

If this committee finds these lands are surplus to the needs of this project, I strongly urge the committee to request that these lands be restored to a Federal agency which is entrusted with administration of grazing lands.

Back in July 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.

This is a policy with all agencies which normally administer grazing lands. Although I am an Indian, and 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 more than 20 years.

At this point I would like to request that a letter stating this be entered into the record.

Senator HANSEN. Without objection, it will be received.

(The letter referred to follows:)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
BUREAU OF RECLAMATION,
Billings, Mont., July 21, 1961.

SHOSHONE INDIAN TRIBE,
Fort Washakie, Wyo.

GENTLEMEN: Land purchased from the Shoshone Indian Tribe and Arapahoe Indian Tribe adjacent to Anchor Dam is available for leasing for grazing purposes.

Because of construction activities near the Dam and problems caused by "sinkholes" which have developed, only the land formerly in your ownership that lies south of the Reclamation fence will be leased. This amounts to about 90 acres of grazing land and lies in the SW $\frac{1}{4}$ NE $\frac{1}{4}$, N $\frac{1}{2}$ SW $\frac{1}{4}$, and NW $\frac{1}{4}$ SE $\frac{1}{4}$, and NW $\frac{1}{4}$ SE $\frac{1}{4}$, Sec. 24, T. 8 N., R. 1 W., W.R.M.

It is our policy to offer the previous owners preference in leasing lands. You are requested, therefore, to advise us as soon as possible and in any event by August 15, 1961, whether you wish to lease the land lying south of the Reclamation fence and if so the amount of annual rental you offer to pay.

Very truly yours,

H. G. ARTHUR, *Regional Director.*

Mr. LONG. It does not seem in the public interest to abolish an established, private, successful business which pays nearly \$5,000 a year for a lease, in favor of a commune arrangement of a semiprivate group which will pay \$10 a year and has a highly doubtful chance of success.

I sent a certified letter to the Midvale Irrigation District requesting that I be allowed to lease the land I had previously used, and I did not receive an answer from them.

After starting with exactly nothing in the ranching business and putting together a successful business over the years it seems unjust that the Bureau of Reclamation makes this capricious decision when the land is not to be used for a higher priority.

I am not now able to buy another ranching opportunity. Ranching is the only business I know. I have no other income.

The Federal code of grazing regulations for the public lands, printed by the Department of the Interior, specifically states on numerous occasions that the prior user shall have a superior preference in leasing public grazing lands.

This grazing land has been left unused since our lease was canceled in October 1966, and was left idle during 1967. I think this is evidence that the Midvale farmers are not in need of grazing lands. The Federal Treasury should be getting a fair return annually from a lease.