Well, let me raise another -- is the assumption in your court that every person who appears before you knows and understands English?
- A. No, it's not an assumption, it never is, even if they start talking to me and I make sure that they do understand, if there's any doubt or any question at all, I either try and seek an interpreter, into the jail division, somewhere, but I will not even go into the case until I make sure that he knows what it's all about.
 - Q Now, are there funds allocated for that?
- A. No, sir, we have no funds and no means for it, but they just -- I have to borrow a trustee from the jail.
- Q Are mechanisms established to get funds in order to guarantee this basic right of a person who is encountering the courts?
- A No. There isn't any. In fact, the last person that I replaced in my in my staff I requested from personnel department that I would like to have a Navajo girl as a clerk, and she would serve for many, many purposes, when she wasn't busy with her work in the office she could be interpreting for me, but at all times she'd be available

1 The answer was that they couldn't find anybody this way. 2 qualified so I never got one. 3 So, the recommendation of interpreters is a recom-Q. 4 Any others, sir? Do you hire -- do you have mendation. 5 any employees in your court? 6 A. Yes. 7 Q. How many? 8 A. We have seven clerks, one probation officer. 9 Any Native Americans? Q. 10 A. The last one we had when she resigned I tried to 11 replace her with another one and the personnel department 12 said they couldn't find anybody that meets the qualifica-13 tions to replace her with so at this time I have none. 14 THE CHAIR: Peterson, you have a question, Mr. Zah. 15 Q. (By Mr. Zah) Yes, Mr. Garcia, in terms of numbers, 16 you were saying something about 20% of Native Americans 17 -- or cases that you handle in your courts are --18 This is our whole picture, everything. A. 19 About what number is that, could you give me a Q. 20 rough idea? 21 A. Wow, we average approximately 30 cases per day so 22 I'll let you figure it out. Say about two out of 30. 23 Thirty cases per day? Q. 24 That includes civil, criminal, traffic, misdemeanors, 25 felonies, the whole works, whole show. 1 3 mg 7 m

Q. And you have seven people working on your staff, 20% of those cases are Native Americans or Navajos?

A I'd say roughly, approximately. We don't keep records as to how many Mexicans, how many Blacks, how many Indians, how many Anglos, to me they're all defendants, they're all people, we treat them all the same, we don't have different guidelines for different people, we do not keep records by different nationalities or races.

THE CHAIR: This is not an adversary setting, if it was I would challenge you. Maybe after we can talk.

A. If I could look at my dockets I could say this is one for the Anglos we had so many, this is the Native Americans we had so many, we don't keep records like that.

Q (By Mr. Zah) The 20%, you know, many of them don't speak English like I say, or speak very, very little English like, what do you do with John Thompson?

A. Well, like I told you, I get an interpreter from the sheriff down there, either a trustee, they ordinarily have one.

Q How many -- in those 20%, how many of them, let's say are being -- are being made aware of some of their rights in Navajo and English?

- A They're all being made aware of their rights.
- Q All of them?
- A Yes, sir. Even on a minor little deal, like dis-

turbing the peace or a public nuisance, this is the first criteria from the supreme court that you got to make sure that the defendant understands all his legal rights.

Q In Navajo?

4.

- If I have to talk to him in Chinese I will; but I'm going to see that he understands regardless who he is, that's the first criteria we have that they must understand their rights. I've got to be convinced they understand. If they say yes, I understand, sometimes I think well, he really doesn't. So then I say well, I'll see you later, and I'll make arrangements for an interpreter or something and have him brought back up again with the interpreter.
 - Q (By the Chair) Isn't time a very significant variable?
 - A Yes, sir, it sure is.
- Q In other words, since time is an essential variable then it means you're forced into some action before you're able to operationalize the understanding, are you not?

 Isn't 24-hour and 48, those increments of time are critical?
- A The time is, yes. Well, not really because if you're talking about your minor, like I say, you know, most of our Native Americans will be minor offenses either DWI's or public nuisance, something like this, so you're not talking about a major crime, so if you would lose one, you don't lose them, all you got to do is release them on

1 35 2

1 their own if you do not have a hearing within 24 hours, 2 so you're not talking about letting out a person charged 3 with murder or something like this, so you're not really --4 Okay, one of your recommendations was the hiring 5 of interpreters to guarantee a basic right. Any other 6 specific recommendations that you would make regarding 7 the administration of justice to Native Americans? 8 A. Well, we're taking care of most of our own, I don't 9 know if you'd like to help in the programs we've got 10 going but like to look into those programs. 11 I was wondering particularly of the modeling impact 12 that an ethnic person would have, Navajo, Hopi or whoever 13 lives in this area, someone to relate to personally, the 14 whole thing? 15 I think it would be great and I've tried it and like A. 16 I say, our personnel board has claimed that they can't 17 find anybody applying for the job that would fit in or 18 was qualified. 19 And those qualifications are clearly --O. 20 Oh, yes, we have them right up on the bulletin Α., 21 board like type a minimum of 50 words per minute and --22 Q. I was thinking particularly at the hiring level, 23 of -- could you identify the kinds of persons that 24 you hire, the kinds of tasks? 25 Well, mainly clerical and bailiffs and probation A.

officers, we even asked for a volunteer probation program and we've had no response at all from the Native Americans.

- Q : And that's clearly articulated in ethnic media, newspaper?
 - A Yes, we've had some articles in the paper.
 - Q Tribal council and --
- A. And the response was zero. We had no volunteers.

 THE CHAIR: Any other questions by any member of the panel?
- Q (By Mr. Williams) Mr. Garcia, I heard an impression earlier that reservation Native Americans posted bond because of problems --
 - A. Not all of them.
- Q No, before you came up to talk to us, but now you tell us you think the problem has been solved because of a relationship you have with Chief Dart. When was this meeting and when was the problem solved and even if solved, is there any kind of formal relationship other than personalities that will keep the system to where it is now?
- A The problems we were having before, like I say, you release somebody to their own recognizance, tell them to appear back, say on the 20th, they would not show up so you would issue a warrant for failure to appear. You send the warrant down to Window Rock and the warrant would come back saying sorry, we will not serve this. So, in

order for people not to commit an offense and then not have to answer for the same, it was either a matter of some of them, not all of them again, some of them would have to post a minimum bond that would be equal to the fine, that way if they didn't show up forfeit their bond and they have paid their penalty.

- Q What was it for --
- A. The last time we had any major problems, I say has been over a year ago, for the last year we have had no problems.
- Q (By Mr. Levis). Judge Garcia, this puzzles me because the newspaper article that appeared in the Arizona Republic, on August 18th of this year, says 90% from reservations skip trial if on bail, the JP says. And the JP quoted is you.
- A. Yes. Well, that's what I say, they either post a bond or fail to appear, they forfeit the bond. There again it would depend on the individual that would post a bond. Some of them that did not post a bond failed to appear also.
- Q But you just indicated to Mr. Williams that the last year you haven't had any trouble, yet this article was written three months ago.
- A That article was completely wrong, I'd like to know who, in fact I called the people that wrote that article and asked who did and he said well, I didn't have anything

1 2 Q. 3 4 Óι 5 on August 18th of this year. 6 7 8 10 11 minimum. 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 A 19 20 21 22 23 he shows up now. 24 Q. 25 you talked about transients and I just wonder how you

to do with it, I'm just quoting somebody else. You're familiar with the article, though? I called the one from the press --This is from the Arizona Republic and it quotes you Yes, this is true, but this doesn't state just for Native Americans, this holds for Anglos too, a lot of people, they just, when they come to trial they'd just as soon forfeit their bonds. They just don't come to trial. Because it's set at the minimum, the bond's set at the The other question is that we have requested from Chief Dart and he will testify tomorrow concerning all of the warrants they received in the last nine months, and extradition requests. And searching, through their records through September, they indicate they've only received four such requests this year. That's why I say, I think what has really worked is that now when the defendant's up in front of your bench and you tell him I have a cooperation from the tribal council and Roland Dart and if you fail to appear, they're going to get you, and we don't have no problems, Well, I'm still puzzled, but another question is,

define a transient?

3.

A Well, like I say, we have this questionnaire that states how long have you lived — where do you live, you put down your address, how long have you lived there, two days. Where'd you live prior to that, give another address. How long did you live there? Three days. Going down the line, and establish them whether they're a local resident, how long they've been, how reliable are they, how long have they been out of a job, how many times been arrested and the whole picture, it doesn't — it's not as simple as one question, you got to establish the person as a reliable person, and you feel you'll not have any problem that he's not going to skip the jurisdiction because of his family ties, his community ties, his job ties, whatever. Then you base your bond on that.

Q And that would include reservation residents of the state?

A. This will include the same on the reservation like somebody came into the city 20 years you're more likely to release him on his own than if he's only lived here a few months and prior to that he lived in Los Angeles and prior to that in Nevada. If he just moves around all the time and he doesn't have anything to hold him in the jurisdiction, what's to keep him from fleeing?

Q But if they are reservation residents, Tuba City for

20 years they're within the jurisdiction of the State of 1 2 Arizona? 3 Right, yes, we still have to go through extradition 4 but we know they're going to be there. 5 What sort of training do you have for the job as Q. justice of the peace? 6 7 Well, I've had two and a half years through NAU here on criminal code, legal procedures, court administration, 8 police, law enforcement, I've also been at the University 9 of Nevada which is a judicial university, the National 10 Judicial University through two of their regular judge's 11 12 seminars, been to some in Albuquerque, New Mexico. 13 I've been to some in Tempe, and Tucson. And about 14 20 years in law enforcement. 15 What are your feelings on the requirement that all Q. JP's be attorneys? 16 17 A. I think it would lose your people's right at that 18 time because right now you go on the justice system in 19 the lower courts, the people's courts, because you're 20 going to be heard under your merits, under your true feelings, under what I call justice. 21 22 You get an attorney there, he's going to weigh the legal outlook of it, the legal points, the legal techni-23 calities, and so you're not -- legal procedure, not going 24 25 to be heard as well as you are now by somebody that under-

1 stands you and that wins strictly by legal points of law. 2 But aren't you required to follow the Arizona Rules Q. 3 of Criminal Procedure? 4 We do follow them. A. 5 Which are drafted for all judges in the state? O. 6 We do follow them but those don't apply to your 7 civil cases, and your family problems and your every day 8 dealings like that. 9 Q. But still all cases that are heard by both JP 10 courts and magistrate courts are subject to appeal by the 11 superior courts and finally the Arizona Supreme Court 12 and possibly the U.S. Supreme Court? 13 Yes, if you're talking strictly about courtroom Α. 14 procedure, yes, you're right, but courtroom procedure is 15 very minute compared to the load that we handle of sit in 16 your chambers and in your home and on the streets, people 17 talk to you about little things, you think they'll talk 18 to an attorney? 19 One final question. We've heard some recommendations 20 that you have made and I just wondered if Coconino County 21 or you have requested funding from the federal law enforce-22 ment assistance administration? 23 A. Not to my knowledge, they haven't. 24 0. And you have not requested that either? 25 A. No.

Q Just for the record, I'd like to identify the newspaper article as Exhibit Number 2. And if you have any response to that, if you want to submit to us in writing, please do.

1 a \$ %

A No, like I say, this holds true to everybody, particularly in traffic cases, most people would rather forfeit their bond than to come back for trial. It's just a convenience for them really, they feel they're guilty so they don't need to come back they just forfeit their bond. Their bond's paid and it saves them a lot of trouble, particularly in the outlying districts where they have to travel long distances and the person feels by the time he spends all the money coming for trial and the fine's only \$10.00 and I'll just forfeit the bond because I'm guilty of speeding anyway so most of them are minor cases and most people forfeit their bonds after they post them.

THE CHAIR: Any other questions by any member of the commission?

MS. LYON: Just one, Dr. Warren.

ţ,

Q (By Ms. Lyon) Mr. Garcia, you indicated that during the past year the relationship has been much improved between your office and the Navajo tribal law enforcement authorities. Has there been any change in the practices or policies implemented by your office for Indian defendants? In other words, have there been any changes in the amount

3

4

5 6

8

9

7

10

11 12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19 20

21

22

23

24

25

of bail, for instance?

Oh, I'd say to some extent you could say yes, be-A. cause with the assurance that if the defendant fails to appear, that you can get him back because of the cooperation with the reservation authorities, then I might be a little more lenient as far as allowing some defendants to be released on their own without a bond because I feel if they don't show up, I will issue a warrant and the authorities will bring him in for trial.

Whereas in the past it was quite difficult. But there really never has been a real, real problem, we've never made an issue of it, just that we had a lot of people that failed to show up. But there's always just on minor deals, traffic offenses, minor things. Certainly on a major crime, a felony, we wouldn't release anybody that is shakey as far as their ability to appear or their stability, we wouldn't release anybody regardless of race, color or creed, without pretty good assurance that you can get your hands on him, on your major felony So, as I say, you're talking about little minor cases. traffic cases, minor --

- Q. But you would say that in general the amount of bail has been lower than had previously been the case?
- A No, not particularly. I feel that if I try to release more on their own without any bail at all.

MS. LYON: Thank you.

THE CHAIR: Any other questions? If not --

Q. (By Mr. Zah) I have.

hard work if you're administering justice and the adminis-

tration of justice. I'm just really bothered by, you know,

Mr. Garcia, justice is very expensive and it's

you saying that you ask the personnel department for, you

know, some interpreters and they say no, they say no to

you and you --

A. No, no, you misconstrued it. I said they haven't

been able to find anybody qualified to fill the job in

our Native Americans.

Q When you say qualified, what do you mean?

A Well, by the standards of the county, I don't know what kind of test they give them but when I've asked them this we have to -- see, when we have an opening we turn in a request for personnel for the personnel department, and we put down our specifications, they must type so many words a minute, maybe shorthand, and so forth, so forth, and then they come up with, we have three applicants, then I interview the three applicants and I make my final choosing. So at that time they said they weren't able to find somebody that would fill the qualifications that was needed for justice court that was able to speak the Navajo language.

1 Q. How can you judge that? Pardon me? A. .3 How can you judge that? Q. A. I don't, the personnel department, the employment 5 does. 6 a Do they have somebody there Navajo that knows how 7 to speak Navajo? 8 A. I just put in my request like I say, and then they send me the applicant and they said they weren't able to 10 come up --11 You don't really have any idea what goes on in the Q. 12 personnel department in terms of seeing that that Navajo 13 language is adequate? 14 All I know is the specifications that I give them A. 15 like so many words per minute on typing, so many words 16 per minute on shorthand, and able to speak the Navajo 17 language, understand it, and they said they haven't been 18 able to find me somebody. 19 What happens, let me give you a hypothetical, if you Q. 20 get somebody, like I say, John Thompson, and you can not 21 get an interpreter from the sheriff's office or anywhere, 22 what would you do in that case? 23 Well, I haven't had it come up yet because I've 24 always been able to find somebody. And I don't feel that 25 I should even think about that because there is always

somebody available, either the police department, the
sheriff's office or one of the other inmates or -- but
there's always somebody around. I have never had any
problems in the last 20 years to be able to find an interpreter.

But it's a voluntary basis, they don't have to do it.

1 The other thing that is, you know, I'd like to

1 mention that the legal things in your American society is

2 so complex that it's very hard to understand, and just

3 an average, you know, citizens, they don't really understand many of the legal concepts, and I'm just puzzled

3 by, you know, just grabbing anybody from the sheriff's

3 office or some other department and say advise this guy

4 of his rights and then do you ever feel satisfied that

5 they're really explaining, you know, in detail, they

7 really understand what their legal rights are?

A. No, sir, when somebody interprets for me they do exactly what the words means, interpret for me, they don't do the advising. They just interpret, translate the language for me. They don't give them their legal rights, I say to them you got the right to remain silent, go on tell him that, so he tells him that.

Do you feel satisfied that they are doing what
they're supposed to be doing so that they will really
understand their legal rights?

2

A. Like I say, if I'm not satisfied, then I seek other means, but it's very, very seldom. We only have a real small percentage, real small, minor percentage that do not understand English fairly well. So I don't come across this problem too often, it does come by once in a while and we need to get an interpreter.

I think you all know yourself that this doesn't exist any more amongst our Mexican people or Indian people any more, most of the people talk pretty good English more, just a few of our old timers maybe, which is those people don't get in trouble to begin with.

So, the ones that you get problems with is this younger generation and most of them are either in college or high school so they all understand English. It's just our old, old people the same way with my Mexican people, it's just the real old that doesn't understand English.

