You may recall my previous visits to your office in Albuquerque last year on this subject. I hope you will adhere to your position. This is a bad bill for the state of New Mexico and I know you are so convinced and are familiar with all the historical details and the multitudinous arguments put forth by both sides. All of these arguments seem to be much the same as last year as I have just finished reading the bill.

One new important factor seems to be worth consideration and that is that to give the Taos Indians title to this land is setting a dangerous precedent, all arguments to the contrary considered, because of the recent activities of Reis Tijerina and his group. These people are requesting restoration of lands, not payment. The Indians gave up their payment request in favor of the return of the land. Their claim is no older than the spanish americans. Land return is a new precedent.

There is no basis for the Taos claim that the lands were taken from them

There is no basis for the Taos claim that the faints were taken from them originally. This is exactly the same type of conjecture Tijerina uses.

The water shed involved affects all citizens of New Mexico and is favoritism of the worst kind. I also notice your difference of opinion with Tom Morris on his proposals for land give away. I implore you to stand your ground and kill this bill and others like it in the senate. I stand ready and able to confer with you again on this issue and feel I am well qualified to present factual arguments to support the opposition to the bill.

The position you previously took of giving them a few acres around the lake itself seems to be a fair compromise and I believe the citizens of New Mexico could support this position and it would cut the import down considerably.

Please let me hear from you on this subject.

Yours truly.

N. P. GUNTER, President.

EL PRADO, N. MEX., September 12, 1968.

Hon. CLINTON P. ANDERSON. U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR ANDERSON: I am writing this letter to express my views on the proposed legislation in Congress to give 48,000 acres of land to the Taos Indians. I am opposed to this legislation.

I am a livestock permittee on the Carson National Forest and I understand that some permittees who graze on part of the land involved could lose part or all of their grazing privileges. This is not right.

A few years ago I bought the Gerson Gusdorf property in El Prado and depend entirely on irrigation water from the Taos Pueblo stream. In addition, the land I farm at Ranchitos is dependent on this same source of irrigation water. If anything should happen to this source of water supply I would be wiped out.

Many of us have worked a lifetime to put together a livestock operation. Is it right to have it taken away overnight by an act of Congress? What are these people to do after their permits are taken away?

I have talked to numerous residents in all the area and they all agree that this

would be a grave injustice.

I hope that you will consider the best interest of all people when this vote comes before the Senate.

Sincerely yours,

e-early bory half-ege 7 Jews - 1 1, 1645

CECIL HOWELL.

Los Alamos, N. Mex., September 6, 1968.

DEAR SENATOR ANDERSON: Recently we became acquainted with the Blue Lake issue, and would like to express our feeling on the subject to you. We firmly hope that you will reconsider your position and allow the Taos Indians to have their 48,000 acres in the Blue Lake area under Title Trust under the Department of Interior instead of the Department of Agriculture.

To begin with, we believe that their religious claims should be considered. Secondly, as people who love nature, we feel that true wilderness areas are becoming all too rare these days, and an area of seven by ten miles should not