

ticular carrier, and I have seen action in the South Pacific area, seen the Japanese kill our boys. I have drunk lots of salt water which has made me understand about this right, speaking for my people. I did not dishonor, I did not disobey the orders of this country to wear that uniform, and my boys in Vietnam carried that order.

Mr. Chairman, give us that justification, give us that justice. Give us a strong condition. We like to preserve. We would like you to give us an opportunity to make that preservation, so our Indian life can exist. Indian customs, Indian features. We have no power to convert our complexion, like your ways. We would like to learn your laws. We like to learn your ways. We like to learn more about your society, and your civil rights, and whatever you have. It is good for us. We are not saying these procedures and these fundamental principles are not good, but at the same time, we like to be protected by the Constitution of the United States insofar as our laws and religion is concerned, and this is our primary purpose to be here today, Mr. Chairman. I do have a respect of all men commonly in this God's world. We talk about our common problems. This is our common understanding, but we can achieve that goal only right here. We are not going to go anywhere to complain but we come right here in this place—poor man, rich man, or average man. This is their home, Washington, D.C. Their problems should be presented, and should be considered. After thorough investigation, due process should be provided for these poor people. Let us not struggle, let's not cause any suffering of our people.

We have no great economy, we have no money. We borrow money and we are a very, very poor Indian tribe of New Mexico. We don't have any resources. We would like to have strong consideration, and I think a good justification was shown by Mr. Haley and Mr. Aspinall of Colorado. These are good men. I have a lot of respect. These gentlemen have a lot of responsibility, and they are doing lots of deeds for the poor people, and also for the rich man.

Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman, for the opportunity to speak.
(Subsequent to the hearing the following additional information was received:)

PUEBLO DE TAOS,
Taos, N. Mex., September 22, 1968.

Re: hearings on H.R. 3306.

HON. GEORGE MCGOVERN,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Indian Affairs, Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The purpose of this letter is to set forth the reasons for Taos Pueblo's unequivocal opposition to S. 1624 and S. 1625, which would take away rights that the Pueblo now has in the Blue Lake Area, and to explain, with reference to the testimony of witnesses opposing H.R. 3306, why enactment of that bill is essential to the preservation of the religion and the integrity of the culture of the Taos Indians.

1. *S. 1624 and S. 1625—Destruction of Existing Rights.* Under the provisions of S. 1624 and S. 1625, 93 per cent of the Blue Lake watershed would very shortly be opened to recreationalists and logging operators. Enactment of those bills would cut off the existing meager rights of the Pueblo to protect its religion from outside interference. Under Section 1(b) of the bills, the Pueblo's rights to the 3,150 acres around the lakes will be subject to Forest Service interference if "necessary to protect adjacent national forest lands"; that vague language does not require administration primarily for protection of Indian interests. The provisions of Section 2(b) of the bills reduce the rights of the Pueblo under the 1940 Permit, thus enabling the Forest Service to develop the watershed without regard to the religious needs of the Indians.