THE CHAIR: Any other questions by any member of the commission? If not, thank you, Judge Garcia.

Will Mr. Ron Wood and Mr. Tom Gonzalez come forward, please?

And would you give your name?

MS. ROSE BENALLY

A. (By Ms. Benally) Rose Benally.

Q. (By Mr. Zah) Initially we're just going to ask 2 you your name, your address and your occupation, start with Mr. Wood. 3 4 5 MR. RONALD C. WOOD 6 7 8 A. (By Mr. Wood) Yes, my name is Ronald C. Wood, 9 Director of the Native Americans for Community Action, 10 this is an Indian alcoholism and Indian community action 11 program here in Flagstaff, Arizona. 12 Okay, Mr. --13 14 MR. TOM GONZALEZ 15 (By Mr. Gonzalez) I'm Tom Gonzalez, Native 16 A. Americans for Community Action, I'm a senior counselor. 17 18 Address also? 19 THE CHAIR: Yes. 20 Two-two-two-one Northeast, here in Flagstaff. A. 21 (By Ms. Benally) Rose Benally, I'm also a counselor A. 22 I live at 3009 North Rose. at NACA. 23 Q. (By Mr. Williams) Mr. Wood, could you give us a 24 brief description of the goals and activities of NACA and how they relate to the administration of justice? 25

A (By Mr. Wood) Yes. NACA is primarily an Indian alcoholism counseling program. We're funded to assist Native Americans who have alcoholism-related problems. Obviously, Native Americans who have alcohol problems are also going to be involved in the criminal justice system.

Alcoholism encompasses much more than simply the abuse of alcohol, it encompasses the entire social, economic aspects that cause people to drink.

Q Mr. Wood, can you describe, since you mentioned that it involves a whole criminal justice system, what kind of working relationships do you have with the city justice system and the superior courts, the justice and superior courts?

A. Okay. NACA works with the city courts, we do court -- we receive court referrals from the city courts, my two counselors, Tom Gonzalez and Rose Benally work with the courts on a daily basis and I feel it would be more appropriate for Tom Gonzalez to answer this question.

Q Okay. Mr. Gonzalez?

A (By Mr. Gonzalez) Yes, we have a good working relationship with the city court, particularly with Judge Brady and Ray Otero where we are referred clients for counseling, people that have been arrested for substance abuse-related crimes, disturbing the peace or DWI, that

type of thing. We have worked on occasion with the justice court and with the superior court, the superior court we've been able to write letters stating that we'd be able to accept a referral if a person was put on probation, they've generally cooperated with us in that respect.

- Mr. Gonzalez, how is the organization funded or either one, when I ask one of the questions either one of you can respond.
- A. It's funded by the National Institute on Alcoholism and Alcohol Abuse, which is part of the Department of Health, Education and Welfare, federal funding --
- Q Have you been able to see any -- able to evaluate the performance of the organization since its inception?
- A (By Mr. Wood) I think as far as the problem of alcoholism it's going to take more than a single alcoholism counseling agency, I think there's going to have to be a change in the social-economic system before we start seeing definite improvement in the alcoholism abuse problem among Native Americans.
- Q What has the City of Flagstaff done to implement the LARET provision of the deciminalization, Arizona decriminalization of public drunkenness?
- A. Okay, NACA, Native Americans for Community Action, was the original contract operator of the LARC here in

Flagstaff. The law came into effect January, 1974. We operated the LARC from January, 1974, through mid-October, 1974. The primary reason NACA dropped the LARC contract was because we had no financial support from the city or the county.

- Q. Will it be reopened?
- A. Plans are in process now and it appears that the LARC will open within one to two months under a different agency.
- Q Okay, how will it be funded, then, to insure its continuance?
- A Okay, LARC funding in the State of Arizona in on a 50-50 basis with 50% coming from the state government and 50% cash or in kind match coming from the local community. The state funding is there, is guaranteed, local funding, since a new organization is going to assume operation of the LARC and some city monies is in the amount of about \$2,500.00 have been made available.
- Q Okay. How do you expect your organization, how do you expect your organization to relate to the LARC when it opens?
- A Okay, since we are an Indian alcoholism counseling agency and over 90% of the clients of a LARC will be Native Americans, we feel an obligation and we will be working with the new LARC on a daily basis, working with Native

3

4

6

7

8 9

10

11

12

13 14

15

16

17

18

19

20 21

22

23

24

25

American clients.

What's been done with the public intoxicants since the closing of the LARC are you taking all of it or just the Native Americans?

A. Okay, we gave the LARC up in mid-October, 1974. A county agency assumed operation of the LARC through June 30, 1975. At that point LARC closed, and since early July, there has not been a LARC in Flagstaff and public inébriates have had to find their own shelter.

Okay, if they have to find their own shelter, are there -- are the police, do they have any different relation about them, are they being arrested for other charges then or are they being held if there's no shelter for them?

There has been a misuse of laws since the public inebriate can not be arrested for being drunk as such. They're being arrested for disturb the peace, for loitering, and I believe you will be -- the Flagstaff chapter of the Arizona Civil Liberties Union will be testifying later, and they have detailed, specific information on what has been happening recently in this regard.

- Okay, any of you give us a general idea of the problems that the lack of interpreters have caused in the court system?
 - The lack of interpreters has (By Mr. Wood) Yes. A.

caused an acute problem in northern Arizona. I have a statement which I would like to read later which will address this point. I would like to state that I have been involved with a former county judge, who was attempting to get moneys for court, salaried court interpreters. Ifve attended meetings of the law enforcement administration—assistance administration, at these meetings it was the prevailing attitude among law enforcement officers that they should be using these moneys to buy more equipment and build bigger and better jails, moneys for use of court interpreters was deemed a low priority item.

- Q Is this LEAA money?
- A. Yes.
- Q In your statement you're going to read later, is that going to also address what your organization is doing to help this problem or can do to help this problem?
- A Yes. It might help if I read my statement now, and my counselors have information that they would like to state also and from that point you might have some additional questions.

THE CHAIR: How many pages is your statement?

- A. A page and a half.
 - THE CHAIR: Less than five minutes?
- A. Yes. Want me to proceed?
- Q (By Mr. Williams) Yes.

A Okay. As I stated earlier my name's Ronald C. Wood, Director of Native Americans for Community Action. Testimony of the Flagstaff chapter of the Arizona Civil Liberties Union will provide detailed documented evidence concerning the administration of justice as it affects Arizona Indians.

I want to make some statements based on my personal experiences and observations. Stereotyping of all races occurs, but stereotyping of Indians in border towns of Arizona is more acute than that faced by other minorities. Contrary to popular opinion, not all Indians have a weakness for alcohol.

THE CHAIR: Will you make that statement again, please?

A. Contrary to popular opinion, not all Indians have a weakness for alcohol.

Unfortunately, this is a common attitude by too many border town residents. This stereotyped notion is also held by too many police officers. This is evidenced by harassment that Indians receive by police in Flagstaff.

Indians are routinely stopped for no apparent reason, and when no alcohol usage is evident, they are released. The rights of Indians are always violated more frequently than those of Anglo Flagstaff citizens, simply because we are Indian and there is less likelihood of any

repercussions from violations of our civil rights.

There is a great need for court interpreters as testimony at this hearing will bear out. I feel that too much priority is put on funding new equipment purchases and facilities. I feel that there is a greater need to fund court interpreters and for court interpreters not to be present in city and county courts is negligent.

But what I have stated is nothing new to Native Americans. We all experience and observe these things daily, but rarely do we express our feelings to the public at large, either verbally or in written form. It is unfortunate that many Native Americans have come to accept this treatment as part of our lot of being Indians.

The frontier cowboys and Indian days are gone and this treatment will have to cease.

Tom Gonzalez has some additional information concerning the LARC and Rose Benally has a short statement she would also like to read also.

THE CHAIR: How many pages are those statements?

- Q (By Mr. Williams) How much is yours?
- A. (By Mr. Gonzalez) Just the same, page, page and a half.

Okay, I'd just like to quickly stress again that the interpreter problem, I believe, is the greatest problem in Flagstaff. I've talked with at least one of the judges in

[.]22

the city and he feels that it is a problem too and has made efforts, it seems that priorities among the administrators, among the people that fund these types of programs, is where the problem really lies.

I think that with the number of, particularly
Navajos that go through the court system in Flagstaff
this should have been a priority a long time ago among
the city councilmen and the county board of supervisors.

The second thing I would like to say concerns the lack of LARC. This was touched on by Ron also.

Again, I think that this is — this has been through the political money hassles also because of lack of funding, arguments between state, county and city, city governments as to who should mandate who to do what. The state set up the law, without proper implementing the LARC and then asked the city and the county to come through and fund 50%. Well, the city and the county said who's the state to mandate for us what to do? So there have been a lot of hassles. And I'm not sure that the problem is through yet.

It's been on a year to year basis somebody picks

up the LARC and runs it for a year, then nobody's willing

to fund it for another year and these have been the big

hassles and this might happen again next year, after this

new organization, after this organizations funds the new LARC

3 4

5 6

7

9

10 11

12

13 14

15

16

17

18

19

20 21

22

23

25

24

they might face the same hassles next year and have to drop it.

Another thing that I'm going to bring up that Ron didn't touch upon, is the public defender system in Flagstaff. I have had some complaints from Native Americans that some of the people that have been appointed to them through the, particularly through the superior court system as public defenders for criminal matters, have not adequately defended them.

I have not -- I have not really been able to substantiate any exact cases, but I feel that there is a legal aid agency here in town for civil matters, and I think that a public defender system in town for criminal matters is a thing that's much needed.

The system as it is now uses judges in private practice who have other duties in addition to these extra-these lawyers in practice that do have other duties in addition to their public defender duties and I think there are sometimes some conflicts of interest.

That's all I have.

(By Ms. Benally) I'm a counselor for NACA and I A. want to voice an opinion that -- it's been disturbing me for a long time and it's an incident or my statement has to do with an incident that happened at the LARC when I was an employee there.

I was an employee there July, '74 to June, '75, and --

THE CHAIR: Will you let her have the mic?

A. Okay, my main gripe is with the police department.

And during this time I had some contacts with the representatives of the Flagstaff Police Department. And they brought in inebriates or intoxicated clients which they brought off of the streets, and sometimes these intoxicated clients would be treated very roughly, which I thought was very unnecessary.

This particular incident was -- had to do with a client that was dropped off, outside the door, usually the police bring in the clients and are deposited at the desk and they usually get the names of the clients, and they take a receipt and one is given to us.

And this day the police -- the one particular police department -- the police officer didn't do so, and I refused -- I was on duty and I refused to accept the client because it was obvious that he was hurting and he was hurt, he needed medical attention. So I called the police department again and I told them that I refused to accept him, and they came back to get the client and he was seen and he was taken care of, but this was not just the one time, this was many -- you know, it was a repeated thing. Clients were brought in hurt and they were, you know,

sometimes they were just dumped outside. And I think it's an example of a typical mistreatment of Indians. And I believe that they were just, you know, treated that way, you know, just solely because they were Indians.

That's all I have to say.

- Q. (By Mr. Williams) Did you or anybody else in the administration of the LARC at that point in time discuss that with the police department?
- A. Yes, I forgot to mention, at the time, every time an incident happened like this, with the police department, we typed up a statement, one was sent to the police department and one was kept on records, so all the records, you know, were -- were kept on file at the LARC.
- Okay, the LARC though, received other than just Native Americans. Were you saying that the only people that experienced this particular kind of abuse were Native Americans?
 - Definitely. That's what I'm saying. Α.
 - Well, back to Mr. Gonzalez as to one short question.

I've got the impression from the three of you that the interpreters is a problem and that understanding the rights without an interpreter is somewhat difficult. Would you say or is your impression that most of the Native Americans that go into the justice system in this area don't fully understand their rights? The right not to plead

23

24

25

guilty, the right to plead not guilty that is and the -- what they're really facing in the court system?

- A. (By Mr. Gonzalez) That's kind of a hard question.
- Q Do you think -- if you feel that they aren't do you think interpreters would help?

A I think this, I think that legalese, legal matters are very difficult for anyone to understand, I think that interpreters for the court system would have to be interpreters that know what they're doing, that know what's going on, that know a little bit of -- enough about the law to be able to adequately explain, explain the legal proceedings. I think Rose will vouch for this, she's fluent in Navajo, and Navajo is a very difficult language to translate literally, and you'd have to have people that would be able to understand the law, interpret it within their own minds, and then translate it.

- Q. So you would say that just getting a trustee or someone sweeping the steps or a clerk that isn't knowledge-able in legal terms might not really suffice as an interpreter for court process?
- A. Right. I -- yes, I would think so. Maybe Rose could say a little more about the difficulty in interpretation from Navajo to English.
- A. (By Ms. Benally) I think it's true, I think you need somebody that knows something about the law to get it

across to the clients.

Q One last question. You mentioned that the problem with alcoholism really goes back to a socioeconomic problems, not just — it's not an easy problem to solve anyway. Would you advocate legalizing or serving of alcoholic beverages on reservations?

A. This is a question for the tribal government to answer. It is my personal opinion that prohibition of alcohol on the reservation has not stopped alcohol usage on the reservation. I think that the Indian tribe is going to have to recognize this as a problem, and I think legalization is an inevitable eventuality.

THE CHAIR: Any other questions?

- Q (By Mr. Levis) Do you, Mr. Gonzalez and Ms. Benally, do you have any other feelings concerning that issue of alcohol on the reservation? This issue will be discussed tomorrow by tribal officials by the way.
- A (By Mr. Gonzalez) Yes, I have some personal feelings.

 I -- as Ron stated, I think that the -- for one thing it

 would keep a lot of money on the reservation. I think

 that's one of the concerns that a lot of people have that

 a lot of money is leaving the reservation, that could be

 put to good use combatting alcoholism on the reservation.

 If alcohol were legalized on the reservation.

As Ron states, it seems to be an eventuality. It's

just a matter of time.

THE CHAIR: Any other questions by anybody?

Do you have any feelings, Ms. Benally, about whether alcohol sale should be legal or not on the reservation?

- A (By Ms. Benally) I don't think my personal feelings would have anything to do with it, if they're going to legalize liquor on the reservation, they'll do it.
- Q (By the Chair) We were thinking in view of the fact that you do deal personally as a counselor with persons who do abuse alcohol, it's conceivable that you would have some personal feelings about that factor.

Maybe, maybe not, But apparently it's a very moot issue. And certainly being discussed by a number of people.

Are there any other questions by any other member of the commission?

If not, we want to thank you very much for appearing before us.

Is Chief Elmo Maxwell, Chief of Police in Flagstaff in the audience?

We note that Mr. Fred Croxen is here, we'd like to check with you a minute, sir, we're going to take a five minute break for the convenience of the Court Reporter and for an opportunity for you to stand, but only five minutes. Then we're going to begin again, we'd like to chat with you

1 a minute, sir. 2 3 (Short recess) 4 5 THE CHAIR: Will the meeting please come to order, please? 6 7 Mr. Fred Croxen, will you come forward, please? Mr. Croxen is the City Attorney of Flagstaff. 8 Do you have some questions, Ms. Lyon? 10 Q. (By Ms. Lyon) For the record, would you state your 11 name, occupation and address, please? 12 13 14 MR. FRED CROXEN 15 16 A. (By Mr. Croxen) My name is Fred Croxen, I am City 17 Attorney of the City of Flagstaff. My mailing address is Box 1208, City of Flagstaff. 18 19 Would you describe your duties to us as city attorney and in what way they relate to the topics which 20 21 the committee is studying? Generally, the duties of city attorney, especially 22 A. in my capacity, are many fold. Primarily you might say 23 they are corporate counsel for the municipal corporation 24 25 of Flagstaff, adviser to the various city departments,

1 various individuals within the city and city-related busi-2 ness, and of course, prosecutor in the city courts. Do you know whether Chief Maxwell intends to be 3 Q. here either today or tomorrow? 4 He did not confide in me one way or the other. 5 You were present, I believe, Mr. Croxen, 6 7 when the first two panels were testifying. Do you have any knowledge of the practices that were described by the 8 first two panelists, Mr. Thompson, Ms. Tuchawena, I'm re-10 ferring specifically to their description of having been 11 told by the police officer that they would be forcibly re-12 moved from their vehicle and in the case of Mr. Thompson, 13 he was, according to his statement, removed from his 14 vehicle. Do you have any knowledge of whether this is a 15 standard practice by the Flagstaff Police Department? 16 A. I have no personal knowledge. For the record, let 17 me state that I do not believe I heard Ms. Tuchawena's 18 However I am familiar with the Thompson matter. testimony. 19 Q. I see. In a trial court level for the charges for which he 20 21 was cited at that time. Would you have any comment on Mr. Thompson's state-22 Q. 23 ment, whether, in your opinion, his statement was correct, would you have any response or any comments from the point 24 of view of your position? 25

A. The matters that he described, I came in while he was giving his statements. I think primarily from having talked, cross examined Mr. Thompson at the trial, that primarily the question of linguistic difficulties was the basis for the entire problem.

