

Mr. MEEDS. Would you then tell me in what respect you differ?

Mr. OLSON. I would say that this lawsuit, just like any lawsuit, could be framed on a statement of facts that were not proven. That this in fact did not exist within the Pueblo of the Jemez at the time. And I would further add at the present time one can visit the Pueblo of Jemez, and he can find the dissidents that brought the lawsuit are presently living there enjoying their religious freedom as any other citizen. There is no further difficulty. There are perhaps at least three or four different Christian faiths practiced within the Pueblo Jemez. And they have church facilities. And there is no problem.

Mr. MEEDS. But if a Federal court, or a court somewhere does not protect this right, and if a Federal court says that it has no authority or jurisdiction to look into this right, wouldn't you agree with me that the right of religious freedom is substantially in jeopardy?

Mr. OLSON. If I could, I would like to answer the question that way.

Again, accepting the statement of facts as made by the Congressman, I would agree. But I do not believe this exists within the Pueblos as they presently have their government, and that by assuming something that has not happened, and in all probability won't happen, by accepting this as the answer, you are denying to them to keep the type of government they presently have.

The statement has been made by the chairman of the All Pueblo Council, and by many of the governors here—they would invite the committee to make an investigation of the freedoms within these Pueblos, to determine for themselves that there is no discrimination. But by the adoption of the language of title I, providing for these things, that the Pueblos will in fact be discriminated against in their own way, and they will be destroyed. This is the position that they take.

Mr. MEEDS. I am even more concerned with the fact as to what the judge said—that he had no right to protect these so-called rights.

The CHAIRMAN. If the gentleman has any questions to ask of the witness, this is fine. But as far as argument back and forth with the witness, the Chair is going to call a halt to this.

Mr. MEEDS. Mr. Chairman, I do not mean to argue with the witness.

The CHAIRMAN. We do not know all the facts of the case. It is all right to ask any questions that you want to, Mr. Meeds.

Mr. OLSON. If I could answer—

The CHAIRMAN. We have too many other witnesses from out of town we are going to hear today.

Mr. MEEDS. Mr. Chairman, if complete knowledge of all the facts is a criterion for a member to pursue a line of questioning in this committee, we are out of order most of the time.

The CHAIRMAN. You ask your questions, and quit arguing with the witness.

Mr. MEEDS. I am not arguing with the witness, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. All right. Now, proceed with your questions.

Mr. MEEDS. I will reserve the balance of my time, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Berry.

Mr. BERRY. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

First I want to join in stating this was an excellent statement that was prepared here. I want to commend the Pueblo organization on putting this very fine statement together. I also commend your counsel, Mr. Olson.