

Mr. SONOSKY. That is not correct, Mr. Chairman. I attended those hearings.

The CHAIRMAN. That is what they said this morning.

Mr. SONOSKY. No. The record shows that Mr. Montoya, who testified here today, testified in detail before the committee, Senate subcommittee in June 1965; also that in Gallup, N. Mex., a number of Pueblo Indians appeared and testified and they told—some of these stories they told, they charged against their own council, as set out in that testimony.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you very much. The time of the chairman has expired. The gentleman from Washington.

Mr. MEEDS. Mr. Chairman, I would just like to take my time to straighten out the record which was made this morning. As I recall the testimony, it was that the Indians had not, the Pueblo Indians had not had notice of hearings on that Senate bill, and I have before me the record of the Senate bill, both in 1961 and in 1965, in which the very gentleman, for instance, who said he had no notice testified here in Washington, D.C., on that very bill that is before us, and in 1961 where he and a number of other people, it looks like about seven members of the Pueblos, different Pueblo groups, testified in 1965 and about five or six in 1961 on this legislation.

I would like the record straightened out on that.

Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. BERRY. Will you—is it your impression that the resolution passed by the NCAI asked that these court amendments apply only to courts of Indian offenses?

Mr. SONOSKY. I heard that resolution this morning and I was shown a copy of it this morning. I had never heard of it, never seen it before. It is almost unintelligible to me because what it says is that it limits it to courts of Indian offenses which is contrary to what I know the National Congress has publicly said, that it supported S. 1843, and the only explanation I can think of is that it was done by an executor committee and not by the full council, and probably done at the instance of the Pueblos since it relates to them.

Mr. BERRY. It relates to all.

Mr. SONOSKY. Yes. The way it is framed it relates to all.

Mr. BERRY. So it wouldn't be at the instance of the Pueblos.

Mr. SONOSKY. I mean probably the reason for this particular resolution was at the request of the Pueblos.

Mr. BERRY. Just one more question because you spent so much time on South Dakota. It is—you were here when the people from Arizona testified. Do we have a similar problem of law enforcement in the other States, too, do you think, Marvin?

Mr. SONOSKY. I heard the mayor of Scottsdale. He is the only one I heard this morning. No, I don't think we have the same problem he was posing.

Mr. BERRY. What about State election laws? How can a State enforce their election laws on a State election which is held on an Indian reservation if there is not at least some concurrent jurisdiction?

Mr. SONOSKY. I think you have a point well taken with respect to enforcement by the State of State election laws where the precinct and voting ballots are on the reservation. Fortunately it is the history