

is given such minority groups as Mormons, Mennonites, Seventh-day Adventists, or Jehovah's Witnesses.

Such minorities may feel their way of life and their progress in it is rigidly different from that of the vast majority of us. We guarantee their religious rights. We do not believe they would function more effectively if further isolated from contamination in our American crucible—our melting-pot way of life—by legislation which generally exempted them from law, except those they agreed to.

Instead these people have in varying degrees entered the mainstream of American life. Some of them are contributing in substantial measure to its success. We do not believe the administration's amendment will help Indians do likewise.

In my area 17 cities and towns together with Maricopa County, have formed the Maricopa Association of Governments. We were stimulated to organize by the commonsense of cooperatives action. We also were encouraged by Congress to do so, to earn return of some of our tax money. We study and plan solutions for serious and continuing problems ranging from transportation to pollution.

For years Congress has tried to encourage municipalities to get together to solve common problems. We are now learning rapidly from these hard lessons of working together. Let us for heaven's sake and in the name of commonsense, not deny our Indian neighbors the same opportunity.

Perhaps you gentlemen appreciate how ridiculous is this title III proposal. It would be intolerable in a metropolitan area, and in no case should be considered as sensible. But the implications all over Arizona fill me with dismay. We have 19 Indian reservations in the State. Shall each of these be granted "local option," so to speak? Shall each of them have its own local selection of State and local laws under which people living in that area shall be judged?

We see an inconsistency in the administration proposal. We ask Congress to save us from its effects. There are some of us in my group who feel that the tremendous pressure of a war abroad, of the gold crisis, or erupting cities, or rampant crime may tend to divert the attention of the administration from some of the niceties of Indian urbanization. It would be amazing if such critical affairs did not.

On the other hand, we live right next door to these Indian people. We deal with them daily. They are our close and respected neighbors and no matter what happens on the French gold exchange, it does not divert our attention from what happens to these Indian people. This, we think, may give us a little edge on the administration when it comes to awareness of what is right and what will work.

You know, in our country sort of way, we believe a symptom of the harassed man is his tendency to inconsistencies. We feel we recognize a large inconsistency in the recommendation of the administration, which divides the Indian community from its neighbors, and sets it up as a separate and apparently a privileged state, but really an unhealthy one. We can see inconsistency in this and the recent efforts of the Congress to unite the urbanizing areas to ease the joint solution of their common problems. We hope you will, too.

Our opposition to the repeal of Public Law 280 is based on the belief that it would in fact enslave them in a cocoon of privilege—that of helping to make laws for others from the jurisdiction of which they