- Q Would you then conclude that the fact that he was forcibly removed from his vehicle was also due to linguistic difficulty?
 - A. Conceivably, yes.
- Q Do you know whether that practice is considered a legal procedure or legal practice?
- A. I -- not knowing the specifics of what did transpire there, just on the face of it, I would say that this is not standard practice.
- Q I see. What about the testimony we have heard also from Mr. Thompson that he was asked to pay the sum of \$12.00 right at the scene where he was stopped by the police officer, is that customary practice, to your knowledge?
- A No, and I think that those are not the facts, certainly from the officer's point of view. Having talked with the officer concerning this matter, knowing this officer, I can certainly avow to this panel that this is not standard practice, either on the part of that individual or on the part of police officers generally.

I think again that this might be traced to the ethnic,

linguistic problems involved. I think there was an investigation of this matter on the part of the police department I know when the accusation was called to my attention I was quite concerned and urged that there be a full investigation of the matter. Because this sort of conduct as it appeared, if it were what was accused, would not be a tolerable situation at all under any circumstances.

Q I see. Then you would say that if this type of occurrence were brought to the attention of the chief of police, he would take remedial action?

A. If the facts were that he -- the officer was attempting to be on the take, this would result, I am positive, in immediate dismissal after a full investigation.

Q I see. To your knowledge, has the police department or the City of Flagstaff, received any complaints alleging mistreatment by the police during the last two years, that is regarding Indian persons?

A. I can't -- I can't think of any that have come directly and formally to the City of Flagstaff. I'm sure that they would be called to my attention. Those that were directed specifically to the police department and its public relations apparatus. I'm not aware of those.

Q I see. Do you -- would you happen to know roughly what percentage of arrests made by the police in Flagstaff are of Indian people?

- A. I do not know.
- Q Do you ever get involved in the procedure which has to be used when requesting the Navajo Police Department to serve arrest warrants?
 - A Either by rendition or extradition? No, I --
 - Q. You do not. I see.
- A. I'm sure that this would not take place on a misdemeanor level, however.
- Q I see. You have, I believe, heard the testimony on the alcoholism problems in the Flagstaff area as far as Indian people are concerned, do you believe that some positive benefits could be provided by an alcohol reception center in Flagstaff?
- A. Undoubtedly. If I might elaborate, I think that especially where Native American individuals are concerned, that a very high percentage of the problems stems from alcohol, either alcohol in use or alcohol abuse in Flagstaff, and that, as I believe the previous panel pointed out, various reasons for this on the socioeconomic level, cultural transition, things of this nature.

I do feel that they had a very valid point when they thought perhaps the alcohol problem conceivably could be alleviated to some extent where peripheral cities are concerned, if alcohol were legalized perhaps on a gradient basis on the reservation, such as it has been in other

reservations. I think the Apache reservation would be an excellent study area for this.

- Q You're talking about the Fort Apache Reservation?
- A Yes, in the White Mountain area.
- Q Right. You feel, then, that individual residents of the reservation, if they were able to obtain alcoholic beverages at home, wouldn't have to go to the neighboring cities to obtain it?
- A Yes, and conceivably under the control of their ethnic and cultural peers, that they would be able to moderate the use or even develop cultural sanctions within their own social structure that would preclude excessive use. Certainly it would not push the extremes of the problem into the hands of peripheral cities.
- Mr. Croxen, have you ever been involved in a discussion or establishment of rates of bonds for Indian people?
 - A. No. I have not.
 - Q. You have no dealings with that.

Do you have any knowledge of assistance received by the Flagstaff Police Department from the Navajo and Hopi Police during the Pow Wow?

A. I believe that in the past that this has been a practice. Certainly from my own experience, the first Pow Wow I attended in 19 -- summer of 1936, there was con-

siderable enforcement assistance came from the Navajo
Nation in this regard, this extended, I think up to within
the past few years, but the last two Pow Wows, I believe
this has not been the case.

- Q. What is your response to the remarks we have heard that it's very difficult to obtain or employ qualified Indian people, for instance to work in the justice of the peace office or in any law enforcement offices?
- A I have some ideas, I have no personal experience with trying to employ Native Americans, either of any of the Indian nations represented in northern Arizona. I think when a person with an ethnic cultural background, especially in Native American cultures, reaches a point where they are able to qualify, fully for a position, then the positions that we're talking about here, they can go beyond that certainly, they would be sought after in other areas. Recruited rather vigorously.
- Q In other words, you would feel that any positions which the judicial or law enforcement systems might have in Flagstaff would not be attractive enough for such Indian people?
- A Well, we don't know at the moment. We don't have any job descriptions of interpreters or anything of this sort, conceivably this might be the case.
 - Q Would you personally consider it beneficial if there

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

were a permanent Navajo language interpreter available to the courts and to the police department?

- A. Of course.
- Q Do you have any suggestions how the police problems in the Flagstaff area regarding Indian people and their encounters with law enforcement personnel could be improved?

A. Well, of course, additional assistance from the various nations involved in perhaps, as we've already discussed, not forcing the recognized alcohol problem of some individuals on to peripheral areas, that would be certainly an assistance. I think the interpreter, if we could find necessary interpreters, that this could be assistance, no question about that. I think additional cultural exposure that is -- we are experiencing now, certainly any observer in this area who has been here any length of time, can sense a great improvement in these relations, when you are able to contact persons who are educated and asserting Indian sensitivities, there's increasing awareness of this through certainly the university, its various programs and the BIA dormitory program pursuant to the mandates of the various treaties, especially 1868.

The general awareness in ethnic and minority areas is, I think, a tremendous help. Popularity of fashion, Indian jewelry, the efforts of NACA, have been, I would say

2122232425

very productive in this awareness feature, increased awareness of all facets of society to the sensitivities of each group.

- Q Do you feel that the community of Flagstaff would be responsive to this type of effort?
 - A. Specifically which type of effort?
- Q. The promotion of sensitivity to Indian characteristics and attitudes, culture?
- A. Yes, very much so. It has always been sensitive to in certain areas to the Indian culture, by reason of the fact that the Museum of Northern Arizona and with its staff, very articulate persons out there, that are able to have programs and have in general, awareness areas.

MS. LYON: Thank you, Mr. Croxen.

Do any of the committee members have questions for Mr. Croxen? Bill, do you?

- Q (By Mr. Levis) Mr. Croxen, you indicated that the assistance from the Navajo Police was discontinued several years ago. Do you know why it was discontinued during the Pow Wow?
- A. Conceivably on a liability exposure basis for one thing, the --
 - Q Do you mean insurance reason, is that --
 - A. Yes, insurance and other liability.
 - Q Are there any American Indians employed to the best

1 of your knowledge, on the Flagstaff Police Department? 2 A. There have been from time to time, I don't believe 3 there are any now, perhaps one. 4 Are you aware of any recruitment efforst in this 5 area? 6 A. There's a constant active program to recruit members 7 of all minorities. 8 Concerning the city courts, at what point does the 0. 9 city attorney get involved, is it initial appearances or 10 only when the case --11 A. On the trial court level, counsel. On the prose-12 cution level for the most part. 13 Q, How many other full time attorneys are there on the 14 city attorney's staff? 15 A. As of one month ago, there's one other attorney. 16 Now, as you're aware under the supreme court case, 17 I think it's Arverson or -- the cities and states are . 18 obligated to provide counsel if requested for an indigent 19 if there's a possibility of --20 A. Incarceration. 21 Q. -- incarceration. How much money or what type of 22 system does the City of Flagstaff have for public defenders? 23 A. We have no public defender system as such, however 24 counsel are appointed from time to time by the court 25 following a screening process to determine indigency and other

1 pertinent factors. 2 Is there any amount of money that's set aside 3 by the city council, to the best of your knowledge, for 4 this? 5 A. There has been an increase in the budget, speci-6 fically how much, I'm not aware. 7 Q. Concerning the Thompson incident, why was that case 8 dismissed? 9 Well, obviously the court found, had reasonable 10 doubt to believe that the offense had been committed. 11 court, of course, the state, the burden is upon the state 12 to prove beyond a shadow of a doubt, a rather heavy 13 burden upon the state and the state did not carry this 14 burden in this case, that's -- ' 15 Was that before Judge Brady or Judge Brown, do you 16 know? 17 Judge Brown, I believe. 18 Do you have any information concerning that case 19 that you'd like to submit into the record or would it be 20 best to just write for that information just to get it 21 clarified? 22 I can answer any questions on the case that the 23 panel might have. 24 It's my understanding that as, in answer to this .25 letter which Mr. Thompson identified, which has been referred to just for this record, it's no legal expense, as Exhibit 1, that, you may want to give that to the city attorney just so he has the letter, that the chief of police wrote a letter back indicating that it is the policy of the City of Flagstaff to require bond of all reservation Indians. In traffic cases. Is this still the policy of the City of Flagstaff?

- A. I believe there have been significant changes since that was policy, sir.
- Q What is the policy of the city right now concerning posting of bond?

A It's basically, you've got to determine whether or not you're talking about minor traffic offenses, if you're not talking about minor traffic offenses then of course Rule 7, I believe, of the Rules of Civil Procedure obtain, and there is a discretionary feature in the magistrate to either release the person on his own recognizance or to require bail.

- Q But isn't it also true that in order to release a person on bail, this has to be shown by the preponderance of the evidence according to Rule 7?
- A I don't know that preponderance of the evidence is the burden required, I think it might be useful to view the rule, counsel.
 - Q I think the prosecution, I think it's clearly

4.

specified under the rule, has to -- the burden is required by the preponderance, but again I think we could probably spend a lot of time on this, I don't want to burden everyone else's time.

A. Well, I think it's very short, perhaps -- bearing in mind that this does not obtain in minor traffic offenses, any person charged with offense, bailable as a matter of right shall be released pending or during trial on his own recognizance unless the court determines in its discretion that such release will not reasonably assure his appearance as required.

If such a determination is made, the court may impose the least onerous conditions or conditions contained in Rule 73 B, which will reasonably assure his appearance.

I don't think that the legislature has placed any burden upon the magistrate to determine the preponderance of facts one way or the other.

MR. LEVIS: Well, without spending too much time, I think it is indicated, but -- I have no further questions.

Q (By Mr. Zah) I have one other question, Mr. Croxen, you indicated that possibility does exist that there's only one Native American employed in the police department. I want -- you know, to know exactly or if you don't know

1 maybe a guess, in terms of how many people are working in the police department? 3 A. Commissioned officers, Mr. Zah? 0. Yes. 5 I think it's around 43. Now, I haven't had any A. 6 contact recently with the personnel lists of the police 7 department, conceivably I could be in error on that. 8 Q. What about Blacks? I think there is a Black officer, has been on two 10 or three weeks. I haven't met him. 11 MR. LEVIS: Dr. Warren, F'11 just point out I have 12 found it, it's Rule 7.2C which says issues under Rule 7.2A 13 and B shall be determined by the preponderance of the 14 evidence, and that the prosecutor shall bear that burden. 15 A. You are right. 16 THE CHAIR: Any other questions of Mr. Croxen by 17 any member of the commission? 18 MS. LYON: No further questions. 19 Thank you, Mr. Croxen. 20 A. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. 21 THE CHAIR: Is Ms. Nancy Hicks here? Will you come 22 forward, please? 23 Mr. Thomas Carr? Mr. Robert Gaylord? And Mr. Bryan 24 Short. 25 Peterson, you want to start?

1 Q. (By Mr. Zah) Could you please state your name, 2 address and occupation for the record and we'll start 3 with Ms. Hicks. 4 5 6 MS. NANCY HICKS 7 8 A. (By Ms. Hicks) My name is Nancy Hicks, I'm the 9 Executive Director of the Arizona Civil Liberties Union, 10 my home address is 2822 East Osborn Road in Phoenix, 11 and the office address is 1429 North First Street in 12 Phoenix. 13 14 MR. THOMAS CARR 15 16 A. (By Mr. Carr) My name is Tom Carr, I'm a rehabili-17 tation counselor, my address is Box 2422 in Prescott. 18 19 20 MR. ROBERT GAYLORD 21 22 A. (By Mr. Gaylord) Name is Bob Gaylord, I'm an 23 attorney in Flagstaff, my address is 1614 North Kutch, 24 K-u-t-c-h, in Flagstaff. 25

MR. BRYAN SHORT

2 3

4

5

(By Mr. Short) My name is Bryan Short, that's A. B-r-y-a-n, Short, I live at 3508 South Cocoma Drive in Flagstaff, I'm a teacher.

6

7

Q. Mr. Carr, could you explain the function or the purpose of ACLU and then relate that to your northern chapter?

8 9

10

A. (By Mr. Carr) Well, I think Nancy, Ms. Hicks, is the primary spokesman as far as the ACLU goes, since she is the staff person in the State of Arizona, perhaps that would be better answered by her.

12

13

11

Q. Okay.

14

A. (By Ms. Hicks) I think I could describe the purposes fairly well, and I think the other gentlemen can

15 16

lead in quite easily from that.

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

The purpose of the ACLU is to defend the Bill of Rights of the United States Constitution, particularly the First Amendment, the freedoms of speech, press, religion, and association, the Fifth, and Sixth and Eighth Amendments, the right of due process, right to counsel, right to reasonable bail, and the 14th Amendment, application of the first ten amendments to the states. I think, as will come out in the report on the municipal court proceedings, the major focus of our activities here in Flagstaff

has been the concern with lack of due process of Native
American Indians off the reservation.

- Q I really haven't, you know, read the report yet but I understand there was a report made by the group and .

 I was just wondering, what prompted the -- your group to study the situation and why the City of Flagstaff?
 - A (By Mr. Short) Perhaps I can answer that.

Our report was born during the 1974 Pow Wow with the cooperation of the City of Flagstaff, and I would like to commend, incidentally, the City of Flagstaff for being extremely cooperative at every stage of the gathering of information for this report.

We organized an extensive observation project to observe the process of justice during the Pow Wow. As part of that, in the Flagstaff municipal court, Attorney Arano (Phonetic) of Phoenix, Attorney Alice Bendheim of Phoenix, Attorney Harold Fedder of Phoenix, Attorney Phil Morgan of Phoenix, Attorney Bob Gaylord of Flagstaff, Attorney Doug Mickeljohn (Phonetic) of Flagstaff, myself, Mr. Carr, and Ms. Eileen McIntosh all observed proceedings in the Flagstaff municipal court. We observed well over 100 arraignments during that Pow Wow week end, and the observation team concluded that the rules of criminal procedure were being routinely violated in ways that amounted to infringements of citizens! rights.

Two questions arose, whether this was a problem based on the intense pressure that the system undergoes during the Pow Wow or whether it was a problem at other times, and what recommendations we ought to make.

After talking the matter over with Councilman Weby (Phonetic) and with the mayor at that time, we decided that more evidence was necessary. The sporadic observation during the year 1974-75, by Mr. Carr, Ms. McIntosh and others convinced us that the problem still existed, so the Arizona Civil Liberties Foundation sponsored a project during this past summer, it sponsored Mr. John Kammer, (Phonetic), who is a first-year law student and who had worked as a police officer part time during summers.

Incidentally, we felt that Mr. Kammer was quite well-qualified for this position, that his first year of law school represented more formal legal training than either of the magistrates that he was observing had, and consequently that he was a good candidate. Furthermore, we prepared him extensively through consultation with attorneys Gaylord, Mickeljohn and Steve Lee in Phoenix, and others to make sure that he understood the rules of criminal procedure, and understood what it was that he was supposed to do.

