

Mr. UDALL. Let me ask the Secretary, the Department's testimony and Department's calculations have all been made on the assumption that California will have a 4.4 guarantee. I assume that this does not mean to imply that the Department advocates that or takes the position that California is entitled to it or anything like it?

Secretary UDALL. Our position on that is the same as it was a year ago when we presented our testimony. We assumed this because at one point, at least, there was the appearance that Arizona and California, or at least some of the States, were operating on this as an assumption. We regarded this as something that was primarily a matter, an argument between the two States, to be adjusted and determined by the committee. If it is the view of the Congress that the 4.4 is the right thing to do, we have no objection. If there is some modified position determined upon, we have no objection to that.

Mr. UDALL. Obviously, if the river is augmented, all this argument about the guarantee or about the water supply for the central Arizona project goes out the window; these things become academic, as you say in your statement.

Secretary UDALL. It disappears; that is right.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Chairman, I have a unanimous consent request.

I have finished with my questions, except to yield to Mr. Haley.

Let me make my request, first.

We are making a record here for the future and some of my Arizona hydrologists and experts are concerned about the modest differences we have in hydrology or in conclusions from hydrology with the Department, or with statements of members here. They fear that my silence here might be mistaken by historians as acquiescence. I would like to ask unanimous consent to file a brief memorandum setting forth some further comments on hydrology and other matters concerning water supply and related matters, particularly dealing with Indian water rights on their lands.

Mr. HOSMER. Reserving my right to object.

Mr. JOHNSON. The gentleman from California.

Mr. HOSMER. Would the gentleman include permission for me to do the same?

Mr. UDALL. Of course, and Mr. Hosmer should have the same right.

Mr. SAYLOR. Reserving the right to object, I oppose the request.

Are these to be statements by the respective members or are these to be statements from other hydrologists and engineers?

Mr. UDALL. I had not reached that point. I was assuming that I would file a memorandum on behalf of Arizona setting forth any modest differences we have in conclusions to be drawn from various water studies, and the figures which our experts tell us are slightly different from those of the Department and those submitted by other members of the committee.

Mr. SAYLOR. Does the gentleman from California have the same thought in mind?

Mr. HOSMER. My thought in mind would be to produce such a statement with or without accompanying authoritative materials as the situation demanded.

Mr. SAYLOR. I withdraw my reservation. I just wanted to know the ground rules on which we might expect these two statements.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman.