

Mr. SAYLOR. Would the gentleman yield?

Mr. KAZEN. Yes.

Mr. SAYLOR. I might say there is still quite a gap. If the Secretary of the Interior and the Commissioner of Reclamation had come to this committee instead of going to the Appropriations Committee in the first instance, we might have had a good authorization instead of the track they took. They did not bother to come to this committee. One of the reasons they are in trouble is that this committee does not know what they are doing. They have never come up here and told us that. It is one of the things where the Bureau went behind the backs of the members of this committee and the counterpart on the Senate side and ran right to the Appropriations Committee. They got the \$100,000 from the Appropriations Committee and never asked for any authorization from this committee at all.

Mr. KAZEN. I do not know the background of this project as the gentleman does who has served on the committee for a long time. I have not had the privilege of reviewing any previous hearings on this subject, but it is a subject in which I am vitally interested, coming from the Southwest.

Let's delve into this a little bit more, following up the statement made by the gentleman from Pennsylvania, what kind of trouble are you in?

Mr. DOMINY. I would like to comment on that. There are solicitors' opinion in the record that the weather modification program which we undertook is clearly within the general authority of reclamation law. We have not required specific legislation.

As to the charge of our failure to keep people informed, we have made regular reports. The program has been discussed with this committee many times. I do not believe it is justified to say that we have not informed the Congress as to what we are doing. It has been a matter of record and the solicitor's opinion is a matter of record that we do not need additional legislative authority to pursue this program.

Mr. KAZEN. I certainly would want to impress upon you that at least as one member of the committee, I would like to stay informed on the progress that you make, because if you do get in trouble, I want to help you out of that trouble, because I think this is too vital a program to falter. It means a lot to the future of this country.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. Secretary, and your able staff with you, I have a few questions that I would like to ask at this time. They might be a little repetitious, but I think for the interest of California and myself, we should have further answers to them.

The first two questions will relate to the water supply studies.

The first question would be: Are not all the Department of Interior water supply studies for the central Arizona project based on also providing a water supply for existing projects in Arizona, California, and Nevada, with California limited to 4.4 million acre-feet?

Secretary UDALL. That is correct.

Mr. JOHNSON. Now, question No. 2: Is it not true that the Department of Interior studies show the central Arizona project to be economically feasible while at the same time providing a water supply for existing projects in Arizona, California, and Nevada, with California limited to 4.4 million acre-feet per year?