I think we mandated to him that what we wanted out of him was an observation of the facts, what went on,

specific cases, to get that basic information. He sat in on the Flagstaff Municipal Court from June 23rd to July 31, 1975, and observed 379 in custody arraignments and 25 trials. These figures I think are extremely important, because what they show is that over 90% of the people coming before that court pled guilty. In only a handful was counsel present. The report that we prepared is concerned not with those people that hire lawyers, but what happens to the person who doesn't hire a lawyer, who comes into the Flagstaff Municipal Court without a lawyer helping him. With no counsel.

9.

It's interesting that under that circumstance, there is then no attorney present in the Flagstaff Municipal Court, because the city attorney, as he stated, appears as the prosecutor only when there's a trial and a trial comes up only when somebody pleads not guilty, so that for a majority, a vast majority of the proceedings there is no counsel available. No defense counsel to insure that the rights of the defendant are not being traduced.

I think that this is one of the things that we would like to focus on in this report, the lack of accountability, the lack of knowledge about these court proceedings on the part of those trained attorneys who would be able to defend, stick up for defendants rights. I think it also goes to show why perhaps members of the

legal community in Flagstaff have not said more than they have about this problem, and that is that they are apt to go into the court only when they have a defendant, and when you have a defendant, you go into court to defend him, then you will insure that his rights are going to be upheld.

Consequently, an awful lot of the court proceedings are going on with no accountability to a defense attorney or to an attorney.

Well, from his observations, Mr. Kammer prepared a first draft of this report, which, out of the sense of fairness, we submitted to Judges Brady and Brown for their comments.

Judge Brady talked with Mr. Gaylord, submitted to us a letter giving his comments and also submitted letters from Mr. Clemmens, who was associate under Fred Croxen, from Asby, Watkins and Deesel (Phonetic), who are public defenders in the superior court, and from Ron Lee, who was doing some public defense work in the municipal court at the time. These letters tended to question the conclusions that Mr. Kammer drew rather than the specific cases and facts that were presented and so on this basis, we rewrote the report almost entirely. Making sure that all of the conclusions were in it that were in it were conclusions that we ourselves felt on the basis of additional observation,

could be maintained and supported.

The report was also expanded to include other observations in other areas that Mr. Kammer was not concerned with. Consequently I think what we would like the panel to know is that the report that we prepared, which is 66 pages long and cites 71 specific cases, represents the work of a number of people between 1974, the Pow Wow of 1974 and the present.

- Q Mr. Short, excuse me for interrupting. For the record, would you explain Pow Wow, what it means to say the city of --
 - A. Excuse me?
- Q. Could you explain Pow Wow? You made reference to Pow Wows and I think for the record we ought to tell you know, in your own words, what that is.
- A Well, the Flagstaff all-Indian Pow Wow is a traditional celebration over 4th of July week end that has been held for, oh, quite a number of years, I don't know exactly how many, 30-odd years, perhaps, in Flagstaff, with the exception of one year. It's generally a celebration of the 4th of July and a celebration of, I suppose you'd say the aspects of Indian culture that we are so close to in town.

The reason why we became concerned with the Pow Wow is because large numbers of Native Americans do come to

town during Pow Wow week end, and the problems that have been mentioned in earlier panels, the problems of the treatment of Native Americans, the treatment of intoxicated Native Americans are exacerbated during the Pow Wow simply on the basis of numbers.

THE CHAIR: You spoke of tradition. Could you identify the party, traditon for whom?

- A. I'm not sure I can say, that I can answer that.
- Q (By Mr. Zah) What about the city, you know, in terms of, maybe Mr. Gaylord or someone can answer, what about the city, were they aware of the study as it was going on and then when it was finished, what was the attitude and the comments that you were getting from, let's say the city officials, the mayor, the police department and others?
- A (By Mr. Gaylord) They were aware of our observation during the '74 Pow Wow, initially when Mr. Kammer went in to observe he did not advise them of what his purpose was, subsequently he did advise them that he was observing on behalf of the ACLU, and we did not note any change in the procedures. They continued to be cooperative and helpful and informative and gave him access to all the files after he advised them that he was working for the ACLU.

We did this specifically so that we could note if there was any change of procedure and first could observe

the procedures anonymously so the court would not be aware that the ACLU was in there.

- Q In your statement, Mr. Short, you made the remark that only a very small percentage, you know, in those cases, you know, was there a lawyer. And I was wondering, could you take a rough guess what you mean by small percentage?
- A. (By Mr. Short) Oh, I would say significantly less than 10%. I think that perhaps Judge Brady would be better able to give an answer to that one.
 - Q. Less than 10%?
- A Well, more than roughly 93% of the cases observed by Mr. Kammer, a plea of guilty was entered, so there was no not guilty plea, there was no request for counsel, I think that perhaps Judge Brady might give a more specific figure on that, certainly an overwhelming majority.
 - Q. You mentioned that the study had to be redrafted?
 - A. Yes.
- Q And I was just wondering, you know, what reasons did you do that?
- A Well, I think that we wanted first to give the judges a chance to respond to it and to see whether or not they had substantive revisions which they suggest and I think that we probably did take out quite a bit of material to which they objected. I think we also felt that

there were issues not touched on and that what we had presented was essentially a rough draft, that is Mr.

Kammer was operating as a researcher for us. He gathered quite a bit of information, presented it with some tentative conclusions, and then we reworked it completely. I think this is something that one would do with any report that one produced.

Q. So you made the report, you know, about let's say the judicial system or court procedure or whathaveyou, you presented it to the people whowere affected and involved in that system, they made their remarks and then they told you in so many words that what they want excluded from that report?

A. They made some comments. They made some specific comments. They also made general criticisms of the report which I think will become obvious probably in later testimony today.

Q. What were some of the areas, you know, problem areas that was --

A. Well, Mr. Kammer had included, I think, quite a bit of his own opinions concerning the attitude of the judges toward defendants, concerning legal issues which perhaps he was not completely qualified to deal with, concerning things that we felt not particularly relevant to the major function of the report.

There was a lot of -- a lot of revision that had to go on. We're not -- you know, we're not ashamed of this fact.

- Q Would one of you care to, let's say summarize what's in the meat of the conclusion of that report?
- A I think I'm probably prepared to do that if you don't mind my taking --

MR. LEVIS: Excuse me, just for the record, if we can identify this also just for the Court Reporter, I think as Exhibit 3. That is the report that has been submitted to the committee which I think you're referring to, if this is the same report.

A. Yes. Incidentally, the date on this report is November 10th of this year, consequently although it's been submitted to the city council, nobody's had a chance to really respond to it yet. The report, as divided into three parts, the first one summarizes the judicial process faced by defendants, the second deals with three primary concerns, the language barrier, the problem of right to counsel and the question of non-attorney judges and the third gives specific recommendations to the City of Flagstaff.

As far as part one, the judicial process, we start at the beginning and we noted that in terms of the arrest, problems occurred in respect to two charges, the

.6

first was 'the loitering charge, which cases did come up in which the loitering charge was clearly in contradiction to the LARC law used to arrest people whose situation was being publicly intoxicated.

I can give you police reports citing one of those cases, while on patrol this officer was radio-dispatched to Sprouse-Reitz store to remove a passed out subject off the sidewalk. Upon arrival I noticed the subject was unconscious and had a strong intoxicant odor from his mouth. The subject was also sprawled out across the sidewalk in such a way that the other pedestrians happened to walk around him.

This officer then arrested him. I then transported him to the county jail where he was incarcerated. No further action taken.

- Q (By Mr. Levis) Excuse me, Mr. Short, again just to explain to the committee and to the audience, could you briefly or someone on the panel, explain the provisions under the LARC law that makes such an arrest, in your opinion, legal?
 - A I think Mr. Gaylord can probably do that.
 - Q We're sort of going into areas that are specific --
- A. (By Mr. Gaylord) I can't cite the statute. When the LARC law came into effect, they also abolished the offense of public drunkenness. Previously, if somebody was

intoxicated and out on the streets, the police could pick them up and incarcerate them, the justification was more or less it was protective custody for the — as much for the protection of the inebriate as for anything else. This law was abolished, the LARC law was instituted and the purpose was to provide facilities where inebriates could be placed without incarceration.

Because of the quarrels with the various government authorities, the funding has never been provided, at least established funding, in Flagstaff, it's been on and off. It's our feeling, from many of the cases cited there, that in fact these are public intoxicants that the officers wished to take into protective custody, and notwithstanding the fact that perhaps at least in some of those cases their intentions are well-meaning, we feel that it's unconstitional.

. . . ? 2

0. Thank you.

20.

A. (By Mr. Short) The other charge where arrest might cause a problem was a disturbing the peace charge, the — one of the judges of the court was reported to have said to our investigator on June 30th, the police are working the hell out of this DTP charge, they investigate a phone complaint, take some guy downtown for investigation, the guy says something out of the way in the car so the police end up by being the complainants. In a disturbing the peace

OFFICIAL COURT REPORTERS

charge, the question is whose peace is being disturbed, if it's the peace of another citizen then ideally that citizen would be the complainant. If it's the peace of the police officer, then the police officer can be the complainant. According to the observer in the majority of DTP charges in Flagstaff, the police officer was the complainant.

Now, there have been supreme court rulings to the effect that a police officer must be expected to show extraordinary restraint, since he has publicly hired for the purpose of keeping the peace, for someone simply to curse at him in the way you would to an ordinary citizen this should not constitute disturbing the peace, and yet cases were noted where it appeared the main complaint of the police of the police officer was that somebody had demonstrated a beligerant attitude or had cursed at him and this was used as grounds for arrest.

After arrest and before arraignment a complaint must either be sworn to the judge or certified by the arresting officer. as to containing reasonable grounds to believe that the offense was committed by the individual charged.

There are situations, however, in which this is not followed in the Flagstaff Municipal Court, one complaint for example, was brought before the court and rather than

being certified by the arresting officer it was certified by the bailiff. Now, the bailiffs a member of the police force but he's not the arresting officer, he has no knowledge of what went on, he can not be expected to certify that there were reasonable grounds for the arrest and on being asked the bailiff was reported to have said, I sign them all, I sign them that way all the time.

22.

We feel that there's an affirmative responsibility on the part of the judge to oversee these charges and to dismiss them where they are improper and we furthermore think that the accountability problem comes in here, too, that if the city attorney were reviewing the charges or if the city council had a representative observing the procedures on a much more regular basis, then whenever a situation appeared where the charges might possibly be defective, they could be dismissed and this problem could be brought before the police.

But we don't feel that this is going on. Once the defendant gets in court, he is read his rights en masse, that is all the defendants being arraigned for that particular day are read a statement of their rights. There are two problems with this, first is that that statement may contain statements which encourage a guilty plea on the part of the defendant.

For example, on June 23rd one of the judges told the

1,2

. .8.

assembled defendants that, a plea of guilty is, quote, a more expedient way to handle your case. You know if you're guilty.

On June 25th, of course if you enter a plea of guilty there will be no need for all this falderal of a trial. On July

On July 12th, if you plead guilty there will be no need for a trial, summoning witnesses, so actually it's the most expeditious way to handle your case, but it's your decision and the court will not influence you in any way.

On July 4th a defendant pled not guilty to a charge of loitering, and the judge said to the interpreter, if he enters a plea of not guilty that means he's going to have to stand trial, post bond. If he wants to change his plea to guilty we can dispose of this right now, otherwise he'll have to come to trial.

The second problem that occurs with the en masse advisement of rights, is that if a defendant doesn't understand English, he doesn't understand the rights, which are read to him, and here I think this is something that this hearing should be quite concerned with. Because this en masse advisement of rights is literally the only significant statement of rights that many defendants get in the Flagstaff Municipal Court.

After the reading of rights, the -- and it's not translated into Navajo or wasn't in more than, say maybe there were one or two cases during the Pow Wow of '75 when there was a NACA interpreter present who did translate these but otherwise, they were not. He comes before the judge and the charge is read, sometimes the charge is only named and he's asked for a plea. If he pleads guilty it is at that point that he is asked to sign the guilty plea and waiver of counsel forms.

Now, this is, I think, one of the most important things that we discovered, and is a very important issue because as a matter of fact, it came up only last Monday in a habeus corpus hearing that was brought before the Superior Court in Coconino County, which I think Mr. Gaylord can perhaps comment on.

A (By Mr. Gaylord) We brought a habeus corpus action on behalf of Sara Begay, specifically she was incarcerated for a period of ten days and we felt that she hadn't been properly advised of her rights, hadn't properly waived her rights.

In response at the hearing, at which Judge Brown presided at the trial of Ms. Begay or this was at the arraignment, at which time she entered a guilty plea and she signed the two standard forms which are signed by every defendant who wishes to plead guilty before the courts.

17.

One is a waiver of the right to counsel and the other one is waiver of the specific constitional rights, they're both standard forms that are set forth in the Arizona Rules of Criminal Procedure and the appendix to that. To the rules.

The court released Ms. Begay, and the conclusion was that because she had no opportunity to read these documents, in fact it was just a ritual, that there was no intelligent waiver of her right to counsel and her other constitional rights, therefore she was released. The guilty plea was not properly taken.

I think the interesting aspect at the habeus corpus hearing was the testimony provided by Judge Brown, was that this case was absolutely normal in every respect, that this is the way it's done every day.

Q (By Mr. Levis) What is done to insure such a procedure will not happen in the future?

A I understand the procedure -- well, first we should say that this specifically applied to Judge Brown. I know that Judge Brady does question the defendants more when he speaks to them individually. I understand, just from talking to Mr. Otero, the bailiff in the city court, that Judge Brown's procedures have also been changed since our habeus corpus hearing.

A. (By Mr. Short) Incidentally, I have here a copy of

the guilty plea form from that hearing, and it shows a number of specific rights that are to be read to the defendant, and then initialed by the judge. And it's quite easy to see that what the judge has done is simply run a series of squiggles and his signature all along the side of the page, and this indicates the rapidity with which this form went through the court.

I think it was estimated, wasn't it, that it took something like roughly one minute between the time that Sara Began pled guilty and the time that she went back to sit down? And then, under this kind of pressure of time and this kind of casualness in regard to these forms, that the plea and the waiver of counsel are not voluntary and intelligent.

Incidentally, the observer did observe, in the Phoenix Municipal Court, and observed a procedure there which I think we would like to recommend, that is the waiver of counsel and request — the waiver of counsel and the guilty plea forms after the defendant indicated a desire to plead guilty, he was given the forms, told to go and sit down and read them, when he finished reading them he came back before the judge and the judge asked him, do you still want to plead guilty. And if the defendant indicated that he still wanted to plead guilty, then the judge read, individually, each one of the rights,

3 4

looking at the defendant and if he felt that the defendant didn't understand any one of those particular rights, he went over it and tried to explain it in simple language.

I think that this is the kind of thing that makes sure that people do understand the right to -- that they give up when they plead guilty and the waiver of counsel.

Q (By Mr. Zah) What about in so far as, you know, the right to a jury trial? You know, things like that, is that all on that piece of paper? All of those basic rights of an individual?

A (By Mr. Gaylord) This is the standard form, it's two forms that all defendants who wish to enter a plea are asked to sign, one of these is the waiver of counsel, and the other is the waiver of rights. They're both quite lengthy forms and the point was saying that from the time Ms. Begay announced that she wished to enter a plea of guilty until she returned back, was, she was also asked to read those documents and she was sentenced during that period. She did not have adequate time to read the documents, they're quite long.

A (By Mr. Short) If a defendant pleads guilty he gets time in which to get the fine together. If he does not plead guilty, if he pleads not guilty, he is faced with the problem of coming up with bond which has been discussed here, so often. We feel that the problem exists in the

1,4

court with the difficulty of obtaining release, OR on one's own recognizance and this leads to situations, like the following.

A defendant from Tuba City, Arizona, came before the court on a charge of drinking in public, do you understand the charge? Yes. How do you wish to plead? Not guilty. You want to enter a plea of not guilty? Very well, the court accepts the plea of not guilty, bond is set at \$120.00. At this point the defendant returned to his seat among the other defendants, several of them turned around, leaned forward and whispered excitedly to him.

After the arraignments he came back to the bailiff and said I want to change my plea to guilty so I can go home.

We feel that until the presumption OR is fully recognized by the court, in other words, if a defendant is not granted release on his own recognizance, those facts should be stated in the report, and should be individually determined.

A problem further occurs in that the right to be released on one's own recognizance is apparently not always mentioned in the en masse advisement. We have 23 included in our report which were tape recorded by our observer, and it doesn't -- it isn't included in either

one of those, and then it tends to have to be asked for by the defendant, and if the defendant speaks no English, it's very difficult for him to ask to be released on his own recognizance on the basis of specific circumstances.

