

and you have the statement, in 1960 when I sent in my ground rent as usual, it was sent back to me with the statement I was no longer their tenant as the land had been sold or leased to others. This, despite a written agreement that should they sell, I would be given first chance to buy this land, on which agreement Mrs. Hiller and I relied for justice and fair treatment.

Since 1960, and we organized in 1960, the people that were put out and their homes were burned, I don't believe it was the neighbors did any burning, and maybe the word got all over the country. Since 1960, I have witnessed many other ground rent tenants, Negroes, Mexicans, poor whites and Indians of other tribes who had all been induced to build homes and churches on section 14, have them burned down, many of which were new and my property was new. I don't know where this conservator gets the idea that there was nothing but shacks. We built our pool, we built 20 new units, we built seven duplexes, and I don't see—that was all under city inspection so where they try to give the facts—your committee—the facts that all the tenants of section 14 were the wrong type of people, we were getting along fine with the Indians on this, but these conservators come in here and with their lawyers and conservators, and your committee has heard how they have been charged all that money.

This one Indian lady this morning had her own guardianship and she made her own deal, and I'm sure that a lot of these people are qualified to do that themselves. Certainly, had they been left alone, and had Mrs. Hiller and I been left alone, we could have paid our rent as we paid all the 18 years before, so I believe your committee should look into this. There's a lot of people with—there is a lot of dissatisfaction in this country the way poor people are being treated, and certainly they were in this section here.

Mr. EDMONDSON. May I ask you a question regarding your statement, Mr. Hiller. You said that they informed you that they had sold your property. Are you speaking of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, or are you speaking of the tribal council?

Mr. HILLER. No, I'm speaking of Mrs. Gillette and her mother. The mother was the guardian when she was the minor.

Mr. EDMONDSON. You have a complaint against two individuals rather than—

Mr. HILLER. No, I don't have a complaint against the mother. The mother had seen the sense and said I should have been given the opportunity to buy the—

Mr. EDMONDSON. If you had a valid agreement with them, would you have a lawsuit against them for breach of contract?

Mr. HILLER. A valid contract is legal, and as far as the court was concerned, it wasn't valid. We were told by the Indian office back in the early forties to make our deal with the Indian, and the same Indian got that piece of land, but even though she signed the agreement in 1950, she signed it again in 1955, when the Indian Bureau give us another lease, told us to go ahead and build all these extra things on, it come up to 1960, we was just told to get off.

Mr. EDMONDSON. You were told to get off by—

Mr. HILLER. Mrs. Gillette.

Mr. EDMONDSON. The contracting party that—

Mr. HILLER. Mrs. Gillette told us to.