

not needed by the Indians could be made available for commercial use, by the Indians or others.

Further this is all from section 4, that there should be necessary and proper safeguards for the efficient supervision and operation of the area for national forest purpose and all other purposes herein stated.

At this point all I am trying to do is point out that I think one of the reasons there has been the problem of complaints which seem to be made to others than the Forest Service and disagreements between the advisers and spokesmen for the Indians and the Indians and the Forest Service about what were proper uses here go to the very point we are talking about here.

We feel that the directive that Congress gave about how this should be managed was pretty specific about this and the Indians and those who have been advising the Indians have not interpreted it the same way we would.

Senator HANSEN. If I understood you, I think you read part of the last paragraph or the last sentence of section 4.

I would call your attention to some of the other provisions in section 4 and see what interpretation you think might reasonably be made on these. The section starts out:

For the purpose of safeguarding the interests and welfare of the tribe of Indians known as the Pueblo de Taos of New Mexico in the certain lands hereinafter described, upon which lands said Indians depend for water supply, forage, for their domestic livestock, wood and timber for their personal use and as the scene of certain of their religious ceremonies, the Secretary of Agriculture may and he hereby is authorized and directed to designate and segregate said lands which shall not thereafter be the subject of entry under the land laws of the United States and to thereafter grant to said Pueblo de Taos upon application of the Governor and Council thereof, a permit to occupy said lands and use the resources thereof for the personal use and benefit of said tribe of Indians for a period of fifty years * * *.

If I may stop here, the language up to this point seems to me to be very specific in that the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized and directed to issue a permit to the Indians to occupy these lands and use the resources for the personal use and benefit of the Indians for a period of 50 years.

There does not seem to be much doubt about that; is that right?

Mr. GREELEY. That is right.

Senator HANSEN. Continuing with the quote:

* * * with provision for subsequent renewals if the use and occupancy by said tribe of Indians shall continue, the provisions of the permit are met and the continued protection of the watershed is required by public interest. Such permit shall specifically provide for and safeguard all rights and equities hitherto established and enjoyed by said tribe of Indians under any contracts or agreements hitherto existing * * *.

Does this language not imply a rather clear delegation of authority to the Secretary of Agriculture to see that any rights or equities hitherto established or enjoyed by the tribe under any contracts or agreements here to existing shall continue for this 50-year period?

Mr. GREELEY. Yes; and we think we have done this.

Senator HANSEN. Apparently this is part of the argument and I gather your feeling is not shared by the Taos, or at least some of them?

Mr. GREELEY. We feel that provision of the act can be complied with without eliminating all of the uses.