

be brought so the Community and/or its members shall have the same rights as any other person to have the issue tried in the United States District Court as to what is fair and just compensation for the lands so taken.

We respectfully request that the foregoing be made a part of the hearing record.

Mr. JOHNSON. I also would like to put into the record a letter from the attorney general of California to me stating his position in behalf of the legislation on the subject matter that has been before this subcommittee.

Is there objection?

(No response.)

Mr. JOHNSON. Hearing none, it will be so ordered.

(The material referred to follows:)

STATE OF CALIFORNIA,
DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE,
Los Angeles, January 25, 1968.

HON. HAROLD T. JOHNSON,
*House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.*

DEAR BIZZ: I appreciate very much receiving your letter of January 19, 1968, regarding California's position on the pending Colorado River legislation.

I am delighted to reiterate what you perhaps already know—that our state is united on the language of a draft bill that is the "Official Recommendation of the State of California." As in the past, the Department of Water Resources, the Colorado River Board, and the Attorney General of California have labored together on it; and we have had the assistance of the Advisory Committee to California's delegation to the Western States Water Council. I understand that the Governor has accepted and supports this position. So long as California remains united, we shall not fail.

As California's lawyer, my chief concern with the pending legislation has always related primarily to its legal aspects. In particular, I have insisted upon adequate priority for California's existing projects as against any new Central Arizona project. Any bill to authorize a Central Arizona project must embody protection for our 4.4 million acre-feet per annum. Sound language to accomplish this result which has been developed by this office, now appears in the draft bill that is the official recommendation of the State of California. This is essentially the same language that has appeared in your prior bills and those of the other California Congressmen and Senators. It is the language that Arizona has agreed to in 1966 and that was then included in the bills introduced by her three Congressmen.

Please feel free to contact Northcutt Ely, Special Assistant Attorney General, and my Water Law staff for any further analyses that may be needed on legal matters relating to this important legislation. We want to be of the greatest possible assistance to our congressional delegation.

Sincerely,

THOMAS C. LYNCH, *Attorney General.*

Mr. SAYLOR. Could I ask the Secretary and the Commissioner several questions with regard to a few words that appear in S. 1004 and H.R. 3300 and ask whether or not they are important when we consider these bills.

Mr. Secretary, on page 1 of S. 1004, line 8, the words "exchange of water" appear.

Are these necessary or should it be shown that this only calls for exchange within the basin?

The reason I ask the question is because some people might wonder whether or not this is authorization for exchanging of water outside of the Colorado River Basin.

Mr. WEINBERG. Mr. Saylor, that language has reference to possible water exchanges within the State of Arizona and between Arizona and New Mexico.