

with an iron hand and without regard to American civil liberties should be weighed against the statements by Mr. Cordova (age 31) and Miss Bernal (age 22) to the Subcommittee that the young people in the Pueblo support with equal fervor the demand for the Watershed. The fact that the Blue Lake Area has been sought for more than 60 years by generations of Taos Indians should in itself rebut the argument that a majority of the Indians do not want the land.

Elliott S. Barker.—Mr. Barker candidly attacks the religious claims of the Indians as "a pure and simple subterfuge to get the land for ulterior purposes." Since H.R. 3206 does not give the Indians any significant economic benefits, it is difficult to imagine what "ulterior purposes" would impel the Pueblo to push so long and so hard and at such great cost for recovery of this land. I suggest that Mr. Barker should not attack the good faith of simple people who are deeply sincere in their beliefs unless he has a strong factual basis for his attack; I trust that the Committee will construe Mr. Barker's attack as a reflection on his views rather than on the views of the Indians.

Mr. Barker's arguments that the Indians' historical interests in the land do not warrant enactment of H.R. 3306, and that to give this land to the Indians would unfairly benefit them in relation to their Spanish-American neighbors again ignore the fact that the Indians will not receive any economic benefits under the bill. It also ignores (apparently as a "subterfuge") the essential issue of protection of the Pueblo's religion and the consequent preservation of its ancient culture. Mr. Barker is obviously interested in destroying Indian cultures rather than in their preservation. We hope the Subcommittee will not vote to endorse such a brutal policy.

Kenneth B. Pomeroy.—The statement that payment to the Indians of \$160,835.94 extinguished their claim to the 130,000 acres presently before the Indian Claims Commission is a misunderstanding which we have explained above. The amount received by the Indians did not compensate them for land lost within the Town of Taos nor for lands lost outside the Pueblo Grant. We hope that there will be no further arguments based on a misapprehension concerning previous compensation payments.

James A. Snead.—Mr. Snead asks whether the Indians are to receive both the Watershed and compensation for its loss, suggesting that enactment of H.R. 3306 would have that effect. H.R. 3306 by its terms requires the Indian Claims Commission to determine the value of the rights granted by the bill as an offset against any award to the Pueblo in its pending claims case. Therefore, the Pueblo will clearly not receive both compensation and the land itself.

Ladd S. Gordon.—Mr. Gordon's statement, pointing out that Forest Service administration of the Watershed "could provide vastly more public benefit" than administration by the Department of the Interior, emphasizes the Indian's fears that continued Forest Service management of the Area will destroy their religion by maintaining the outside pressure of recreationalists and lumber interests.

The other adverse witnesses before the Committee, and several of the witnesses named in the foregoing paragraphs, also relied on the fact that enactment of H.R. 3306 will create an undesirable "precedent." Whether or not a precedent is created by enactment of the bill is a question of fact. The facts are that no other tribe can show the same religious interest in land adjoining its reservation which remains in Federal ownership, has been adjudicated as Indian-owned land by the Indian Claims Commission, and has been recognized by two Acts of Congress setting it aside for the benefit of the Indians. Exclusive use of the Rio Pueblo Watershed is required to protect and preserve the Pueblo's religion and culture. Protection of its religion was the principal ground for enactment of the 1928 and 1933 Acts. However, the Indians have not succeeded in obtaining exclusive possession of the land under those Acts, and Congress should now fulfill its original intention of setting this Watershed aside for the Taos Pueblo by enacting H.R. 3306.

We trust this letter will be made a part of the Committee's record of the hearings on the bill.

Sincerely yours,

RODEY, DICKASON, SLOAN, AKIN & ROBB,
by WILLIAM C. SCHAAK.