A couple of comments, brief comments on part two of our report. The language barrier we found out the kinds of things that everybody I think has been saying here today, and that everybody agrees on, that the rights can not be regarded as being understood if they're not translated into Navajo, that under such cases where the charges and the proceedings are translated the translation is done by another defendant or by a friend of the defendant whose competence as a translater is surely under question.

The communication between judge and defendant, when the defendants are specifically Navajo Indians who don't speak English or don't speak it very well, is a real problem in the court. As far as the right to counsel issue, according to our figures, the budget for indigent defense for the Flagstaff Municipal Court was \$2,000.00 a year as opposed to \$60,000.00 a year in the superior court, and the budget for jury trials was \$700.00. Where did you get those figures, Bob?

- A. (By Mr. Gaylord) Judge Brady.
- A. (By Mr. Short) Judge Brady. And we feel, of course,

this is absurd, that the City of Flagstaff has a very definite responsibility to put more of its money into the court, to the effective running of the court to provide translation and to provide right to counsel.

Furthermore, under certain circumstances such as Pow Wow week end, the public defender may not be in town, and consequently a defendant who wants to apply for counsel may face a situation in which he will have to wait longer than his sentence would be in order to talk to the attorney for which he is applying. We feel that unless this counsel is made available on a regular basis, and also made available during arraignments, these guilty pleas are not going to be knowing, are not going to be voluntary and intelligent.

The third area that we talk about is that of nonattorney judges, it's been recognized by the Supreme Court
of the State of California and also by the Cities of
Phoenix and Tucson, that judges should be attorneys and
we feel that there's no reason why Flagstaff might not
recognize a similar -- similar need.

The final section involves our recommendations to the City of Flagstaff, a -- I'd like to read about a page and a half of these recommendations.

The court must be staffed by two full time attorney magistrates. Two full time magistrates are needed so that

3

5

4

6 7

8 9

10

11

12

13 14

15

16

17 18

19

20

21

22 23

24

25

arraignments, many will not be heard and so the defendant who pleads not quilty can be tried within reasonable time after their arraignments.

The magistrates must be attorneys because that's the only way to insure that defendants will receive complete and adequate arraignments, fair trials and proper sentences.

The court must provide trained and independent translators who will be at all arraignments and when needed.

Court-appointed counsel must also be present and available at all arraignments and on call during the day.

The indifference of the cityscouncil and the city attorney's office towards the court must cease. directly responsible for the conduct of the court. neither has made any significant effort to correct the problems of the court which have been brought to their attention.

The city attorney's office should screen the complaints filed in the court and instruct the judges in the The council must supervise the judges whom it There is money available to improve the court and provide needed services from the federal Law Enforcement Assistance Administration and other agencies and the council. and the city attorney's office should try to obtain it.

Then, as far as proceedings, the judges must not regard a police report as an indication of a defendant's

guilt before the plea has been entered, and must refuse to accept complaints which are incomplete, vague or not been certified properly. They must make every attempt to make sure that non-English-speaking defendants understand their rights, their choices of action, their results of a plea, and the processes through which they are going.

The judges must protect the presumption of innocence by not encouraging the guilty plea, not accepting pleas where no factual basis exists. He must live up to the legal guaranteed presumption that defendants be released OR unless specific facts dictate against such a release. They must make the facts a matter of record. They must make sure defendants understand their rights to reasonable length of time for the paying of fines.

This occurred several times, the non-English-speaking defendant didn't understand that he could be allowed a month or two months to pay his fine. The judges must insure that the loitering statutes and the disturbing the peace statutes are being used as determined by the law.

So that's the substance of the report.

Q (By Mr. Zah) I have one other question. You found all of these things out and you documented it and you turned it into a report and I was just wondering, what is the group, you know, planning on doing with the report so that a positive result or response might be, you know,

given by the City of Flagstaff? And I'd like to ask Ms. Hicks that.

A (By Ms. Hicks) We were just discussing that at lunch today. I don't think we can say at such an early time, and perhaps other members of the panel would like to discuss it too, I think since it only came out this week, there should be a chance for the city to respond. It's quite clear that there is a need for financial commitment, it may be through the city and also through LEAA to provide funding for interpreters for public defender, for regular public defenders, for jury fees, this — the notion of \$700.00 for jury fees is absurd.

After -- if there's no response, then I'm -- I'm the state coordinator and I'd like to see what the -- you know, I'm responsible for the entire state, and most of the solid ideas come from local areas such as the northern chapter, so I --

A. (By Mr. Short) I think that our first step has been to try to open this up as a matter of public debate, I think it's quite possible that there are other people in town who have other points of view and other information to add, that would help in solving this problem or other recommendations to make.

Bringing this report here and presenting it is a first step. Then, of course, we will be bringing it to the

1 city council and to see what kind of action they are willing 2 to take and so I think we just want to try to make people 3 aware of the situation and get those people who are concerned 4 to get their heads together and working together for a 5 solution. 6 We're not interested in an adversary proceedings 7 either, we've found out what we think is information that's 8 important to our concerns and we want it to be taken under 9 consideration by those people who can do something about it. 10 MR. ZAH: I don't have any question, other members 11 may want to ask. 12 (By Mr. Levis) I'd like to follow up on a few 13 questions, if I could. 14 Do youmind if we keep these documents and just 15 A. No. 16 -- concerning the Sarah Begay case, I think we'll 17 just refer to the waiver of counsel document as Exhibit 18 4, and the quilty plea as Exhibit 5. 19 Are there any other documents that you could send 20 us concerning this case from the superior court or --21 A. The only other thing in the file, other than our 22 habeus corpus petition, was the minute entry of the court. 23 I could perhaps send a copy of the petition. 24 I would appreciate that. Q. 25 To back up and discuss a few -- it's my understanding

from reading the report that you talk about the arraignment proceeding, but in looking at the rules, this is also the initial appearance, is it not?

ć

A Yes. A point to be emphasized, this is a proceeding in which attorneys don't appear. Even if — if the person has the assets normally if they're going to go out and hire an attorney, for example, if one of my clients calls me up from the city jail, I can go down usually and get him released that night by talking with the police officers, or if not, I can speak to the court in the morning and get him released. I don't go through the normal arraignment proceedings when you have the en masse advisements and everything.

And then the second part which you're asking, yes, the arraignment is also the initial appearance.

- Q And this is also the time at which I think you stated 90% of the defendants plead guilty so this all has to be done within 24 hours of the arrest?
 - A. Yes.

Q Under Arizona law.

Now, you indicated that to the best of the observer's knowledge, the only time the rights were read was at the time that the defendants are brought before the judge, right at the beginning, that they are not read individually before a person is informed of his right to plead not guilty

3 4

> 16 17

18

19

15

20 21

22 23

24

25

and the waiver, and that this has been in a sense overturned by the superior court in your habeus corpus proceeding involving Judge Brown or not --

Excuse me, that's not quite true. The court, during the en masse advisement, and the judges do have more or less a standard form which they read, and it's quite comprehensive, I think for the most part it's quite a good advisement, we question whether this is sufficient in view of the fact that rule 17 says the defendant personally appeared before me and that's also a part of the affidavit which the judge signs there when he accepts the guilty plea. However, the court accepted the en masse advisement as an adequate advising of their rights, the question was, then, whether they understood them.

The court's under some obligation to determine this, and they felt that simply handing them the form and having them sign wasn't sufficient.

- What bothers me is under rule 17.2 it says before accepting a plea, the court shall address the defendant personally and what does -- you know, what is your view of the word personally, I think is what it gets down to.
- A. Well, at our habeus corpus proceedings the court accepted the en masse advisement as sufficient.
 - Q That's not when the person is --
 - That wasn't the basis of his ruling. À.

Q But if you read -- you could read the rules, I take it I think very easily to say that a person has to first be advised of their rights and then when they're asked to enter a plea, they have to be advised of their rights again.

A. I think you're right. I don't know if the court would accept my interpretation.

Q Now, I don't know if it was discussed, when you went through the review, but there was a discussion in the report of dollars versus days in sentencing. I wondered if you could just go into that a little bit? What -- what that procedure is? And what the ACLU found as far as dollars versus days in sentencing?

A. It's still a common practice for the court to give dollars or days, in other words, 30 days or a fine of \$330.00. It's common practice. The supreme court requires that == the United States Supreme Court requires that if a person is assessed a fine or a dollars or days sentence that they are to be given an opportunity to, a reasonable opportunity to pay their fine. In some of the cases which we observed, and these had particularly to do with Judge Brown, in these cases Judge Brown would neglect to mention to the defendant his opportunity to pay a fine.

- A. (By Mr. Short) To have time to pay a fine.
- A. (By Mr. Gaylord) To have time to pay it. In other

words, you either go to jail or come up with your money right now. Was, I think the alternative as the defendant received it.

A (By Mr. Short) I think that was a very important concern of the team at the '74 Pow Wow, but I think that the team did feel that in Judge Brady's court, a significant and valid effort was made thereafter to make sure that the defendants did understand that they had that amount of time to pay their fine so that the procedure was really cleaned up in Judge Brady's court.

Q The other issue that concerns me is I've talked to Judge Brady concerning the release of a person on his orm her own recognizance, and he indicated to me that a person has not been arrested before or has not abused the privilege before, that he will release anyone from the reservation on their own recognizance.

That is that they will, in a minor case, they'll appear for trial. Yet your statistics seem to indicate that 90% of those who appear at the initial appearance plead guilty. And there seems to be an inconsistent set of facts there that I don't really understand.

A. (By Mr. Gaylord) Of course, as to the 90%, that doesn't directly tie into the question of release OR. What we're saying is that, it is our feeling that the threat, the requirement of a bond was one of the factors that went

4 5 6

3

7 8 9

11

12

10

13 14

15

16

17

18 19

20

21

22

23

24

25

into encouraging people to enter a guilty plea, perhaps they --

(By Mr. Short) And that perhaps the circumstances A. under which OR release could be expected by a defendant were not made clear to him before the plea and it's quite possible that defendants who might have been released by the court OR pled quilty because they just didn't understand what was going on, where I'm speaking primarily of those who don't speak English.

This gets back to the other question we've talked 0. about interpreters, and the fact that I think representatives from NACA said not only do you need interpreters who can translate the law, or the statements from English into Navajo and then back again, but you need people who are conversant in legal words. What are your recommendations in this area and what can be done to deal with this problem because, you know, all-- well, what does own recognizance mean? Start right there.

My feeling is that if they pay a translator enough money they can probably find somebody qualified to fill I think that if one goes through a bureaucracy the job. in terms of applying to have this person with certain qualifications fill a job, from all of our experience, the results aren't often what you want. I think that if the -- if the city decided that this was as important a

thing as we feel it is, that they could find somebody that could be trained in the procedures enough to be able to do it quite well.

Q Should there be a public defender there at all times? Let's say in a big city court, of course you have other problems there, there probably are public defenders who are at the initial appearance or at the arraignment to deal with some of these problems. Is Flagstaff, do you feel —

A I think that if, perhaps before the en masse advisement of rights or sometime in conjunction with it, if the defendant were given the guilty plea form, the waiver of counsel form, and the request for appointment of counsel form, in other words, if he were given these far enough ahead of time to be able to study them and to see what these forms dictate in terms of the requirements, in terms of the availability of counsel, so that he might make a decision on the basis of the possible availability of counsel before he came up before the judge to enter a plea.

I think that under those circumstances, then those people who felt that they hadn't -- that they were not guilty could feel, would feel more comfortable about the possibility of having a counsel or court-appointed counsel and of course that counsel would have to be immediately available.

- Q Should this also not be done in Navajo, possibly Hopi and then also have an OR form too? Because I think those are the four forms in looking through the rules of criminal procedure that seem to be the most critical.
- A. Yes. The release questionnaire is fairly complicated and I think if it's going to be meaningful, the defendant probably needs help with that.
- Q Because my understanding there's two parts to that, there's first the officer part where I think you indicate in some cases they ask a question and the officer didn't answer it except say yes, no --
 - A All right.
- Q -- and then there's the other three forms you men-

One final question. I think it was in yesterday's paper or the day before there was, at least in the Denver paper, there's been a study done by a department or a division within the Department of Justice concerning indigent right to counsel, where it was indicated that this guarantee as protected by the Constitution, ruled on by the Supreme Court three years ago is not being adhered to in any courts that were studied. I think there were 19 cities.

A. Yes, I think that we would like to stress the fact that we are not accusing Flagstaff court of being worse than other local courts, in fact there may be many circum-

6

7

8

9 10

12

13

11

14

15

16

17 18

19

20

21

22

23 24

25

stances under which the Municipal Court of Flagstaff is far better than many of the justice courts throughout rural areas of Arizona or smaller towns in Arizona, and that there is a tremendous problem when you ask a justice court in a very small town under a very limited budget to provide this kind of help for a defendant.

Our feeling is that Flagstaff has the funds, that Flagstaff is a town in which law enforcement takes quite a bit of money and consequently we should be -- not be holding ourselves up to standards of rural justice courts but up to standards comparable with those in Phoenix and Tucson where these things are more readily provided.

- Will the information that's found in this study also be sent to the state legislature? Because a lot of this money I suppose has to be allocated by them, at least as far as public defender system, it's my understanding that by state law only Maricopa County and Pima County have to provide such a service because they have over a 100,000 people.
- Well, certainly if I'm right this is a law that we -- the ACLU on the state level has been concerned with. In other words, we would like to see this made more general and lobby to that effect.

Nancy, do you have anything to add?

(By Ms. Hicks) Just that it will be distributed to

1 several members of the legislature and hope that the 2 right to counsel could be facilitated in Flagstaff 3 THE CHAIR: Any other questions? 4 If not, we want to thank you for appearing. 5 Is Judge William Brady in the audience? 6 Will you come forward, sir, please? 7 (By Ms. Lyon) For the record, sir, would you please 0. 8 state your name, address and occupation? 9 10 11 JUDGE WILLIAM BRADY 12 13 (By Judge Brady) My name is William C. Brady, I'm 14 the Chief Magistrate for the City of Flagstaff, and I 15 live at 3134 Mount Eldon Drive. 16 Q. Thank you. 17 We want to apologize to you for running behind 18 schedule, but as you were able to observe we had some 19 very worthwhile testimony presented to us and thank you 20 for your patience. 21 That's perfectly all right, I enjoyed it. A. 22 Would you please describe for the record the O. 23 Flagstaff Magistrate Court, your specific responsibilities 24 and qualifications? 25 A. I am the Chief Magistrate, I am responsible for the

1 administration of the City of Flagstaff Municipal Court. 2 I sit in the court, I'm responsible for the office, for the actions of the personnel and my associate magistrate, 3 4 Judge Brown. 5 Could you tell us at this point whether you have 6 any Indian employees? 7 A. I don't have any Indian employees at this time. 8 Q. Do you anticipate starting any recruitment for 9 Indian staff? 10 A. I tried to get the money to get a full time bailiff 11 to assist in keeping court records and also to serve as 12 interpreter, but the money that I thought I was going to 13 get for that is now going to be used for a survey of filing 14 and processing and so on between the police department and 15 the court. 16 Q. We won't ask you to comment on your response. 17 A. Very well. 18 Judge Brady, how would you respond to the ACLU 19 report we've just heard today? 20 I think it's biased, slanted, erroneous, and I 21 intend to prove it. 22 All right. Well, we're here to listen to you if Q. 23 you'd like to give us some examples, chapter and verse. 24 A. Fine. Very well. Do you mind if I stand? 25 0. Not at all.

6.

9.

A All right.

I've been Judge of the Flagstaff City Court now, Chief Magistrate for some seven years. You have a copy of the report, you also should have gotten a copy of the first draft. The draft was done over and they came out with the second draft. I answered, and by the way, if any of you would like to go along with this, on my chair are copies of this and you can go along with it page by page.

If you'd like to have them, I think it might prove interesting.

Now, this study was done by a one-year law student who came into the Flagstaff City Court on June 23rd, and as he states in the first draft, I approached Judge Brady in Chambers and not without qualms of conscience.

I told the judge a very carefully measured portion of the truth. Now here's a man who's going to be an attorney and he's already violated the cannon of ethics. Cringe.

All right. He mentioned that he was a former police officer, and he was, in a small town back east, he worked summers for three summers in a police -- or a capacity in a town of 250,000 people and during the three years, he made two arrests. It's in the record.

