

then be no question as to whether a permit might be revoked. The boundary of the tract would generally be prominent ridges which could be easily identified, signed and posted. The area would be large enough to assure privacy and non-Indian use could be kept away throughout the entire year.

Our recommendation also directs the Secretary of Agriculture to make certain clarifying amendments to the existing permit. These could be beneficial in confirming the Secretary's authority for protection and management of the remaining part of the permit area not subject to exclusive use and occupancy by the Indians, and the provisions relating to Indian and non-Indian use of the area.

For example the provisions of the permit relating to livestock grazing by the Indians should be expanded to spell out how the grazing capacity would be determined, and how the range would be managed.

We have attempted to work with the Indians in taking steps to control overuse of drainage bottom areas and other more accessible areas. However, we have had difficulties in this. There is presently overuse of the forage resources where the cattle tend to concentrate, and the watershed and range are being damaged in these areas.

One particular source of conflict has been the extent of non-Indian use of the permit area for hunting, fishing, hiking and the like at times when such use is not prohibited because of the Pueblo's religious ceremonies. This locality could be a very useful area for such recreation use if it were managed under circumstances to permit recreation use rather than to discourage it.

We think that day use permits could be issued by the Forest Supervisor, but that no overnight permits should be issued unless concurred in by a designated Pueblo official. This would allow more people to use the recreation potential of these lands, without interfering with basic Indian needs.

We recommend enactment of this legislation with the amendments we have indicated in our reports. The bills in their present form have several features which give us serious concern.

*First.*—The bills would compensate the Taos Pueblo with land, rather than with money.

We are familiar with the interlocutory order of the Indian Claims Commission concerning the land. The order provides for determination of the acreage and values of the land.

If the finding of uncompensated appropriation of the land becomes final, compensation will be paid the Pueblo. We believe that this process should be followed through as has been done in other claims of Indian tribes for the taking of land by the United States.

If the Pueblo is granted land rather than cash, this action could well set a far reaching precedent that would extend to other Federal conservation lands.

We have no way of knowing how many other areas in national forests, parks, and other public land units were historically used by Indian tribes for hunting, fishing, and the taking of other natural foods, for timber and water, and for religious ceremonies.

Senator METCALF. Mr. Greeley, I wonder if we may just suspend at this point. Senator Anderson and I have amendments to take to the floor and then I would like to have an executive session and a consultation as to how to proceed.