

Secretary UDALL. I think we are both in the picture. I cannot argue with you that the States involved have a right to determine the schedule on which they want to make depletions, but because the Bureau of Reclamation will build the projects, because the Federal Government, Federal financing and a schedule of Federal action are involved, I think we are really both in the picture. Obviously we disagree on certain assumptions.

Mr. ASPINALL. We agreed, I think, in this assumption, that we want the river developed and that we want the river developed coordinately for the benefit of all sections of the river. On the other hand, I have heard some statements coming from Arizona to the effect that if they didn't get this project as a Federal project they would go ahead and build it themselves.

If Colorado should assume this same position, the Bureau of Reclamation wouldn't have very much to say about the depletion of the upper basin, would it—or if the State of Wyoming or the State of Utah should take that position? You wouldn't have very much to say about it as far as the representative of Federal Government, would you?

Secretary UDALL. That is an argument that cuts both ways. There are many problems attendant to the State building projects on their own, as I think some of the Arizona people have found out.

But, in a sense, one could make the argument the chairman is making, just as others have made the argument in a similar way.

Mr. ASPINALL. I am not asking for your agreement. What I am trying to say is that it isn't necessarily beholden on the Department of Interior or the Federal Government to determine what the development in the upper basin is going to be.

That is a matter for the States concerned and for the Congress of the United States. Is that not correct?

Secretary UDALL. I think I would have to agree with you in part that we do not have complete control.

Mr. DOMINY. Mr. Chairman, in appearing here in support of the central Arizona project authorization, I think it is proper for us to point out some weaknesses in the projection the upper basin has used. I do not agree with it. I think ours are much more realistic.

For example, Mr. Tipton showed an increase in upper basin depletion of nearly 3 million acre-feet between his study of a couple of years ago and 1985. Now, considering that, over the past 100 years, uses have developed to deplete the upper basin by only 2,800,000 acre-feet, we don't believe it is realistic to show uses developing in the next 17 years that will require depletion in excess of that amount.

Mr. Tipton shows full depletion by 1985, both on the Navajo Indian irrigation project and the Bonneville-central Utah project. I just don't think that this is possible of achievement by a long way. It would involve full development of 110,000 acres and full water depletion of 250,000 acre-feet by 1985 on the Navajo Indian irrigation project and 166,000 acre-feet of depletion by 1985 on the Bonneville unit of the central Utah project. I don't think it can be done.

Mr. Tipton shows full depletion of all five upper basin projects by 1985. Even if they were built concurrently with the central Arizona project, all the lands would not be in production nor would all the