

could choose to be excluded. How can we have people who vote for representatives to make laws, who vote for judges, then determine whether or not those laws will apply to them, or have those judges hear their cases. Such a proposal is so downright destructive of American principles as to be indecent.

I realize the strong temptation in this case is to take the path of least risk. Nobody can complain in November if still another poultice is applied to the unhealing ills of the Indian for which we blame ourselves.

By upholding the act of a previous Congress, Public Law 280, this committee has an opportunity to sustain a healthful environment in which without being constantly poked and prodded and examined and patted by do-gooders, some of our Indians, at least, can ultimately demonstrate their capacity to do as well as the other minorities.

As I understand it, it has been the policy of the Congress to find ways to set the Indian free. You have wanted to get him out from under the pile of warm blankets—that layer on layer of good deeds under which he is slowly smothering. If I am right, then I ask, in the name of humanity, that you do not now add another burden to those which already stifle the pride, suffocate his initiative, and curb the will to progress which is the dominant characteristic of our people.

Do not do these things to our Indians and thus heap upon them the last in our history of injustices, permanent humiliation as men, as a people, too weak to live with our laws; too weak, in the final analysis, to become Americans.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you have a separate statement, Mr. DeBolske?

Mr. DEBOLSKE. No, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you very much. The statement has taken 13 minutes. That leaves 17 minutes under the unanimous consent request which was agreed to at the beginning of this session. That means you have five and a half minutes each for questioning.

As I understand it, Mr. Tims, the gist of your statement is to be found on page 3 when you refer to the proposal to repeal as a part of the Indian civil rights legislation, Public Law 280, is that correct?

Mayor TIMS. I do not have a copy of my speech with the page numbers on it.

The CHAIRMAN. You refer in that paragraph: "This month the administration sent a message which asked that an earlier act of Congress be amended"—

Mayor TIMS. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. And this is the gist of the presentation today and the reasons that you have set forth——

Mayor TIMS. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Upholding this position.

Mayor TIMS. We are upholding Public Law 280.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Washington?

Mr. MEEDS. May I reserve my time, Mr. Chairman?

The CHAIRMAN. It is all right with me. Unless there is an objection, the time of the gentleman will be reserved for another witness.

The gentleman from South Dakota?

Mr. BERRY. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Thank you, Mr. Tims, for an interesting statement.