

water be depleted by 1985, by even an optimistic estimate. It isn't possible.

Mr. Tipton shows 40,000 acre-feet being used in the four counties area of northeast Colorado by 1975. That use has been in controversy, is still in controversy. If it were resolved today, the projected water use could not be accomplished by 1975. The Seedskadee project, Mr. Tipton shows full depletion by 1980 on that project. That is not possible of achievement.

I defend the project projections the Bureau made. We have been in the business for a long time and we have no special axes to grind.

Mr. ASPINALL. I just want to say Mr. Dominy has defended the projections that the Bureau has made. This is his proposal as far as that is concerned. If it conflicts with the other information, he is certainly of a right to make that statement.

Mr. BURTON of Utah. Before you leave that point, I would like to draw it out a little better on the record.

When Congress seemed unsure of the central Arizona project, there were people in Arizona who said they would go it alone. Nobody in the Federal Government said Arizona did not have the right to go it alone. Is that correct?

Secretary UDALL. I think they have the right to go it alone. I think they can undoubtedly put a project of some kind together. There is no doubt that the water cost would be substantially higher. I think the State has the resources, I think it has the determination that, if once it were made clear there were to be no Federal legislation, you would see quite a movement in the State. That is my own judgment.

Mr. BURTON of Utah. If the gentleman from Colorado would yield further, that is the point, simply to ascertain that the compact rights of the seven States involved are inviolate, as far as I see it, from the Federal standpoint or Department of Interior standpoint.

If I may add this one point, Mr. Chairman, some people have fears in my State that if this project is built the ultimate fate of central Utah may never come to pass.

Because, as you indicated in your statement, Mr. Secretary, I think on page 9, it is unlikely that any Federal developments will be authorized when the river is virtually dry. However, there have been some people in Colorado and in Wyoming and in Utah who have said that, if we are not able to use our entitlement through the benefit of Federal projects, some of the States involved might use this water in the development of oil shale should this resource be developed in the future. I cannot see any reason why Utah or Colorado or Wyoming could not go it alone on certain reclamation projects if they choose or why they could not use the water in oil shale development in future years if they choose, without interference from the Department of the Interior.

Would you agree with that?

Secretary UDALL. I think whatever option Arizona has to go it alone the other States have a similar option. The only other ingredient is their own determination or their own desperation, as it might exist.

I want to add one other comment, though, because we develop quite a pessimistic, gloomy mood when we discuss it this way. I have been an optimist all along about the future of this region. This is one of the fastest growing regions in the country. This country is strong