

to this very important legislation. This bill, which was passed by the Senate on March 11, 1968, contains several amendments to the original bill passed by the House of Representatives last August.

If I might here skip over the first page, because this has to do with the body of the civil rights bill, which we have under consideration, that has already been commented on and I am in full support of it, I do want to go directly then to the Indian sections with which I am most familiar, about which I have been asked several questions from Members of the House and I felt that I should make my remarks directed to those sections of the bill. So I will proceed from there.

The other significant amendment in the Senate bill is the material contained in titles II to VII relating to the rights of American Indians. These titles are identical in the provisions of S. 1843, which also passed the Senate last December and which is now before the House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee. I want to address my remarks today primarily to these provisions. I do so because I am particularly interested in these matters both because so many of the tribes with whom I have worked over a period of 20 years in the Bureau of Indian Affairs will be affected by these provisions and also because I myself am an enrolled member of the Rosebud Sioux Tribe of South Dakota. I was born and raised on the reservation and know from long experience what the effects of these titles will be on our Indian citizens.

I think it is in this area that I might best contribute to the work of this committee and the deliberations regarding the entire bill. I might state at the outset that I sympathize with the position of my distinguished colleague from Colorado, the chairman of the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, Mr. Aspinall. Through the years he has been a wise and great friend of American Indians and has greatly influenced the course of continuing relations between the Indian tribes and the Federal Government. Under almost any other set of circumstances I would support his position that these titles should be given separate consideration through the normal proceedings of his committee. However, for three reasons I think that this committee nevertheless should submit the entire bill for the vote of the membership on concurrence with the Senate version without amendment. First, I think we are presented with an opportunity which may not arise again to enact into law two extremely important provisions, the open housing bill and the civil rights protection bill. If this action is not taken soon by this body and the bill is sent to conference for amendment, it may be many weeks before we can vote on a conference version of the bill, after which it will have to be returned to the Senate, where I am very much afraid that those Senators who have so consistently opposed both of these provisions would make passage of the revised version virtually impossible.

The politics of a presidential election year, the emotions of this summer, may well conspire to block the bill. Secondly, even though the titles affecting Indians have not gone through all of the usual hearing processes of this Chamber, the legislation in fact has been the subject of extensive hearings over a 5-year period before the Senate Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights.

During 1961, 1965, the Senate subcommittee held three sets of hearings in Washington, D.C., as well as field hearings in the States of