

ing the land of a deceased because of section 7. It is not a question of enrollment; it is a question of property inheritance. I do not think that is right.

Mr. HOVIS. I am James Hovis, the attorney for the Yakima Tribe. I might try to clarify some things for the Senator in regard to this matter.

### STATEMENT OF JAMES HOVIS, ATTORNEY, THE YAKIMA TRIBE

Mr. HOVIS. Other tribes have introduced, or have requested, as has Warm Springs, a similar type of legislation.

Senator HATFIELD. They have not requested this.

Mr. HOVIS. This is the thing. They have requested their Congressmen to introduce it, and it has been introduced in the past. We thought it was an internal tribal matter for the tribes and if Warm Springs wanted to do it, let them do it. We did not oppose their bill. As a matter of fact, we believe in our hearts and in our own minds that this is the salvation for a lot of the multiple-heirship problems that we have. We think it would be a good thing for all tribes to have similar legislation. It would help solve a multiplicity of inheritances that are bugging every other tribe in the country. We have the best program, we think, in this regard, of any other tribe in the country, and we would suggest that we think it is an internal tribal matter. If they want to do it, that is their business, and we not only do not oppose it, we suggest such legislation for all tribes.

Senator HATFIELD. Let me clarify the record. I think it needs clarification here. I do not want to let it go on the record this way. Warm Springs at no time has proposed similar legislation. I think you are actually wrong when you indicate that. What Warm Springs has proposed is that proper legislation be enacted, and if the Yakimas persist in this type of legislation that there then be the type of legislation enacted that would permit, if you please, an action that is corollary to this, a reciprocity action—retaliation to put it bluntly—which would permit retaliation. But at no time have they proposed similar legislation to this.

Mr. HOVIS. This can be furnished for the record of the committee.

Senator ANDERSON. I wish that you would. Give your own statement and present it.

Mr. HOVIS. We will insert that in the record. But, again, we might say this is what Warm Springs wants to do. We did not oppose that bill, that legislation. We feel like this is an internal tribal matter. If Warm Springs wants to do something, wants a program, then that is their business. Basically, our objection to the amendment of section 7 has been, in a large part, dictated by the law of the State of Oregon. Inheritance in Oregon is much different than in Washington. In Oregon, you only get one-half interest. Under the State law in Washington, if you inherit you get the full one-half, and it is forever. This is in the case of distribution. Every different tribe has a different enrollment, a different distribution statute in the State, so that in a large sense, at least, if we go back to State law, then the Oregon law would be discriminating against the Yakima, not Warm Springs. The Oregon law would be discriminating against the Yakimas. If the committee wants to attack this program, we would like to see a uniform one.