

Originally, we leased this land from the Indian Department under my Mother's name, Annie F. Long. This was in 1943. We have had the use of this land (my father and I) for the ensuing 22 consecutive years. We pay nearly \$5,000 annually for the lease. I understand that the Midvale farmers are going to pay \$10,000 a year, plus the cost of administration. It appears to me that the U.S. Treasury would be short a considerable amount. Back in July 21, 1961, a letter to the Arapahoe Tribe from the Bureau of Reclamation stated the following: "It is our policy to offer the previous owners preference in leasing land." Has this policy been changed or is there some reason now to deny the return of the land, or the use thereof, to the Arapahoe or Shoshone Indians? Although I am an Indian, and I am proud of it, I do not feel that such status should deny me the right to make a living in a manner that has been successful for over 20 years. I am not now able to buy another ranching opportunity. Ranching is the only business I know and if I lose this lease, I am out of business. I have no other income.

I was highly gratified when I heard the statements you made to the effect that you wanted the entire Department to be of help and assistance to the Indian people so that their opportunity to participate in the American way of life by making a decent living for themselves and their families would be enhanced. These words are very encouraging to us, and we concur with the thoughts. It is, therefore, difficult for us to understand why one agency of the Federal government in your Department could take action which will deny some of the Indians the opportunities you are interested in fostering.

The Manager of the Midvale Irrigation District told me recently that the Commissioners of the District have no plan for administering this grazing land. From personal knowledge of the land, it will be difficult to properly administer. It will be easily overgrazed. Sustaining an annual production of forage so that there will be no diminishment in the return will require careful and prudent management. The Bureau of Reclamation also offered to let the Bureau of Land management administer this land some time ago. With these thoughts in mind, it seems evident that the land is surplus to the needs of the project. Measures to administer the land to prevent overuse and overgrazing is apparent.

This being the case, why shouldn't the land be transferred, or at least the use thereof to the Arapahoe or Shoshone Tribes so that the administrative talents of the Bureau of Indian Affairs could be used? Their range program administration on the reservation has been successful. The same successful, high-level type techniques and administrative procedures could likewise be used on this land. I feel it would be desirable to follow this course rather than allowing it to be used without applying proper conservation and use principles. The individual farmers know that the return would be so small to each one that they could not afford very much interest in how the land would be used.

I sincerely hope that you will consider this problem very carefully and that each of the points mentioned above will be taken into consideration in determining the proper and fair course of action to be followed. I am depending on you, Mr. Secretary, your sense of fairness and fair judgment to save the only opportunity left for me to make a living.

Sincerely yours,

RENO M. LONG.

Mr. LONG. The farmers contemplate a community pasture arrangement. The area which my father and I leased and for which we paid nearly \$5,000 annually will be leased to the Midvale farmers for a total of \$10 a year. It appears that the U.S. Treasury would be short a considerable amount.

According to the Bureau of Land Management, grazing capacity figures, the 63,000 acres can graze only 505 cows for 1 year. Since there are 370 Midvale farmers, if all shared equally in the community pasture each could graze less than two cattle. It requires 124 acres of this land to sustain a cow for 1 year. The 505 animal unit grazing capacity is, however, sufficient to permit at least one and possibly two economic units. The ranching business is just as important as the farming business. The less than two cattle per farmer is of no consequence