

experience I hope we've learned a lesson. This time let's build a smaller, sounder and less complicated airplane—but one that will fly. And if it won't accommodate all of our would-be passengers on one single glorious flight, we'll just take those with the most urgent business the first time and make several other trips for those who have no need to go right now.

In the context of our four-point agreement of last year I see the possibility for a new meeting of minds and a new joint effort of our two states and the other basin states. This is clearly evident when you realize how little change is necessary to bring that agreement into line with the realities of 1968.

I

On the building of the Arizona aqueduct there obviously can be no compromise, and no one has suggested one. This is the center of the controversy.

On the need for immediate, meaningful steps toward augmentation there certainly can be and ought to be complete agreement. Augmentation is more important than ever, for all of the basin states, and already we have lost over a year of irreplaceable time. It is not in the need for augmentation, but in the method of achieving it, that we have encountered difficulties. And I see no reason for these differences to continue.

When the Santa Fe Compact was signed in 1922, everyone assumed that the river would continue to flow at the same rate as it had in former years. But it hasn't, and we now know that there will be years when the river provides less water than the total of all our legally-constituted shares. This is the reason that your state has attempted to use its 38 votes in the House to exact from Arizona with its three votes the guarantee that I have discussed. Well, I happen to think it's a lot more important to augment the water supply than argue about dividing up shortages. And while the exact form of augmentation contained in our 1966 bill is no longer possible—at least not in the foreseeable future—there are three other methods of augmentation that are available to us. In other words, of the four, three are available to us. Let me list them.

First, there is desalting.

Second, there is weather modification. This is really exciting and may answer our problems all by itself.

And finally, there is salvage and conservation of existing water in the Lower Basin.

This leaves only so-called trans-basin transfers—in other words, importing water from the Columbia Basin—as unavailable to us at this time.

Let me tell you a little bit about this one method we're having to abandon for now. It would involve constructing a large, long, costly aqueduct, pumping system and other works—and doing it now in dimensions capable of meeting our needs 30, 40 and 50 years from now. To build a little aqueduct to meet our present demands would be an awful mistake, as it would simply have to be enlarged later. But to build a huge aqueduct now, many years in advance of actual need, would mean carrying an enormous investment that was yielding no return for up to half a century. At this moment no one, including those Californians most sanguine about this proposal, has any real idea what it would cost. However, the best engineering estimates based on today's technology price the water from that system at anywhere from \$80 to \$200 an acre foot.

Just to put that in perspective, we have a couple of friendly economists in Arizona who say that our farmers can't afford to pay \$10 an acre foot. Domestic users, of course, can pay much more, even \$200 an acre foot, but they certainly don't want to pay such prices if water is available more cheaply some other way.

Which brings me to the first of the *possible* means of augmentation available to us. This is desalting.

There are two very favorable factors working for us in this regard. The first is that today's technology will produce desalted water for us more cheaply than imported Columbia River water. The second is that desalting units can be built in stages as they are needed, rather than all at once, saving the "idle plant" cost inherent in importation.

I have said we must assume there will be shortages in the Colorado River. But they don't exist today because the four Upper Basin and three Lower Basin states aren't yet at that level of population and development to utilize all their allocations. Let's see what this means in relation to the construction of desalting plants to make up for these deficiencies.

I am told that the first of these staged desalting plants would not have to be put into service until the year 1992, the second in 2001, a third in the year 2013