

And I think we need to recognize that this water is vital not just for the irrigation uses of the pueblo, but the economy of New Mexico, and in particular the Taos area depends on this water. We can't, as you know, have new industry and have growth, without water.

More and more of these Indians are having to seek employment outside the pueblo, and this employment is going to have to be provided by economic growth. The water is going to be the limiting factor on that growth, so we say that this watershed, the need to have it protected, is important to the public, and the public includes the Taos Indians.

We think the Forest Service is the best agency, the best qualified agency, to administer that watershed. They have more experience at this. Their record is better.

We have lands in New Mexico that are a sad sight to see, and these lands are the lands that are trust lands, under the Department of the Interior. This land has been terribly abused.

Senator METCALF. With all due deference to the Department of the Interior—

Mr. LITTLE. They have had difficulties, sir, and we recognize that.

Senator METCALF. And it is probably our fault, because we have failed to give the appropriations for these very fragile Bureau of Land Management lands, and the other lands that the Department of the Interior administers, and over the years, the Forest Service has, by a superb performance, persuaded the Appropriations Committee to do a little better job in getting some help.

So I know that the Department of the Interior is trying very hard to take care of erosion and control of these lands. I can be critical of them, but I see no reason, unless some justification is developed in this hearing, to take land away from the Forest Service, which has done an admirable job of administering it, and carrying out the provisions of the act, and turn it over to the Department of the Interior, where we who are interested in the Interior Department in the West have great difficulties in getting appropriations for their actual needs.

Mr. LITTLE. May I say something about this timber business?

There was a trespass on the Carson Forest 2 years ago. It was alluded to yesterday, and they took pictures of the area. This trespass, this report, will lead you to believe that it was the Indians that pointed this out to the Forest Service, "Look, here, they trespassed on our land."

This trespass was on land outside of the permit area. It was in the forest, but outside the permit area. The Forest Service people were the people that first noticed it. They noticed it in a matter of days. One of the operators had felled a few trees. They charged him for the trees, and let him have them at a penalty rate, I understand, rather than waste them.

Snow came, and he was unable to get in there and clean up his mess during the winter. He was in there the next spring, and that was the spring of 1967, a year ago, and the matter was taken care of.

With regard to the pressure that has been alluded to here, as far as this timber-cutting business, I think what the Forest Service has done, as best as I can determine, is to try to make it clear to the tribe that this timber is available to them, as specified in the 1933 act, and when and if they want to allow the cutting of it, they try to encourage