

more besides. But I'm still not going to let you marry my daughter because I don't think you've got the strength left to take her to the altar."

If you view things in this light it is little wonder that many Arizonans question the good faith of Californians who tell us, "We want you to get your share of Colorado River water, but first there are these few little old conditions."

Now I know, and most Arizonans know, that compromise is the essence of the legislative process. And we can't expect to pass any legislation as big as this without some give and take. But we'd certainly like to see a little more take with the give, or less give with the take.

What we are really complaining about in Arizona is a curious double standard for water development projects—one standard for the west bank of the river and quite another for the east. In my nearly seven years in Congress I've seen the enactment of at least ten projects in the states that make up the Colorado River Basin—projects like the \$425 million Auburn-Folsom Project, which I voted for, and the \$100 million San Felipe Project, both here in California. When projects like these come up—and I certainly want to mention the \$72 million federal participation in your Bolsa Island desalting plant—the only questions raised are: Is it sound? Is it feasible? Will it repay its costs? If the answers are affirmative, the bill passes, and that's that. When Auburn-Folsom came up, no one suggested that hearings had to be postponed until your state had guaranteed Arizona's water requirements for the next fifty years; no one demanded that controversial dams be built, that the Mississippi River be diverted, or that Arizona's 2.8 million acre feet take precedence over your state's share of the Colorado River. When the \$81 million Southern Nevada Project came up, no one suggested that the vote had to be delayed until all problems in the Colorado River Basin had been solved. No one demanded these things when the \$43 million Dixie Project in Utah and the \$170 million Fryngpan-Arkansas Project in Colorado came along, even though the waters were to come from the same river we are now told is too short.

Authorizations for your Central Valley Project here in California now exceed over one-and-three-quarter billion dollars, and on no occasion have you people in California had to stand on your little fingers, perform backward cartwheels, or demonstrate unusual heroics or feats of legerdemain in order to enact this legislation.

But on the east bank of the Colorado, once it passes Lee Ferry, it is quite another story. In the state which has the most serious shortages of all, which has the second most rapid population growth in the country and the most rapidly falling water tables, which has been stymied for 40 years while the other states of the basin have raced ahead—almost always with Arizona's support—in this one state only a different standard applies. It isn't enough that we show feasibility, need, cost-repayment criteria, and all the rest. According to California, we can't even bring our bill to a vote in the House of Representatives until we have given guarantees, single-handedly run over the Northwest, built the most controversial dams in the nation's history, and with our three-man delegation foreclosed any possibility that our 432 colleagues might change a single word, or even a comma, before final passage.

So much for dwelling upon the past, which, after all, is only prologue for what happens in the future. As we approach 1968 I think it's vital for your state and mine to assess where we are, what is possible and what is not, what is fair and what is right.

Where are we? Well, from the standpoint of reclamation, we're at essentially the same point we were at when the 89th Congress began. Nothing of consequence has moved forward. This big issue is holding up a backlog of reclamation issues—a lot of them in California—waiting to be considered. As long as this issue remains unresolved, the whole reclamation cause is hung up on a reef, going nowhere.

What is possible and what is not? Let me begin with a couple of major "impossibles" and get them out on the table for all to see.

For one thing, it is no longer possible to pass the big package of proposals we were all united on in 1966. Your leaders made the decision to help block final action in the 89th Congress, and the critical moment passed. In spite of all the charges of the Sierra Club and other organizations that we were going to flood the Grand Canyon—which wasn't true—and in spite of opposition from the Northwest that we were going to rob them of their water—a really absurd idea—we had succeeded in convincing a majority of the members of that Congress that our cause was just and that this bill should be passed. After 18 months of hard work, meetings, speeches, mailing campaigns and lapel tugging we were at the psycho-