

logical moment for a floor vote. But it never came. The moment passed, and it will never return.

I must tell you bluntly that no bill providing for a so-called "Grand Canyon dam" can pass the Congress today. I fought them—we fought them together—but the protectionists have won—at least for now.

I must also tell you that no bill providing for augmentation of the Colorado River by importing water from the Columbia River system—or even feasibility studies directed at the Columbia—can pass the Congress today Senator Jackson, chairman of the Senate Interior Committee, will see to that.

There isn't a California water leader or Member of Congress with any knowledge of the situation who can say with a straight face that either of those two things can happen today any more than he can say that the sun can be made to rise in the west. Yet the official position of the California water agencies as I stand here at this moment is that the Central Arizona Project must be opposed vigorously unless these two impossible conditions are included.

Let's start with a good, strong dose of candor right here. If this is California's position, you are simply out to obstruct any Arizona bill from ever passing. You don't fool us, and you shouldn't try to fool yourselves.

All right, these things are impossible. What is possible? Obviously, this is where we ought to concentrate our efforts if we sincerely want to see reclamation move ahead, if we want to enable Arizona to utilize its share of the Colorado River, if we truly want to end this feuding that has gone on so long. And I will tell you that I see many avenues that are open to us, many ways in which our two states can proceed side by side to solve our common problems.

One of the greatest satisfactions for me in public life is reaching that point where divisions are bridged, feuds settled, where people who have been fighting can lay down their guns and begin to build instead of fight. Lyndon Johnson often quotes his father as saying that any jackass can kick a barn down, but it takes a pretty skilled carpenter to build one. I look back with real satisfaction on several such occasions in my congressional career.

Last year I thought we had reached such a meeting of minds in the Colorado River Basin states. I am hopeful that we may yet, in the six weeks remaining in our countdown, recapture the essence of that 1966 agreement, for it contains a whole bundle of things that *are* possible and can be enacted. Stripped of a lot of detail and many items of considerable but secondary importance you could write the essentials of that agreement on the back of an envelope. There were four main points:

1—California and Arizona's other neighbors would, at long last, support Arizona in building its aqueduct from the river to Phoenix and beyond.

2—Recognizing that this new drain on the river would bring shortages for all of us in 25 to 30 years, we agreed to start right now on a big, solid, meaningful program of studies and actions to augment that river so that, when the pinch of the 1990s comes, we would have enough water to meet all our needs.

3—We knew that augmentation would require big, bold steps and that they would cost money—hundreds of millions of dollars. This was where the dams came in. With their revenues we hoped to open a "savings account" to pay for the things our studies and investigations indicated were necessary and feasible.

4—Finally, to relieve California's great fears, we came to an understanding about what would happen in the 1990s and thereafter if, in spite of the augmentation program, there were shortages. We agreed that the Arizona aqueduct would beat those shortages to the extent required to get you your 4.4 million acre feet until this river was augmented or until the Resurrection, whichever came first. In effect, we gave away much of our "paper" victory in the Court to get our aqueduct built.

We have been promised that early in 1968 there will be a vote in the House Interior Committee on this legislation. We intend to try to win it—either with your help or over your dead bodies. But before that vote occurs there is time to get back on that four-point program—not in its precise form of 1966 as your leaders demand—but in its essence.

I suspect I'm going overboard on metaphors today, to make a metaphor. But another one comes to mind. I see that 1966 bill as a kind of jerry-built airplane designed to get a lot of people off a desert island. Because there were so many people to accommodate and so much excess baggage we put on about seven engines and five wings and three-and-a-half fuselages and six-and-a-half landing gears. It was a real dandy; it just had one defect: it wouldn't fly. In fact, California's designers and test pilots even refused to get on board. Out of that