Okay. Former police officer. Now a law student, working in cooperation with a professor of law at the

And what was that study about? A study of defendants and the alibis that they use in the lower courts. It's in the report.

All right. He further explained he was having difficulty hearing the arraignments, asked if he might be allowed to sit in the jury box close to the judge and defendants. Judge Brady courteously agreed, and the situation improved from them.

All right. Now, this was on the 23rd of June, on the afternoon of July the 10th he decided to tell the judge the truth. That he was in fact doing an investigation for the ACLU. And Judge Brady took the news calmly but appeared surprised. When the observer expressed his hope that the news would have no effect on the judges, the bailiff or the clerk or his access to the records, the judge said we won't even tell them. And I didn't tell them.

Sam Clements, which there was a letter from him, a three-year law student who was practicing in the court at that time, he's the one that found out from Mr. Kammer and told the others.

All right. This is all taken from the first draft which all of you who have a copy of this, a letter addressed by me to Ms. Nancy Hicks, received your letter dated.

October the 15th, the Flagstaff City Court did receive a

a copy of the first draft of the Flagstaff Municipal Court

-- or proceedings court. I went through this report

thoroughly. This court feels the report is full of misstatements, innuendos and half-truths. He advised -- I

have submitted copies of this report to the city council,

to the Coconino Bar Association, at one of their regular

meetings, and requested that they study the report and

offer comment to the court regarding the allegations made.

When I was through speaking to the bar, Mr. Gaylord, who is a member of the ACLU, was present at that meeting. Mr. Gaylord took the floor and stated and I quote verbatim, Mr. Gaylord's here, if he'd care toodeny it, he was one of the instigators in the setting up the investigation of the Flagstaff City Court procedures, but that he did not believe half of the stuff in the report, that it would be redrafted, and that 50% of the garbage would be taken out.

All right. Then I went on to say, I had not received the second draft, which I did last Friday. Okay. Now, the garbage that was taken out was everything nice or decent that Jack Kammer had to say about the Flagstaff City Court and its treatment of the Indians. It's right here. There's copies of it out there.

All right. Let's take the first page. At arraignment the defendant's case will be in the hands of non-

attorney judges. If the defendant is fortunate enough to be brought before Chief Magistrate Brady, his case is likely to be treated with dignity and compassion. But they took it out.

Let's go to page 10 of the original report. On
July 8th, informed of number three's predicament by court
observer, Charlie Donaldson, a lawyer in Tuba City, Arizona,
with DNA, phoned Chief Judge Brady who immediately contacted the jail and ordered number three sentences commuted
to time served. Number three. In this report, everybody's
referred to as a number. Not names.

I had no chance to look these up, to check them out, to rebut them. Numbers. There was a key with the names furnished, that was given to me this morning, the day of the hearing. This is fair and this is impartial?

All right. Now here, we've had talked about interpreters, no attempts made to see that people understand their rights. And yet in this report, Brady to the interpreter, do you read English? Yes. Interpret this, then, for the defendant. He handed the guilty plea proceeding form. It lists the substantial defendants' rights. Tell him he's charged with disturbing the peace but read the rights first.

The interpreter referring to the form spoke with the defendant for two full minutes. Judge Brady, does he

understand that? The interpreter said yes.

Now, tell him that he's charged with disturbing the peace, and Judge Brady read the statute, the statutory language, including the words maliciously, wilfully, tumultuous, I don't know where maliciously came because it's not in the disturbing the peace statute, but anyway, it's in Jack Kammer's report.

The interpreter, taken back, says you want me to interpret that? Judge Brady said yes. He then, however, dismissed the charge on grounds not related to the language problem.

Let's go to page 14 of the first draft. The inadequate efforts by the Flagstaff Municipal Court to overcome
language difficulties could be termed a sort of discrimination against Indians, especially Navajos. If it is
discrimination, it is a passive discrimination brought about
by indifference, rather than a conscious or subconscious
effort to treat the Navajos poorly.

All right, they do not indicate that the Flagstaff Municipal Court actively discriminates against Indians or against Chicanos or Blacks either, for that matter. The court observer found very little evidence to support allegations of affirmative discrimination.

All right. Page 15 of the first draft. Judge Brady is proud of his court, there is no indication that here

personally has tainted his court with racial discrimination.

All right. And then he says, Judge Brady, too,
makes mistakes. During a trial before Brady on July 9th,
a defendant acting as his own attorney was cross examining
the prosecution witness. The prosecutor objected to a
question that the defendant had asked. The objection had
nothing to do with the question being a leading question,
for the prosecutor, of course realized that the defense has
every right to ask leading questions of a prosecution
witness. Nevertheless, the judge sustained the objection.
He told the defendant nothing other than he was leading
the witness.

Well, that one I was able to look up, because of the date, he certainly was leading the witness, he was asking the questions and answering them too. And certainly the objection was sustained.

Now, page 18 of the original draft. It has been observed that many JP's, justices of the peace, are exsheriffs, police officers, peacemen with prosecution experience only. Appointed for political plums, who as judges tend to be prosectuion minded. But if such is the rule, Judge Brady is the exception. Brady has 25 years experience in law enforcement, see appendix E, but rather than having made him prosecution minded, his law enforcement background appears to have made him more de-

1 mandi

manding on police and prosecutors.

On June 25th, in an obvious boast, I was bragging, but perhaps still a true statement, Judge Brady, during a break between trials told this observer, before I came this was an assembly line court but I changed that. Before that the police would bring a man in, he would be found guilty and that was it. But I have since told them that chief, the cases had better be good, if so you'll win, bring in a bad one and you're wasting your time.

Judge Brady's boast exhibits an intent to remain aloof at all times, and not have undue cooperation with the police. He has been even criticized by some police officials for being so.

All right. Judges Brady and Brown might both be better judges if they were trained attorneys, certainly they could be better trained in the law. But even a judge who knows and can quote the law beautifully may be lacking in judgment, common sense, compassion, feeling for his fellow man.

All right. Judge Brady, compassion. Judge Brown, harsh. Judge Brady does not have the ability to quote the law beautifully. But he does have judgment and common sense. Judge Brady is a man of compassion and fairness.

Now, on June 26th, while accompanying the bailiff on the transporting of prisoners from the county jail to the

city court, the observer went with the bailiff, they were coming for arraignment. The observer had occasion to speak with two of the court's regular offenders. Number 13 and 14. Both told the observer that they would much rather prefer going before Brady than Brown. And they were both upset when the observer mistakenly told them that Brown would be on the bench that day. All right?

Judge Brady has an uncanny knack for putting a nervous, frightened defendant at ease. You know, these are some of the good things.

We're going to get to the non-attorney judges part, the observer part, the en masse readings and so on, if you'll just bear with me.

On the next page Brady, this is page 19 of the original report, Brady has the respect of the defendants who appear before him in large part because he treats them with dignity. A treatment which does not preclude friendly chiding. Number 14 had been before Brady on June 25th on a charge of malicious mischief to which he pled guilty and was fined \$31.50. The next day he was back on a charge of being a pedestrian in the roadway, and the judge chided him, this is actually — all right.

On June 26th, an elderly and apparently penniless gentleman was arraigned by Brady for hitchhiking in the roadway. The defendant told the judge he was trying to get

back to Buffalo, New York, on the occasion of the death of his father. After accepting his plea of guilty and pronouncing a sentence of one day or time served, Brady asked the defendant do you have any money? When the defendant said no, Brady said how do you eat? He said, well, I start at one end of town and go to the other, hitting the restaurants for a handout. That doesn't work, then it's brother can you spare a dime. Judge Brady reached into his wallet, handed the old man \$3.00, and says this ought to help you get started.

After court the observer asked the bailiff about the donation. The bailiff answered, yes, he does that every now and then.

The only reason I'm bringing this in, I have been accused in what I feel, in a vicious attack on the -- my character and the character of the court, more or less in the article in the paper, I've been called stupid, unintelligent, don't know the law, but it's a funny thing, there have been no complaints from the Superior Court of Flagstaff regarding the operation of the city court, there have been no complaints from the Coconino Bar Association regarding the operation of the city court, there have been no complaints from the City court, there have been no complaints from the City Council of the City of Flagstaff regarding the operation of the court. We serve the people, all of the people. It makes no difference to me whether

they're Black, blue, green or brown, everyone is treated the same way. We have had problems, yes, with interpreters. We are going to correct that. We are making every effort to correct that. Now, this court handles, in 1973, we handled 9,000-and-some cases. 1974 it jumped up to over 10,000, almost 10,500, that's a tremendous increase.

We're talking here about Native Americans, I have lived in Flagstaff for 25 years, I don't think there's anybody in this town that knows or understands the Indians better than I do. But anyway, to get on with this, and get on to other things, on July 31st Brady conducted an arraignment which of all the arraignments the observer witnessed typifies the judge's mercy.

The defendant was a bruised and battered number 21, an Indian, it might be worth mentioning, charged with disturbing the peace.

After hearing the defendant's intent to plead guilty, Brady asked him what happened. The defendant said I got in a conflict last night. Judge Brady said, conflict? It looks like you fell in a cement mixer. Were you taken to the hospital? The defendant said yes. Brady, checking the report, taken to emergency room and was checked but refused care. He asked the defendant why? The defendant said I was too up tight. If it's possible I'd like to go back to the hospital.

Judge Brady said definitely. One day's suspended, hold on, there's a warrant here for you from last April, '74, you were given time to pay a fine which you failed to do, so therefore you're found contemptuous of the court order and you must serve the time then.

All right. The defendant then protested the warrant must for someone else, not him, however identification was made through tatoos, age, physical characteristics. All right. Brady said I find you contemptuous of the court order, and sentence you to the ten days in county jail, to the bailiff, see that he gets medical attention.

Okay. After the adjournment, number 21 approached the judge, the defendant told him he was — had been temporarily released from a Halfway House and the local alcoholic reception center in Phoenix. So that he could go to Cortez to see his mother who was ill. Judge Brady told the bailiff we will suspend the ten days, there's a possibility that what he says is true. And it's not that important to us that we keep a man in jail. I would hate to have it on my conscience that I kept a man from his sick mother, dying.

Now, page 22. Brady is not a brilliant jurist, I never claimed I was. But he may, with diligent study, learn to become an adequate jurist. That adequacy combined with the respect and dignity with which he regards defendants,

judg

2

could make Brady a municipal, a brilliant municipal court judge.

Now, this is from the man who made the report. This is the garbage that they took out in the redrafting of it.

All right. And in here the parts where it says both judges will dismiss charges where the arresting officer has failed to submit a report of the arrest, he gives examples of this on there, which we do on illegal complaints that are not proper, they are dismissed summarily.

All right. Then we have been the loitering arrests.

And these date back to the Pow Wow. Now, I don't know whether any of this committee has ever been a guest at the City of Flagstaff during Pow Wow. But if you haven't been, you should attend. Because during the week end of Pow Wow, it flat looks like it's raining drunks all around this town. They are in people's back yards, they are under trucks, they are in cars, they are just everywhere that there is. And there is a problem of getting them for their own protection, to keep them from physical injury, from being run over, rolled, and so on, to get them off the streets.

Now, I am prepared here, if you would like to go through the arrest reports from the '71 Pow Wow, and we'll go through the one of the '75. The sentences are mostly, unless the offense is serious, if it's al alcohol-related offense, one day. Long enough to get them out of the way,

sobered up, they sleep where it's safe, and then they are released to go back out and celebrate. I have been to 25 Pow Wows: here, I know of what I speak. And they talk about the arrests. Okay. I observed a subject for a period of three or, four hours sitting on the sidewalk in front of the Club 66. She became progressively more intoxicated and then was no longer able to sit and just fell over. She was arrested for her own protection and incarcerated in the county jail. This is full of those.

The disturbing the peace, we've heard talk about that, well, they don't think it's right for an officer to sign a complaint on someone who curses them. Now, I disagree. For the simple reason it says nowhere in that statute, when you disturb the peace and quiet of the neighborhood, or the peace and quiet of the complainant or other persons, by loud or unusual noise, by tumultuous or offensive conduct, by threatening, traducing, quarreling, challenging to fight or by fighting or by the use of violent, abusive or obscene language and it doesn't say at the bottom that this does not apply to police officers. In no way.

Now, the percentage of arrests in disturbing the peace, we average somewhere around, between 40 to 60 a month. The percentage out of that maybe three that the police officers will sign. And that's because every foul

four-letter word that you can think of has been used on them. Now, -- and we heard some talk about the supreme court ruling. That's quite interesting.

In Gooding versus Wilson, prohibiting certain types of language must limit their prohibition to fighting words. Well now, if somebody called you those words, or me, we'd fight. And it's true also, but they neglected to mention this, that there is no law in Arizona which states that a police officer's peace may not be disturbed. But Supreme Court Justice Powell, in an opinion on Lewis versus New Orleans, in these words curses to a police officer had been addressed by one citizen to another face to face and in a hostile manner, I would have no doubt but they would be fighting words.

All right. Presumption of guilt. They may induce a defendant to give up his intention to plead not guilty. A defendant may be told that he has pled guilty when in fact he has not.

On June 23rd, number 57 was brought before Brady on scruple charges of writing a \$5.00 check on a closed account. The defendant explained that he'd been on vacation, that he'd just made a deposit of \$80.00 to his checking account, he was not aware that the bank had closed his account.

After conversation with the defendant about the cir-

cumstances of the check, the judge said well, how do you plead? With a puzzled expression on his face, the defendant said, well, I'm guilty of writing the check. Brady interrupted then, all right, the court will accept your plea of guilty, however the sentence was withheld until June 24th pending reconciliation of the check. It was expunged from the defendant's record by Judge Brady. And the charge dismissed.

All right. Now, we've had some talk about how it comes that you're given time to pay a fine in the city court. The proper procedure and it's followed to the letter. Now, I might add this, Mr. Gaylord doesn't really know, he doesn't practice in the city court. And the records will show Mr. Mickeljohn doesn't practice in the city court, and Bryan Short, as far as I know, is not even an attorney. I question their ability on the basis of this report to sit in judgment of the procedures in the city court. Now, when a sentence is rendered on a plea of guilty at arraignment for a finding of guilty at the trial, the judge will, unless the sentence is a straight jail term, include an alternative sentence in the familiar pattern of one, 20 or 30 days.

Now, these sentences are authorized by the Arizona Revised Statutes, we are not doing anything wrong regarding that. Arizona Revised Statutes, 13, 1648, all right.

The municipal court judges ask each defendant who's punished by a fine, how long will you need to pay the fine? Now, Judge Brown may ask that. I don't, I say are you prepared to pay your fine at this time or will you need some time to pay it? I'm well aware of the rules of the supreme court regarding this matter. So therefore we give them the time and the observer goes on to say, in the Flagstaff City Court, the standard reasonable time could be 30 days, or the defendant may need and be allowed only a few hours or he may need and be allowed two months.

And upon any showing at all of good faith on the part of the defendant, Judge Brady, as Chief Magistrate, will grant further extensions.

No justice, no fairness? All right.

Now, we come to the bail, the ROR. I heard the testimony in this case today regarding the Indian subject who testified that the officer demanded \$12.00 and so on. I didn't know anything about that case until it was brought to my attention by Louise Gibson from DNA out of Tuba City who called me regarding that. She also sent me a copy, she told me she had contacted the chief of police and that she was told by him that that was standard procedure and that it was set up by the city court.

I told her, no way, a traffic citation may be signed by the person getting it unless there are extraordinary

5

7

8

6

9

10

11 12 13

14

15

16

17

19

18

20

21 22

23

24 25

circumstances. I went down and talked to the chief of police and told him that that was not so, it had never been an order of the court, and he said well, we always do it to the Indians, and I said well, you're wrong, that procedure should be stopped immediately.

And as far as I know, it has.

All right. I know proper procedure on a traffic violation.

Now, there's -- it's been said that it's hard to get an ROR in city court. That's a misstatement, it's not The only time that you will be denied release on your own recognizance by me in the Flagstaff City Court is if you have a prior, where you failed to appear for an arraignment or if you failed to comply with the court order where you were given time to pay a fine and didn't do it.

'It also says, by orders of the supreme court, if the judge has reason to believe, and he may use his judicial discretion, that the defendant may not show up for arraignment or trial, he does not have to grant ROR. It's at his discretion. However, I have no reason not to if they don't show up we can go ahead and issue a warrant, . they come back through town, they're picked up for another offense, then we will have them and drop it on them.

