Arizona, California, Colorado, New Mexico, Washington, North and South Dakota. At the last of the Washington hearings I believe the subcommittee received the testimony and statements of some 79 witnesses including representatives from 36 tribes located in 14 States and including in particular a spokesman for the only Indian tribe which I understand is seeking further hearings before this body.

Equally significant, following such hearings, the Indian titles were greatly revised to meet all of the more important suggestions and objections then raised by the executive departments, tribal leaders, and their attorneys. And the proposals as so amended and now a part of H.R. 2516 have been strongly endorsed by the very same groups. In other words, we have here a case where the hearing process in a larger sense has already been thorough and effective.

Lastly, while bearing in mind my sympathy for the jurisdictional position of my good friends, the Chairman of the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, I nonetheless must conclude that the Indian titles deal with such fundamental rights and are so extremely welcome amendments to existing law affecting Indians that further delays can not be justified.

In my mind, myself an Indian, I consider these provisions to be among the most important and best provisions of the entire bill. It would be one thing if your committee was asked to bypass the normal hearing process of this Chamber in order to pass bad legislation. But it is an entirely different thing when we are given an opportunity not only to enact much-needed civil rights laws but, in addition, to enact a bill which would grant to the American Indians many of the rights presently denied them.

Titles II to VIII are designed to accomplish two major purposes: First, to create a bill of rights for the protection of Indians tried in tribal courts and to improve the quality of justice administered by tribal courts; and, second, to provide for the assumption of civil and criminal jurisdiction by States over Indian country within their borders only with the consent of the tribes affected.

Taking up the second point first, this committee should know that virtually every Indian tribe which has commented on this legislation is 100 percent in favor of the provisions in this bill which would change the entire jurisdiction allocation presently as provided by Public Law 280, passed by the 83d Congress. As you know, Public Law 280 granted to six States immediate and comprehensive jurisdiction over almost all of the Indian country within their borders with respect to both civil and criminal matters. These States are Alaska, California, Minnesota, Nebraska, Oregon and Wisconsin. In addition, Public Law 280 provided that thereafter any State acting without any consultation whatsoever with the tribes to be affected could assume such jurisdiction at any time. Five States have done this since 1953. These were Florida, Idaho, Montana, Nevada, and Washington. Three of these States, as I understand from inquiring about it, did so without consultation, indeed over the objection of many of the affected tribes.

In my own State of South Dakota we experienced a major battle over this arbitrary power given to State governments. In 1963 the Legislature of South Dakota enacted a bill which would have assumed total jurisdiction over all of the Indian country within that State