

Bureau of Indian Affairs knew about, or was making some communication on; this; and after the law was made, they did so immediately, but more than anything else, I believe they made a statement that this came from the Yakima Indian General Council. There have been no less than six or seven votes on this in general council since then, and they have all opposed the amendment of this act. My people are not educated. They believe that if you get too much land inherited out, that there will be a termination to it, because this was treaty land, to begin with, given to these people who were non-Yakimas.

This comes and goes without saying, Mr. Totus and Mr. Seelatsee have been with us for many more years. One was there, before I knew that there was a tribal identity, although I lived there. They were, in effect, saying that this is an act of the general council, and we are the ones that built this up from nothing to something that means something.

Now, everybody wants to get in as members on the value of the timber, the farmland that we have developed through our leasing situation and in the cutting of the timber. They all want to get onto this. We Indians are a minority. Where were our rights when the 1887 Allotment Act came in? This is just a corrective measure.

I think that Mr. Totus has also brought out the fact that in this section 7, as it is applied today, that there is something like 146 that were made "inter vivos", and this is Mr. Anderson's letter of July 7, 1967, showing that the authority under section 7 of this act through the Bureau of Indian Affairs, they are now transferring their lands either in patent and fee, gifted, or inter vivos to other members who would not be qualified under the act to inherit.

The Washington State Sports Council that is generally opposed to the Indians in 1960, in voting on H.R. 1176, unanimously opposed any amendment to the Yakima Enrollment Act after we explained this, because they said that this is the only tribe that says who is an Indian, by having this one-quarter degree cutoff, and, therefore, know which members are entitled to hunting and fishing rights. They supported us in this.

We do not say that the allotment act was just in allotting our land away, but we say that we are trying to solve the multiple heirship proposition. We come with the support of our tribes almost unanimously except for maybe one-half of 1 percent, and we respectfully request that the Congress and the Senate of the United States gives us the dignity to determine our own future. We feel that the other people have shared enough in our reservation lands, and we believe that we should be left alone, that this is an internal matter. It has worked for us for 22 years. If it did not, our people would tell us and not elect us.

We will answer any questions we may.

We would like to say that we will stay here and answer all questions if you have any during this hearing or after, because this is of No. 1 importance to us. We believe this is either termination or not termination, because the land base is the only thing to help these people who stay on the reservation who are uneducated and who cannot go someplace else. This is our country. We have no other place to go. We respectfully would like to keep this law intact, as we believe that Congress intended it to be 22 years ago.