

(The data referred to follows:)

HOVIS, COCKRILL & ROY,
Yakima, Wash., April 4, 1968.

Hon. HENRY M. JACKSON,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR JACKSON: In reference to the discussion that the Yakima Tribal delegation had with you and your staff on March 7, 1968, regarding S. 1764, I wish to report as follows:

Upon the delegation's return to the Yakima Reservation two proposed amendments to S. 1764 were discussed with the full tribal council on March 13, 1968. The purpose of this discussion was to give direction to the undersigned as to how to compromise with other tribes. The first amendment would be to amend S. 1764 to allow Section 7 to be retained but to provide that Yakimas not be able to inherit from other tribes. The other was to provide that Section 7 be retained but that compensation shall be paid to those who cannot inherit for the interests they otherwise would not inherit. Because of sickness we were unable to further consider this matter until April.

While the Yakima Tribal Council still stand by their statement that they have no objection to other tribes having the same provision or passing retaliatory legislation, they do not believe that they have the authority in face of overwhelming action against any amendment by the General Council to propose any amendment. Therefore, my hands are tied in discussing compromise with other tribes. I was so instructed by the Tribal Council at their meeting April 3, 1968.

The Yakima Tribal Council is uniformly against the passage of S. 1764 or any amendment to Public Law 706, 79th Congress, and request your support in this regard.

Sincerely,

JAMES B. HOVIS,
Yakima Tribal Attorney.

STATEMENT OF ORVILLE NELSON OLNEY, ROLL NO. 1894, YAKIMA INDIAN TRIBE

We of the Yakima Indian Progressive Association endorse and urge passage of S. 1764. Our association is strongly in favor of any legislation that would eliminate any discriminatory provisions, or deny us or our heirs our constitutional rights contained in the act of August 9, 1946 (60 Stat. 968) providing for the preparation of a membership roll of the Indians of the Yakima Reservation. Section 7 of the act denies heirs with less than one quarter degree of Yakima blood to inherit. A non-Yakima spouse who has spent a lifetime helping develop the property is denied the right to inherit. We ask that section 7 of the act be repealed on the grounds that it is inequitable. Our association represents many people living on the reservation, many living off the reservation where they can best provide for their families, and those serving in the Armed Forces all over the world.

STATE OF OREGON,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Salem, Oreg., March 1, 1968.

Hon. MARK O. HATFIELD,
New Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MARK: My close association with the Confederated Tribes of the Warm Springs Reservation brings me in frequent contact with many of their internal problems. Recently I have been talking to some of my friends and constituents on the Reservation concerning Senate Concurrent Resolution 11, introduced in the 90th Congress by Senator McGovern and others, on February 17, 1967.

This resolution has been well received by many thoughtful leaders of the Warm Springs Confederated Tribes. They believe that it will assist in the updating of the thinking of, and allow a new approach for, Congress on matters pertaining to Indian affairs and Indian problems.

If this resolution is approved, the future deliberations will not be restricted by past resolutions on this subject which may have become obsolete by this time.