

sume partial jurisdiction either by geographic area or by subject matter. Some of the States have in fact done so. For example, Nevada has assumed jurisdiction over limited areas. Idaho has assumed jurisdiction over limited subject matter.

Does this reach a portion of your objection?

Mr. LAZARUS. Yes, it does reach a portion of my objection but it doesn't reach every State because the Department of the Interior didn't mention all the States.

The CHAIRMAN. We will have you back. Your time has expired.

Mr. LAZARUS. May I just give for the record the citation of the *South Dakota* case which ruled exactly the other way, which said that you could not do it piecemeal. It is *Re Julia Hankins*, 125 Northwest 2d, 839, South Dakota, 1964.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you very much.

STATEMENT OF ARTHUR LAZARUS, JR.

Mr. LAZARUS. My name is Arthur Lazarus, Jr. I am a member of the New York and Washington law firm of Strasser, Spiegelberg, Fried, Frank & Kampelman, and appear before this subcommittee today on behalf of six Indian tribes which we represent:

The Hualapai Tribe of Arizona;

The Metlakatla Indian Community in Alaska;

The Nez Perce Tribe of Idaho;

The Oglala Sioux Tribe, of South Dakota;

The Salt River Pima-Maricopa Community in Arizona;

The San Carlos Apache Tribe of Arizona.

Our clients wholeheartedly support S. 1843. In this regard, we note that the text of S. 1843 has been added as an amendment to the Senate version of the pending civil rights bill—H.R. 2516, and, in order to expedite enactment of the Indian rights legislation in which they are so vitally interested, our clients are urging that the House of Representatives pass H.R. 2516, as approved by the Senate, without change.

Our clients also endorse H.R. 15122, but, since the exact same proposal already has gone through the Senate, recommend that this subcommittee lay the measure aside in favor of H.R. 2516 and S. 1843, respectively.

Our clients oppose H.R. 15419 because this bill does not include the most important feature of the other bills—the proposed consent amendment to Public Law 280.

On behalf of the six named tribes which we here represent, we submit the following more detailed comments upon the provisions of S. 1843, H.R. 15122, and H.R. 15419:

CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS

Section 102 of the pending bills would prohibit any Indian tribe in exercising powers of local self-government from denying its members various rights which are recognized as fundamental under the laws and Constitution of the United States. Among the rights enumerated are freedom of speech and religion, freedom from unreasonable searches and seizures, and freedom from double jeopardy or the imposition of a cruel and unusual punishment. All of the rights enumerated