

This amendment was adopted in the House and is embodied in H.R. 3306 so that the bill now provides that persons not members of the tribe may enter the area for purposes consistent with its preservation as a wilderness.

However, they would be permitted to do so only with the consent of the Taos Pueblo. I would like to emphasize that the permission of the Indians will be the deciding factor in determining whether others may enter.

Conservation values are fully protected. In fact the religious values which the Indians attach to the land require the preservation of the land in its natural state.

As Secretary of a Department that has broad conservation responsibilities, I would not recommend the enactment of this bill if I believed that its enactment would conflict with basic conservation values.

The House amended the bill in subsection (b) so as to give both the Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary of the Interior responsibilities in regard to conservation administration.

While it is possible to reconcile the two areas of responsibility, we believe it would be preferable to concentrate responsibility in one office, under the circumstances we think that of Interior.

This would require the deletion of the words "Secretary of Agriculture" on line 19 of page 5 of H.R. 3306, and the insertion of the words "Secretary of Interior" in their place.

Senator METCALF. Thank you very much, Mr. Secretary.

The Senator from New Mexico.

Senator ANDERSON. When you state that H.R. 3306 will right a wrong, has the House been wrong to a greater extent at other times?

Mr. UDALL. Well, because of my view of the history of this, the creation of this particular national forest, and of the view that these Indian people take of the injustice that was done, I think both of these pieces of legislation, rather all three bills, recognize a wrong was done and that corrective action should be taken.

The basic argument is really a question of what area should be restored to them. In one instance it is proposed 3,000 acres and in another 48,000. I think as far as the question of righting a wrong, that there is agreement in both pieces of legislation with regard to principle.

No one admires more than I do the action Teddy Roosevelt took in 1906 when with a stroke of the pen he put millions of acres of forest land that were publicly owned in the West into national forests.

He did more than any other President. Yet as late as 1906—these were not lands taken a hundred years ago; they were taken about 60 years ago—this was land this particular group of Indians had been using for centuries; and it was not a case where typical public domain land was taken from them and put in national forests.

The question is whether we should give them money or, because of the religious significance to them, give them back the land; and it seems to me the best approach, and both bills say it is, is to say we are not going to make you conform to the usual pattern and give you money.

It is recognized some land should be restored to them. We favor the larger parcel of land and the Department of Agriculture favors the smaller tract.