

Progress is being made today under Public Law 83-280 and co-operation is being achieved between the State and its Indian tribes. We hope it will continue.

Thank you for your consideration and the opportunity to be here today.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you very much, Mr. Rider. Under the unanimous-consent request that we have working, you have used about 4 minutes. That means that we have 26 minutes to divide if the members of the committee wish to use it. That is approximately 9 minutes apiece.

The Chairman would ask you two questions. Referring to your statement, the first sentence in the second paragraph, you state: "The New Mexico Municipal League is fully in accord with the hopes of most Americans that the Indians will receive every education and economic opportunity and will become an active participant in our American political structure."

By limiting this you do not mean to deny to any of the Indian citizens any of the civil rights that are guaranteed to them by the Constitution and its amendments and the statutes of the United States, am I correct?

Mr. RIDER. That is correct, Mr. Chairman. I think our feeling is that the Bill of Rights and the Constitution of the United States and State of New Mexico should apply to the Indians.

The CHAIRMAN. Your statement goes largely to the change that is made in the current law by the repeal or amendment of Public Law 280 by the Indian rights, so-called Indian rights bill, is that correct?

Mr. RIDER. That is correct.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you take any position at all on the first section of the bill to which reference was made by our friends from the pueblo groups this morning?

Mr. RIDER. Mr. Chairman, I think we are in full accord with titles I and II of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. With what?

Mr. RIDER. With titles I and II of the bill. I believe we have no quarrel with them at all.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Washington?

Mr. MEEDS. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Could you tell me very quickly, Mr. Rider, because we are limited in time here, what is the status of jurisdiction in the State of New Mexico with regard to Indian tribes? Is it all uniform, under different arrangements, or what?

Mr. RIDER. We have not amended our constitution to take jurisdiction as was proposed under Public Law 280. This is my understanding. However, under the Kake Indian village case in Alaska, it is my understanding that the state exercised concurrent jurisdiction without amending its constitution, that the constitution provision in New Mexico constitution relates to the Indians proprietary rights. I am not an attorney and I would rather not go any further than that.

Mr. MEEDS. So, you have not assumed the jurisdiction that you are talking about at this time?

Mr. RIDER. It is my understanding that by the recent enactment of our particular water pollution control law and air pollution control law that the State has attempted to assume jurisdiction.

Mr. MEEDS. That the State what?