

Mr. MEEDS. You were transporting or talking about transporting 4 million acre-feet of water, the cost per thousand acre-feet would be less than it is at 2 million; would it not?

Mr. DOMINY. That is right; yes, sir.

Mr. SAYLOR. Will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. MEEDS. Yes.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Dominy, this is one of the points I tried to bring out in hearings last year, that if you want to make the Mexican water treaty a national obligation, all of the basic costs—right-of-way, tunnel, and everything else—will be charged to the 50 States. All you would have to do would be just to enlarge it a little bit. The increased costs are all the folks out there would have to pay for all the other water they would bring in.

When we had a gentleman from Texas as the Chairman of the Subcommittee, he was going to get seven and a half million acre-feet, plus Mr. Skubitz was to get seven and a half million acre-feet for Kansas; and Oklahoma was going to get in for their little dibble. Of course, most of the people in the Bureau thought that was pretty good, because they could make that real feasible if they did not have to worry about the initial cost and only the increased cost in size, just as Mr. Meeds is pointing out right now.

Mr. HOSMER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MEEDS. Yes.

Mr. HOSMER. In light of the fact that, the difference between 2.5 million acre-feet and 10 million acre-feet is minuscule in comparison with around 195 million acre-feet of Columbia River water that wastes into the sea every year, what are we getting at? I just do not quite understand either his or the other gentleman from Washington's emphasis on this quantity factor.

Mr. MEEDS. I think there would be some disagreement that there are that many acre-feet wasted into the sea every year from the Columbia.

Mr. HOSMER. This is just a study based on clocking the river.

Mr. FOLEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MEEDS. Yes.

Mr. FOLEY. Is the gentleman aware that there are years when the flow of the Columbia is beneath 15 million feet?

Mr. HOSMER. Oh, yes.

Mr. FOLEY. If the gentleman is aware of that, I think the answer to his question is obvious.

If the gentleman will yield further, we are talking here, I understand, in terms of augmenting the Colorado River as a goal, not necessarily moving the Columbia River for purposes that are best known to the gentleman from California. And the costs that the Federal taxpayer will be asked to bear here do have a relationship to what method of augmentation we use. Is that not correct, Mr. Commissioner?

Mr. DOMINY. Excuse me?

Mr. FOLEY. I am addressing this question to you.

Is it not true that the costs involved are directly related to the method of augmentation we use?

Mr. DOMINY. Certainly. You would certainly want to use the most feasible means of augmentation. That means the most economic that we can find.