

Senator HATFIELD. Yes, Mr. Chairman.

If this is a sound principle for the Yakima Tribe, why is it not a sound principle for all the Indian tribes who want to protect their lands? Do you not think there are other tribes that have that same interest, that their lands are in that same position? You understand, this is special legislation which only applies to the Yakima Indians? If this is good for the Yakimas, why should it not be equally applied to the other tribes interested in the same question?

Mr. JIM. We believe that these other tribes want this. The trust land is a special status land that is reserved by treaty. Not every other race is part of this treaty. We are treaty people, descendants of treaty signers.

Senator HATFIELD. The Yakimas are?

Mr. JIM. The Yakima treaty signers signed this and it was ratified by the Senate, and we want to retain that trust land as much as possible. We are prepared to show the allotments that explain that.

Senator HATFIELD. Are you the only Indian tribe that has this kind of treaty land?

Mr. JIM. No, others have it. The Osages have a similar inheritance provision, as Mr. Bennett said. But we believe that our timber is worth more than oil, that it is more valuable. Oil will run out.

Senator HATFIELD. What about Warm Springs?

Mr. JIM. They have indicated that they would like the same provision in their act to protect their reservation. I think that if you will review that, it is a problem that we are trying to show, because we are trying to solve the multiple heirship problem.

Senator HATFIELD. I happen to be a Senator from that State; the Warm Springs people are not asking for special legislation of that kind. They are asking to repeal the legislation, because they feel that this would be very, very bad for other Indian tribes who enact this type of legislation in retaliation to the Yakimas. They think that everyone will suffer as a result. That is why the Warm Springs people are represented here today, not as a tribe but as individuals within that tribe, to ask for the repeal of this section 7. They are not asking for the enactment of this or similar legislation.

Mr. JIM. We believe, as Mr. Seelatssee has said, that the Department of the Interior was aware of the proposals in 1945. They knew of the bill before 1946. As a matter of fact, the Indian agent at the Indian reservation advised the tribe to do this.

Senator ANDERSON. To do what?

Mr. JIM. To make an enrollment law, and this act was the result of it, in 1946. And this, with the help of the Solicitor's Office of the Interior Department.

Senator HATFIELD. We are not directly involved with the enrollment question. That is not the point here for discussion before us, really. We are not going to argue or quarrel with Indian tribes on their qualifications for enrollment. We are talking about the divestment of property. I have the idea that we have no right to divest the Indians of property, these heirships of \$100 or less, whether it is \$5 or \$1,000. It is the principle: We should not divest them of any right. I think that you are divesting people of property rights by the retention of section 7, because, as Mr. Bennett said, 780 persons were heirs under the State of Washington laws and were precluded from inherit-