

tary will, I think, concur in that. The legislation even spells out inter-basin transfers as an area to be studied. We were all for it, it is in the record.

I introduced the bill myself.

There is nothing that prevents the Department, as the chairman pointed out, from presently studying interbasin studies on a reconnaissance study, the same thing that has been done in desalting. It is not a question of study, it is a question of whether this Committee should obviously indicate preference for one means of augmentation over another when the studies have not been done and when the information is not in existence

Thank you, Mr. Secretary.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. JOHNSON. The gentleman from Kansas, Mr. Skubitz.

Mr. SKUBITZ. I have no questions.

Mr. JOHNSON. The gentleman from Arizona, Mr. Steiger.

Mr. STEIGER. Mr. Chairman, if I could defer for just a moment the very few questions I have for you in order to correct the record.

I know of my colleague from Pennsylvania's penchant for accuracy and his virtual total recall. Earlier in the hearings, in his colloquy with Commissioner Dominy with regard to the recent storm in Arizona, some figures were offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania I would like to inform him and for the purpose of the record that the blizzard between December 13 and December 20 of 1967 deposited 84.6 inches of snow on the city of Flagstaff. This, I am sure the gentleman will recognize instantly is 7 feet plus six-tenths of an inch. There were drifts in that area up to 40 feet.

Now, Mr. Saylor, I know that you were quoting an observation made by somebody other than yourself and I know that you will in the future consider it as not quite as reliable as perhaps you may have considered it in the past.

Mr. Secretary, I would like to consider page 21 of H.R. 3300, section 304(c). It is that language which refers to your option to require exchanges between those areas not receiving mainstream water and those areas that do receive it.

I am sure you are familiar with the language, Mr. Secretary. I would ask at this time, is it your opinion that this language protects the water needs of the northern counties of Arizona and clarifies, as far as the Department and the administration are concerned, the so-called exchange principle?

Secretary UDALL. Yes, I think it does, Congressman. We recommended this language. I would like to say, however, because I want the record to be clear on this, and I am very familiar, as the Congressman is, with this particular problem, that this language is not mandatory. It says the Secretary "may" do this.

I think the Arizona people ought to recognize, and we ought to make the record on that, that the Arizona Interstate Stream Commission, the Governor, the people who are going to make policy with regard to the future of Arizona, that they, working with the Secretary, whoever he is, are going to have to make decisions on how Arizona uses its water.

I have thought all along, and I know the Congressman has, that certainly the needs of the northern Arizona and the upstream com-