

Mr. SAYLOR. Well, that is only a small step up from the \$71 we were told we were going to have a year ago. That is only a \$9 increase. This indicates there is not going to be much increase in costs.

Mr. Secretary, as the chairman pointed out this morning, the other body apparently had very, very little interest in establishing a National Water Commission. It is my understanding that this was a recommendation of the administration. I am not privy to most of the things in the administration because I sit on the outside and only get the crumbs that fall from the table when people walk out and shake their napkins on the outside. I am never asked to feast, or come to the festive board and to know all of the plans of the Great Society.

But if my information is correct that the President is in favor of this National Water Commission, and since the chairman has even stated that he did not believe it was going to accomplish very much, those of us who said that even though it might not accomplish much, we were willing to give it a chance, were able to get it out of this committee, predominated by the members of your party, and I was able to convince most of the people on my right, in my party, to go along with it and spoke for it on the floor of the House and got the bill passed.

It seems to me with the 2-to-1 majority over the Congressmen who serve on the north side of the Capitol, if the President was interested in that National Water Commission to help solve the problems of the West, he would have had that bill out and signed. Although if the people he appoints on it do not have any more expertise than the ones he appointed to take vacancies that were created in the Indian Claims Commission, I will have to agree with the chairman, I might not expect very much from the National Water Commission.

Now, if you care to comment.

Secretary UDALL. First, on the festive board, Congressman, it is not as sumptuous as it sometimes appears from the outside.

I think the House did a very good day's work when it passed this committee's bill on the National Water Commission. I sincerely hope we can get a bill. I am going to do what I can to that end. I want to assure you of that. I think this could serve a very useful function, to help lay the groundwork for the long-term future of this country in terms of its water supply.

Mr. SAYLOR. Now, Mr. Secretary, the last questions I have concern the decision of the Supreme Court in the case of *Arizona v. California*, in which they perfected the rights for Indian reservations. In March of last year the Solicitor General filed with the Court a list of present perfected rights. You have included those in your statement, but they do not correlate with the figures which you indicated you were supposed to get of 4 acre-feet of water on every acre of land in Arizona. Is this still contemplated?

Secretary UDALL. Yes, we base our estimate of consumptive use on the 4 acre-foot figure.

Mr. ASPINALL. If the gentleman will yield.

Mr. SAYLOR. Yes.

Mr. ASPINALL. That is on diversions.

Secretary UDALL. Our figures are referenced to a consumptive use of 4 acre-feet per acre.