

plication that we are not to authorize any projects in the upper basin until that matter is settled?

Secretary UDALL. Congressman Aspinall's letter did not request information on the five projects. Therefore, that is covered in the beginning of my statement, that our position on these projects is unchanged from our position of a year ago. We only responded in this statement to Chairman Aspinall's letter.

Mr. SAYLOR. Well, what other projects or what projects are in the upper basin which are dependent on a contested water supply which have been or would be authorized or undertaken?

Mr. DOMINY. All of those five projects, all of the others that were authorized as part of the Colorado River storage project, and those that were listed for advanced attention for continued planning have been taken into account, Congressman Saylor, in our own projections of upper basin depletions. The difference is that we project those depletions and full use of the upper basin water over a longer period of time than Mr. Tipton and others have suggested might be realized.

Mr. SAYLOR. The next item that you come to is the water losses along the Lower Colorado River. The last sentence of your statement, Mr. Secretary, states that we know that we can salvage water through ground water recovery. Now, ground water recovery in Arizona near the Wellton-Mohawk project was the cause of a tremendous international incident between the United States and the Republic of Mexico regarding the quality of water. If we are going to recover—salvage water through ground water recovery, what is its quality?

Secretary UDALL. Congressman, the Wellton-Mohawk project did provoke this serious problem. The ground water we are talking about here is in the Yuma area. In several of these projects—the Yuma Mesa area is a good example—we built up, by applying water on desert land, tremendous underground water reserves that had not existed. They call them underwater domes. We would pump out of those domes and salvage water in that fashion.

But the quality of water, in answer to your question, in this instance is very good as compared with that underlying Wellton-Mohawk.

I am not saying there is not a diminution in quality, but the quality is generally good.

Mr. SAYLOR. That is just it, the water is bound, Mr. Secretary, to have picked up certain minerals as it was leached through the ground and leached out certain minerals. There is no water purification plan that exists is there, that you know of?

Secretary UDALL. One thing you have to bear in mind is that as a project gets older, the solids are leached out and the quality of water gets better. This will happen with Wellton-Mohawk, we think.

Mr. SAYLOR. On page 17 you list the waters in the central Arizona project. You leave this committee in a position where they are going to have to act like Solomon because, assuming that this is the best possible presentation that the Bureau of Reclamation can make, you state that only time will tell which assumptions are more nearly correct. I notice you do not say which facts are more nearly correct. And you further state there is no way of guaranteeing or proving with certainty any given assumptions today.

Now, despite that fact, despite the fact that you have indicated that there is not going to be sufficient water to take care of a 2,500-second-