There's been some talk here by the gentlemen from NACA,

20.

and I was happy to hear somebody admit that we did have NACA interpreters in court over this past 4th of July, somewhere in here I'm not exactly sure, I think it was by the attorney, said -- or no, it was Kammer who said that interpreters were there but they were not used.

We had two, Phoebe Hill (P), from NACA and Rose Benally and Ladies and Gentlemen, they were used. They read the en masse rights to them, those who could not speak English and now I might add this, also, at Pow Wow time when the Indians all come to town we get many, many more longhairs who do not understand the language. We understand this, we try to bend over backwards to see that they do understand the proceedings that's going on. They know from past years that the penalties, one day. Which they have already spent the night in jail, they know what to expect.

Now, there's been talk about all these people pleading guilty, has anybody given any thought to the fact that maybe they were, that they were apprehended actually in the commission of the offense?

We are talking only about low misdemeanors. Alcoholrelated offenses and we have a terrific alcohol problem
being this close to the reservation border. Since they
did away with the D and D charge, they did away with the
LARC, it is a problem. But what in the name of humanity

are we going to do with these drunks who are passed out in the alleys, in the streets, in the doorways, and now with winter coming on, unless we get some action somewhere, and get a LARC started back again? NACA is doing its best, we work with Native American for Community Action, when I took over this court I got a grant from Justice Planning Agency, got a full time probation officer, first in the state. He works as a hub for the spokes of the wheel are the various agencies around town that we work and cooperate with.

NACA is one of them, we refer alcoholics, Indian problems to them, they are able to refer them to counselors on the reservation, we put them on probation with the number one provision that they will attend counseling and guiding, we get reports back regarding the prgress they're making. It's a good program.

Now, we also work with vocational rehabilitation, we work with the American Legion, we work with the Veterans of Foreign Wars, Coconino Guidance Clinic, if somebody comes into the court they have a mental problem, we can help them, an alcoholic problem we work with the recovery house, if they need a better job we can arrange for their training under vocational rehabilitation and through the state unemployment service we can even help them find a better job.

All right. Now, Mr. Kammer even mentions, on page 55,

that we talked about interpreters then. That it was a fundamental necessity. And Judge Brady is seeking authorization from the city council to employ such a worker, since the new worker would presumably work five days each week an arrangement for the other two days could be made with the Native Americans for Community Action or other local agency which has contact with larger numbers of Navajo-speaking persons.

All right. I think I've probably covered enough here. I might mention on the ROR's, Mr. Kammer's observation, nevertheless a showing by the Flagstaff Municipal Court that an OR release of a reservation Indian does not reasonably assure his appearance in court as required and could be destructive of the case. Strong evidence in the court's favor, strong evidence in the court's favor is the fact that the court, on July 11th, had warrants issued on defendants who had failed to pay almost \$22,000.00 by the time specified for payments. Not all of that is due from reservation Indians, but it is not unreasonable to suspect that the majority of the delinquent fines may involve reservation Indians.

Now trials. In that final draft it says the few trials that we have in city court. We are averaging over a 1,000 cases a month in city court, we are holding trials on Tuesdays, Wednesdays and Thursdays and had these gentlemen

been practicing in city court they would have known that.

We have a calendar that is almost beyond belief, but on

Mondays we have boundouts and the in-custodies, Tuesdays

we have trial all day, Wednesdays we have trials all day,

Thursdays all day, Friday we have in-custodies and traffic

court.

Every third week I work seven days a week. Holding the initial appearances for the county. Okay.

Now, there's been some talk about the en masse proceedings that we use in city court. I would like to just say at this time, tell you where it came from.

I attended a judicial conference put on by the American Academy for Judicial Learning at Denver, Colorado. One of the people or the instructors that we had there, and it was a most learned group, was Judge Joseph Barnard. Judge Barnard is the presiding judge of the Recorder's Court at Birmingham, Alabama, he graduated from Birmingham Southern College and also his law degree, University of Alabama. Former district deputy attorney for the Judicial Circuit of Alabama, faculty of '71-74, various state and national academy instructor and now American Academy of Judicial Education.

Judge Barnard, a very well-educated man in the profession of law, Judge Barnard. And this is the one he gave me at the conference, made this up, it passed the Supreme

Court of the State of Alabama, it was passed out to the judges, some 52 of us at the conference, and he told us that this covered everything that a defendant needed to know as far as the rights are concerned.

It's been said in the report that we say that a defendant has the right to have an attorney to represent them, however in most of the cases in this court, and we're talking about the low misdemeanors, a defendant may present their own case and the services of an attorney are not really required.

However, should any of you desire a lawyer, if you will inform the court, you will be allowed the opportunity to employ or otherwise retain counsel. Now, should you not care to act as your own attorney, and are shown to be indigent, the court will appoint an attorney for you at no cost to you.

If you wish to make application for a court-appointed attorney, you will so advise the court and you will be given the opportunity to do so.

THE CHAIR: Is indigent operationalized, do they know what that is? Most of the persons who appear before you, are they able to clarify indigent?

- A. Well, indigent or without funds, now I don't know how you can make it any more plainer than that
 - Q (By Mr. Williams) Are you using DES guidelines?

A. In fact, our superior court has come up with even a better one than that. These are the advisements, the mass advisements, and it's also been ruled by the superior court who is the chief judge of this county, Judge Thomas Brooks, that the en masse advisements is all right.

Q (By Mr. Levis) Judge Brady, excuse me, before you go on, if we could identify this as Exhibit Number 6, that is the municipal court advisement of defendants' rights prior to arraignment.

I just have one other question, if you're going to go through --

A. I sure am.

Q -- this document page by page, I would prefer, because of the late hour, if we could just enter this as ...

Exhibit 7, that is the information that Judge Brady has provided starting with the letter to the ACLU, dated October 24th and I think you've discussed many of the things in here, if you could briefly, like in less than five minutes, talk about it, I'd really appreciate it because I think there's some committee members --

A Less than five minutes, very well, I'll just quote from each letter, how's that? Who it's from and --

Q. If that's okay. Because I know there are committee members who have questions and it is 6:00 o'clock now.

(Short recess)

1 THE CHAIR: We're ready to proceed.

Q (By Ms. Lyon) Judge Brady, we'd appreciate it, as Mr. Levis mentioned, if you would limit the remainder of your remarks to five minutes. Whatever else you would like to submit into the record we would be happy to receive, and we will have some questions to ask you which pertain to the general subject of our whole study.

A. Very well. Then in the five minutes, first: of all, there's been a recommendation by these gentlemen before the hearing was ever concluded regarding attorney judges.

Okay. Now, during the spring term of the Supreme Court of the United States they came out with a decision regarding this, it's in the case of North versus Russell, this case has not yet achieved notoriety and at the present time it looks a little auspicious. However, presently there are over 15,000 lay judges in this country, our forefathers thought that it was sufficient that the layman hear the small misdemeanors and so on that are committed by their fellow man.

However, it's also notable that there are over 30 states which have criminal trial courts in which the presiding judge is not an attorney. It's also been held the fact that a justice of the peace or the city magistrate is not an attorney does not mean that he is, per se, unqualified to declare the law in the limited type of situations over

which he has jurisdiction.

The fact that a judicial error may be committed in a proceeding does not necessarily imply a denial of due process of law. The 14th Amendment to the United States Constitution does not assure any of us immunity from judicial error.

Beck versus Washington, Arizona Appeals Courts, U.S. Courts. So it's been held.

You know, isn't it funny? I read an article in the paper last night that there's 20,000 attorneys out of jobs. We have 15,000 lay judges. Coincidence. Okay.

The problem is not feasible in the State of Arizona due to the fact that our outlying districts we don't even have any attorneys to make judges out of there, not that I'm implying that they will make better judges or serve up a better brand of justice than myself or Judge Garcia, that they would have more understanding, that they would have more compassion, show more mercy in the court than myself. I have endeavored to increase my education, shall continue to do so, should the city council see fit to keep me on.

All right. Now, I have here --

THE CHAIR: Do you have any more items --

A Yes, I do.

THE CHAIR: -- as part of an exhibit?

A No. I wanted to get into the record just statements

2.

from each one. And I want to tell you what these are. These are letters from the practicing attorneys in the City of Flagstaff who practice, if not daily, but weekly in the Flagstaff City Court. The first one from Sam Clements, a third-year law student who was present in the court at the time that this alleged investigation was being made, and as he says, in his letter, that neither Jack nor I knew much about the Flagstaff Municipal Court. His period of observation coincided with my internship under the city attorney, so he and I are drawing from the same cases and arraignments.

I take issue. I'll just mention a few things in here. All right. Now, in truth, Magistrate Brady, you do not need to be defended by me or anyone else. You've built your own defense by your years as a fair and impartial magistrate, concerned for the rights of all parties.

It was my privilege to practice before you this summer, your record speaks for itself. There's his certification as a third-year law student. So we know what he was.

And then we have Aspey, Watkins and Diesel, a firm here in Flagstaff, an unsolicited response, it is certainly worth reading and I believe being considered by this committee.

It is our considered opinion, in the fourth paragraph, that you, Judge Brady, although not a lawyer, possess the integrity, the judicial knowledge, the honesty and above all the common sense necessary in the making of good magistrates. The people of Flagstaff should be proud to have a man of your proven ability.

Now, my learned, not adversaries, this is not supposed to be an adversary thing, they have passed over this very lightly. Insignificant. It's not important. It's important to me, it's important to the City of Flagstaff, to the people in Flagstaff, how the attorneys feel.

Garbarino and Lee, Attorneys at Law. I have had occasion to prosecute and defend in many of the lower tribunals throughout the state, and I can say without hesitation that justice in the Flagstaff Municipal Court is superior to any of the other courts I've practiced in.

John Grace, Attorney at Law. I have perused the report prepared by one Jack Kammer, who I don't even know, and I'm somewhat amiss as to how he appoints himself amicus curiae, so I offer a few comments.

Now, you want me to make it short, since your term on the bench I have observed an upgrading of the dignity of the municipal court as truly a court of law. You have followed very well the Arizona Rules of Criminal Procedure

22°

and the rules of court for the municipal court, which, when prepared, were approved by a committee of the Coconino Bar Association of which committee I was a member.

All right. He casts aspersions both directly and by innuendo in the operation of the court. I would challenge him or anyone else to find any specific instances where your court has been unfair or misleading.

Verkamp and Verkamp. We both felt the criticism in general of your court was distinctly off base and mis-leading.

So it wasn't just my opinion. My opinion and the opinion of these gentlemen who practice in the court. The language problems experienced by the court and some of the non-English-speaking Indians do represent a problem. Granted, I know that, I'm trying to correct it.

All right, now in closing, may we say that we feel that our Flagstaff City Court system is one in which all of its citizens can be proud, we commend you personally for your role and offer our continued support also.

Another point that should be noted is the immense administrative task which you have in just processing the hundreds of cases filed in your court each month. People think a judge has an easy job. Sit on his tail and sentence people.

Stevenson, Warden and Smith. I have at this time,

previously reviewed the above report, I'm shocked at the manner in which it was obtained. This is an ex-county attorney who has practiced superior courts, state courts, other state courts, Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals, and federal courts in Washington.

All right. He feels that the procedures used in the Flagstaff City Court are beyond reproach. He also makes the statement it's peculiar to me why the ACLU would waste its time on the Flagstaff Municipal Court when in fact it could be used more profitably in other areas.

One more. William Egan, Attorney at Law. All right. Because I have also practiced in many lower courts throughout the State of Arizona, I can compare your court with many others. And in my opinion the Flagstaff City Court is far more superior than any others I know. Mr. Kammer's report is too greatly concerned about technicalities and not sufficiently concerned about fairness and impartiality and justice.

Okay. I realize the time is running short, I'll rest my case.

THE CHAIR: Fine, we have some questions we would like to ask.

- A. I was sure you would have.
- Q (By Ms. Lyon) Thank you. Well, may I reiterate that any additional material you would want to submit for

the record now or within the next 30 days, the commission would be happy to receive, let me also reiterate that this is not an adversary proceeding, the purpose of this hearing is to hear testimony from witnesses on the facts as they perceive them, and this you have given us. And we have some questions which bear directly on the administration of justice for Indians in the State of Arizona, which, based on your very extensive experience, I feel sure you can give us your opinion on if you would, sir.

- A. Very well.
- Q First of all, you did mention that you would take care of the matter of the interpreter. And --
 - A. Yes, Ma'am.
- Q I would be very interested in hearing from you how the plan to approach that.
- A Well, with the City Council of the City of Flagstaff there -- you -- the procedure is you make out a budget, and you submit it, and they tell you now don't put that in ink because some of it's going to be erased. I now have a committee to the court from the city council who know and understand the needs of the court. Now, there's something that I didn't mention here, we have \$76,000.00 out on accounts receivable right now. Fines that I have given, and Judge Brown, people time to pay. That's a lot of money. Some of it is going to be accounts uncollectable.

Okay. We started this, of course, when the supreme court ruling came in when the new rules were promulgated in '73, and it has just kept building up more all the time. I needed more office help. I went to the council and I cried, I begged, I threatened, and so on, I couldn't get them to give me anybody. So in order to get additional help, I got a COE girl from the high school. Then through SETA, I got another girl. Then I got the city council to finally give me another full time girl in the office that I put to handling traffic citations and accounts receivable. So that we could work on this.

Okay. In case you're interested, at the present the total amount of fines past due in the city court, \$76,624.60. You know, if I had somebody to work these accounts receivable, now the procedure on that is this, they are asked how much time they need to pay the fine, how much time will you need. They say 30 days, 60 days, or sometimes they'll say, oh, I'll pay it next payday, but that's not so. They can't pay it all in one payday and I can understand that, if they do, then if it's a non-Indian the rent doesn't get paid, there's no food on the table, they turn the lights off and so on. So we'll go ahead and in the most cases, 60 days to pay it and more as it states in Kammer's report, if they make any effort at all I'll give them more time.

u = 1

Here's a breakdown, in case you're interested. The status of the warrant file in city court at this time, during the month of September, 1975, we made a search of the warrant file to ascertain the status. It was found that a total of 1,005 warrants were issued and a total of 825 persons, which means that some of these people have more than two charges. The types of warrants that are covered in this report are, warrants for failure to appear for arraignment or trial, they're generally of two kinds, first those that are released by the police department after being charged with the commission of a crime, the commission of a crime and are released in the custody of some other person but they'll fail to appear for arraignment.

Second is the pretrial release where the defendant is released on their own recognizance with no bail required and has pleaded not guilty.

The third failure to comply with a court order, these are persons who are found guilty in a court trial or have pled guilty to some charge and sentenced to pay a fine. The court withheld the imposition of sentence and they were given time to pay the fine within a specified time.

Now, if the fine is not paid within this specified time, a letter of reminder is mailed to these persons giving them an additional 14 days to contact the court to

make some arrangement for payment. At the end of this time, if we have not heard from them, a warrant is issued by the court.

- Q May I ask, sir, is the purpose of your statement to illustrate how you will fund the position of interpreter?
 - A. Yes. Basically if I can collect some of the fines.
- Q Well, would you care to submit that into the record also?
- A. Okay. We have a lot of fines outstanding, if the court is able, and I have explained this to some of the councilmen, to obtain another employee, for the -- to work on this, we can increase the income of the court, we can also, it was my intention and, as Tom Gonzalez, from NACA, told you, I was going to hire a full time bailiff and also to assist in the court records, and he was to be a Navajo, an educated Navajo who would know and understand the -- he would be trained in the court, he would understand the workings of the court, and this sort of thing.
 - Q. Who would do the training?
 - A. Who would do the training?
 - Q. Yes.
- A: He could be trained by the superior court or he could be trained in the working operations of the city court, he could observe, we could train him ourselves.

 You see, the city court is a misdemeanor court, I mean we're

limited, very limited, so his knowledge, what he would have to understand is how to break down the terms we've been criticized for using the word arraignment, indigent, the — this sort of thing, and I don't know how you would break that any — or down any further than indigent, without funds, or able to pay, the arraignment or hearing, now this is the way I put it, this is an arraignment or a hearing, and you are here to be heard. How much plainer you can make that, I don't know.

- Q All right, if we might get back to the subject, then --
 - A. All right.

