

apply as a credit on Arizona's guarantee. However, that's not the way your water leaders see it. Unless the water is dumped physically into the mainstream of the river, they say, it just doesn't count.

But, they say, if we build the same plant under the same arrangements with the same federal financing, *and* if we build a tremendous new aqueduct to Las Vegas and pump this new water to Lake Mead and dump it there, it *does* count on the guarantee. By the time we pump it to Lake Mead and then pump it back to Los Angeles, to meet this ridiculous requirement, that \$70 water will cost perhaps \$200—but it will count on the guarantee.

Similarly, they say Arizona can get no credit for the kind of "new water" made available by expensive basin fund expenditures for salvage, canal lining, phreatophyte control and the like.

This logic is a little hard for us to follow and impossible to accept. When you propose this kind of guarantee, you are really saying that Columbia River water counts, and nothing else does. I believe I have shown that this road, justly or not, is not now open to us.

2—The second thing wrong with your state's position on the guarantee is that it saddles Arizona, and Arizona alone, with the main burden of augmenting the river. It gives us every incentive to augment and you every incentive to block augmentation. I think this is unrealistic and unfair. It's unrealistic because your state is going to need much more water than this, and it's unfair because the burden is just as much yours as ours.

After all, by the time that 27-year guarantee runs out, California will have had preferential use of the Colorado River for a total of 60 years. I think we'll all be better off if the incentive to augment it after that date falls equally on both our states.

Thus, of the four items on that envelope, we have three on which I think we could reach agreement without too much difficulty, and one which remains a subject of controversy. I don't think my state will go beyond the 27-year guarantee of the Senate bill, but theoretically we could give a perpetual guarantee. While I don't think this whole argument makes much sense or makes much real difference, I suppose we can continue to haggle about it. If we do, I hope our haggling doesn't divert too much of our attention away from the far more important things we have to discuss.

I entitled this speech "Countdown on the Colorado." That countdown, which began some time ago, will end in late January or early February when we've been promised a committee vote on our Central Arizona Project-Colorado River Basin bill. As that day approaches it seems to me all of us—but especially California—have two basic philosophies to choose from:

The first is a philosophy of pessimism, localism and defeatism—the philosophy Arizona observed in the 1920s and 1930s and which is now urged on you by some of your people. This philosophy says that not one single step can be made toward meeting Arizona's needs of the 1970s and 1980s until we know precisely—in the minutest detail—what will be done about California's needs in the 1990s. If your state follows this philosophy then whatever happens in Congress you will lose and we will probably lose with you—the river will remain short and no one will have enough. This is a fact that everyone has to face. If Arizona should go it alone and take its water out of the river under some kind of state plan, we will have to face the shortage of the 1990s, just as you will. This is the ultimate hard rock that everyone has to face. Furthermore, if Arizona is forced to build its own project, you can bet that we're going to oppose any and all federal projects sought by your state, perhaps your lawyers or ours will dream up some more lawsuits, and conceivably we'll even raise some questions about all that good water going to non-reclamation, non-municipal, non-economic use in the Salton Sea. I think your decision to follow this philosophy can be disastrous for our states and for the cause of reclamation.

The other choice is to continue the proven path of progress and cooperation, to adopt a philosophy of optimism and faith and hard work and a willingness to join together in solving—one step at a time—the problems as they arise. Except in water matters this has been the history of our two states. This philosophy acknowledges that we can't do everything we'd like to do right now. We can't fully and finally, in one bill, augment the river to meet the needs of all time. But we can make a substantial start on an augmentation program and we can create a basin fund to help pay for it. We can and we will meet Arizona's needs for an aqueduct now. And while it is being built we will spend money on investigations, feasibility studies, long-range plans. We will begin the great and im-