Q — have you explored the possibility, since this appears to be a unique problem, the need for a Navajo interpreter, have you explored the possibility of assistance through the state Judicial Planning agency, I submitted an application for help through Mr. Berger, Leon Berger, who works on these grants for the city. And it was understood, we've made it all out that I wanted a bailiff, and he — he would be able to talk Navajo and so on, what his duties would be and then I went on a week's vacation.

And when I came back, there was \$5,000.00 granted for a study on the proper way to file papers between the police department and the city court, and possibly going to a computer system.

1 Well, I would strongly encourage you not to give up. 2 Oh, I am not going to give up. 3 Q. 4 5 6 7 8 that this is a very crucial need. A. 10 11 12 13 Q. 14 15 questions that we have. 16 A. Very well. 17 18 19 cases? 20 A. 21 O. I see. 22 23 A. 24 Q. 25 A.

LEAA does have an Indian programs manager in Washing-Mr. Dale Wing, and if all else fails, I would encourage you to contact Mr. Wing and get his advice on how you might get this position filled because we have, I think, seen it demonstrated today, and you have agreed

Absolutely, and I think that perhaps on the basis of this hearing, the need brought out before everyone, and so on, may help me but definitely when the council meets tomorrow night .--

Well, let us devoutly hope so.

If we might quickly progress to some of the other

- Very briefly then, what are the types of cases that you hear, you mentioned that they were largely misdemeanor:
 - They are all misdemeanor cases.
- I believe you stated to commission staff that 65% of the misdemeanor defendants are Indian people?
 - I would say possibly between 55% to 65%, yes. >
 - What is -- excuse me.
 - Go ahead. This -- and these are mostly the Native

Americans do not really commit, shall we call the real serious offenses, they are the low misdemeanor, that is the alcohol-related offenses, in the majority.

- Q. What is the most frequent charge that Indian people appear before you on?
- A. I'd say under the present time, trespassing, public nuisance.
 - Q. This would be trespassing into private property?
- A. That's right, they are finding them in people's back yards, in their cars, on their porches and so on.
- Q Under what circumstances do you release individuals on their own recognizance and when must they post bond?
- A. I explained that before, however I'll do it again.

 I'will release them on their own recognizance if they have

 not, in the past, failed to appear for arraignment or

 failed to comply with a court order when given the oppor
 tunity to pay a fine.
- Q And this would include residents of Indian reservations?
- A Absolutely. As I also explained before, that I have no feelings about this because if they fail to appear, we can issue a warrant for their arrest, if they're picked up again and the warrant is in the file and can be served on them.

I don't worry about extradition, I don't try to bring

1 them off the reservation at all. 2 You don't? O., 3 I went with Judge Garcia to talk to Chief Dart up A. 4 at Window Rock, and there is better cooperation now that 5 came out of that meeting, however, I do not process any 6 warrants on the reservation. Was this in August, the meeting that you referred to? Q. 8 A. Was it where? 9 Q. What month was that meeting with Chief Dart? 10 A. Let's see, it was about a month before last, I 11 quess. 12 Well, I note that as of July 13th of 1975, 13 according to information you gave our staff, reservation 14 Indians accounted for 188 of the 288 persons who owed 15 unpaid fines. 16 A. Uh-huh. 17 What do you do, you say you just let these cases 0. 18 do? 19 Right. If they fail to pay, then a warrant is 20 issued according to the rules and then sooner or later, 21 why; they'll come in. 22 Q. But you do not routinely request the cooperation 23 of tribal police, if a defendant fails to pay? 24 A. And for this reason, if you send a warrant to 25 the reservation, and a person is picked up, then they have

the right to a formal hearing by a reservation judge as to whether this warrant will be -- it's the same as if you try to extradict them from the next state or so on. -- and here again I say these are misdemeanors, and I just don't feel that it's worth it to push it that far. There are other ways.

- Q. And what would these other ways be?
- As I already said, a warrant will be issued for their arrest and should they come back to the court's attention, with a warrant in file, then they will be given due process.
- Would this include a notation on their li-Q. cense -- driver's license number?
 - À. Only on a traffic offense.
 - 0. I see.
 - That's state law. A.
- I see. What recommendation would you have regarding 0. the legalization of alcoholic beverages on Indian reservations in this area?
- A. Well, I think they should. I think that if alcohol was legalized on the reservations, that we'd save some of the accidents coming and going. I also feel that though it might be an increase in alcoholism at first, that when it became available and easy to get, that this would then wear off, and they would settle down to a normal, about the

12°

way they are now, to coming to town and getting it. It would certainly ease the situation in the fringe reservation towns regarding law enforcement for alcohol-related offenses if they could get it on the reservation.

It would also, of course, if it was controlled by the tribe, which it should be, provide added income to the tribe.

Q. What type of cooperation do you have with the Navajo and Hopi Tribes, and with NACA specifically, I mean is there routine procedure that you follow or do you contact them as needed?

A. Right. We have a working arrangement with NACA at this time that, before we have our arraignments in the morning, that one of the girls calls down and tells them about it so they will be there for the arraignments. Then if we have an alcohol-related offense that the court feels that this person needs some guidance and counseling, that it appears that they are getting too many charges of alcohol-related offenses, why then we refer them to NACA.

We put them on probation; refer them to NACA on a regular form, and then they are able to refer them for counseling and guiding on the reservation.

Q One final question. You mentioned, and I quote, we do have problems, unquote. Are these any problems we have not yet discussed?

A Well, the number one that I feel is — is the interpreter, and also working with NACA now who has offices here in town, and with Mr. Gonzalez and Mr. Wood, if there are problems that come up regarding the Indians, and I do get contacted every day on some of these things, why, I think that we have a better working relationship now and that it will increase, it will get better as time goes by.

The -- and with a full time interpreter, I can't see anything but good come out of it, that's all, because the rights will definitely all be read then in Navajo by someone who is more apt to explain it in a better way than as I heard today from a prisoner who happens to be in custody at the time, although many of those are very well educated and are able to speak the language very well. But with NACA coming in and should Rose be there on these mornings, she makes an excellent interpreter, although she has trouble with -- in her Navajo with some of the words.

However, if we knew we were going to have her, all the time we could probably break that down.

MS. LYON: I have no further questions.

Any committee members have additional questions?

- Q (By Mr. Levis) I have a few very quick ones.
- A. Shoot.
- Q What are longhairs?

 A. What are longhairs? These are the older Indians who still wear their hair in the old style, it is a cue sort of thing in the back, and it's in a roll, I might -- MS. LYON: Turn around, Trudy.

- A Right.
- Q (By Mr. Levis) The reason I asked is because there are several different types of longhairs, and I don't think it was clear earlier.
- A. No, I was speaking of the Indian. Well, we've got some other Indian longhairs too, look at Tom Gonzalez.

 Ron Wood, too.
- Q The other concerns are based on my information is that the rules of the city court that you referred to in one of your letters were approved by the county, the county bar association in 1971, which is two years before the Arizona Rules of Criminal Procedure went into effect, and to the best of my knowledge, they have never been adopted by the Arizona Supreme Court, so --
- A. If you'll notice, these rules do not change any laws, they are mostly on the duties of the court, the scheduling, the 48 hours notice in the city court before a motion for a continuance and this sort of thing.
- because of the fact they have not been approved by the supreme court and by the rules they have to be before they

can be used in lieu of the supreme court rules.

A. Well, we could very well change that from rules to actually regulations or something like that, these were, we made them up to get some kind of -- and they're supposed to be revised every three years, so they -- we intend to do that.

The committee from the bar association and myself will be trying to get that straightened out, it was brought to my attention, and if they feel that it's necessary to revise these rules or just forget them, and go by the new rules, then that's the way we'll go.

Q Two other quick points. You talked about legal technicalities and you're more concerned about individual rights, unfortunately I think that legal technicalities are what make the rights and the rules of civil procedure I think you could very easily argue are legal technicalities and everything else that involves the law is, and that gets to an issue concerning the LARC law. And we have an opinion by the state attorney general in this state, who said his biggest concern concerning the public drunkenness law is not the fact, as I understand it, that people are not arrested but that people are arrested as a result of this. And my question is, based on his opinion and the fact that the says that the county and the city and the state has an affirmative duty to establish LARCs, and the

fact that the City of Flagstaff does not have a LARC, and then he also says that you have a problem if you arrest somebody, how do you feel with this situation because it appears to me that the police are in violation of the law for arresting someone. You, possibly, are in violation of the law for finding someone guilty, and the city and county are in violation of the law of not having a LARC center. Have you ever thought about that? The attorney general's opinion?

A. The attorney general lives in Phoenix, and it's nice and warm down there and the drunks can lay out all night. Or they have a LARC to take them to. But here, up here and in these northern counties, we don't have that, and they can very well freeze to death, you see.

All right. Now technicalities. Sure, a bad arrest is made or perhaps — but from the humanitarian side or from the Indian side himself, or from the Indian people, would they rather thave these people taken from the cold out of the streets and wherever it is that they're found, even across the railroad tracks, stretched out, and brought to safety and warmth, to where they have a place to sleep and a meal in the morning and then are released, or would they, because of the technicality of this law, would they rather have them left there? Now —

Are you saying, then, that you have other concerns,

I don't know if the word is beyond or above, and I'll let -- you can almost fill in the last two words if you'd like to.

A Bill, I'm only a small town judge. I've tried to treat these people the way I'd want to be treated myself and I would not want to be left laying out in the cold, drunk, and unable to keep myself warm. I'd rather they picked me up, take me where it's warm and I'll talk to the judge in the morning, because I would know that he understands.

13⁻

Q One final question. It's my understanding that Judge Brown is an associate or an assistant magistrate under you. Many of the charges in both the preliminary report and the final report are addressed to his court. His procedures.

A. Right.

Q What is being done concerning those allegations and also what is being done, I think you mentioned to me, concerning bringing in a full time magistrate who has had formal training?

A. The good Lord's willing and the creek don't rise, why, next July the budget comes out there will be money for a full time magistrate, if not before. If it must happen before, possibly we can get it done and the way the caseload is now, why, I'm sure that something will be done

.6

the hands of the city council.

Or in the hands of anyone who wants to deal with it

before then. Beyond that I can say no more, it rests in

on a different level, I suppose, too, as far as a lawsuit is concerned?

A Well, yes. Right. Judge Brown is quite elderly now, he's been with the city for nine years, I don't know, he -- he sometimes doesn't listen as well as he should. I have this problem. But hopefully that will be corrected before too long.

Q We were going to permit Mr. Gaylord and Mr. Meiklejohn if they'd like, to a short five minutes to rebut if they'd like, to anything that Judge Brady has said, and I'd like to ask them if they'd like to take advantage of that at this time? On an equal time basis.

Thank you, Judge Brady, and again if there's anything else you'd like to submit into the record, please do in 30 days, or anyone else in the audience.

A. Very well.

MR. GAYLORD: First, this isn't intended entirely as a rebuttal, I would agree with the portion of Mr. Kammer's, report that says Judge Brady is considerate and compassionate and all of those things, and that portion that was excluded from the second, the final report, that wasn't the part of the garbage that I was referring to. There were

also many derogatory comments about his colleague, Judge Brown, which I felt were perhaps true but it's almost — it almost sounded like a personal vendetta and we did exclude all of those comments as well.

In addition, there were a couple legal theories that we felt, we being myself as well as the other lawyers that were helping in the preparation of this, we felt the legal theories were a bit tenuous. However, since the judge has mentioned it we would ask your permission to forward a copy of that initial report so that you can see the changes that were in there.

MR. LEVIS: If I could just for the record, identify the initial report that Judge Brady referred to at length as Exhibit 8. Which would be the Kammer report, I think we can refer to it or the Kammer draft.

MR. GAYLORD: Next point that I would like to emphasize, this wasn't intended as an attack on the Flagstaff Municipal Court, although I would concede that it certainly comes out that way when you read our report. I would agree with the statements in several of the other attorneys' letters that the Flagstaff Municipal Court is superior to many of the other justice courts in the State of Arizona. I would agree that Judge Brady has upgraded the quality of justice in the Flagstaff Municipal Court.

What we're asserting is that nevertheless, the

requirements of the United States Constitution and the 1 Rules of Procedure for the State of Arizona, are not always 2 being complied with. With regard to the attorneys, 3 saying I don't appear in Judge Brady's court, I do 4 periodically, not that often. What we're trying to 5 emphasize here, though, these are the things that happen 6 when attorneys are not present, when I've been there, I've 7 seldom had any complaint about Judge Brady's procedures. 8 The procedures that we're complaining about, the en masse 9 advisement, the initial hearing, that whole proceeding 10 takes place without a lawyer present, without the judge of 11 the superior court, without the city council. 12 judicial officer normally is Judge Brady. The city 13 attorney isn't there. 14

- A. (By Judge Brady) May I ask a question?

 MR. GAYLORD: Yes.
- A I have wondered, you know when this thing started, that if these people that criticize the city court, now every practicing attorney is considered an ex-officio officer of the court, am I correct?

MR. GAYLORD: Yes.

A. Very well, and have a responsibility to the court.

Why didn't these people get it all together and come and say hey, Judge, I think that what you're doing here is wrong and here's why? Why didn't we all get together, we could

2425

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

have got the committee from the bar association and we'd have talked it over and made the proper changes.

There have been things recommended to the court before that I have immediately incorporated into the operation of the court. Why was it not done this way instead of this way?

THE CHAIR: This is a procedural matter and I think we're going to have to call this meeting to a close after a few minutes.

Are you finished with your comments?

A I thought he wanted an answer.

MR. GAYLORD: I will.

The next point, if a person's guilty, if he's caught in the act, nevertheless that person is entitled to their constitutional rights, to the rights that are guaranteed to them under the Constitution and under the rules of the Arizona Rules of Civil Procedure. We are not convinced that the guilty pleas that are being accepted by the Flagstaff Municipal Court are entered knowingly and intelligently, voluntarily, that's required by the United States Constitution and the Arizona Rules of Criminal Procedure.

A I'd like to answer that.

THE CHAIR: Well, if he has some other points.

MR. GAYLORD: With regard to the statement on low

1

3 4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12 13

14.

15

16

17 18

19

20

21

22

23 24

25

misdemeanors and the right to counsel that language was overruled in the case of Argersy (Phonetic), if there's a possibility of incarceration, and I believe that could include dollars or days, that person's entitled to a judge.

THE CHAIR: To an attorney.

MR. GAYLORD: Excuse me, an attorney.

Mr. Kammer's conclusion again, was that excluded from the final report? If I would reemphasize, if not, we did not find overt bias in the municipal court, which is what you're here concerned about, we were concerned about the lack of interpreters, we were concerned about the bonding procedures, but as to overt bias, simply doing this because he's an Indian and doing that because he's an Anglo, we did not discover that.

MR. LEVIS: Can I just make one clarification? Under the statute that the commission operates and the committees operate, we are not only concerned with overt bias we're concerned with equal protection of the law which does include discriminatory effect under the 14th Amendment.

MR. GAYLORD: Finally, the last statement and in partial response to Judge Brady's question as to why we brought this out this way is because we have discussed many of these things with Judge Brady, he has been more than cooperative, he has listened, he has made changes when the

25.

thought they were justified. We have disagreed with him on some of them and we've argued with him. But we got to the point where the most dramatic change I think has to come in the attitude of the city council, and not just the Flagstaff City Council but city councils all over this state, and county supervisors all over this state, the justice courts, the lower courts where the little, grubby misdemeanants come in are completely ignored. Nobody's getting any money. We got lots of money in the superior court, boy, we can prosecute cases and we got investigators and secretaries and everything running out everybody's ears, that's why we went to the Flagstaff Municipal Court, not because it was unique but because it was one of many of these low courts, that have lots of misdemeanants, no money.

We're talking about LARC, what's happened to a LARC? Flagstaff gets one for every Pow Wow and then immediately it disappears.

Interpreters. We've all acknowledged the need for interpreters, we've sent letters to the city council, we've been politely ignored. Defense attorneys, defense attorneys don't hear many of the problems that are here that we've talked about, just having him here to point out to the judge, Judge this complaint is deficient. It's not the judge's job to look at the complaints and say it's deficient it's the defense attorney's but if you don't have a

defense attorney saying the judge should be doing it, that's all. Thank you, thank you very kindly. THE CHAIR: We will recess now until tomorrow morning at 8:00 a.m. and we wish to thank all of the persons who appeared to offer testimony. (Hearing adjourned until 8:00 a.m. Tuesday, November 18, 1975)