

But on the other hand, I think that there are ways that this could be accomplished. I think the State would probably have to have, realizing that the whole State and its economic system would benefit from water, a statewide ad valorem tax or a tax of some kind imposed on at least the counties that would benefit from a water district. They could accomplish this and they could have a project. The water would be much more costly. It would put Arizona in the position of having to go to a much more costly solution than any other State on the river. I don't think that is right, I don't think it is fair.

But if they were put to it, I think Arizona would do this. That is what I would advocate if I were an Arizonan that had a vote on it.

Mr. HOSMER. As long as we are quibbling about semantics, I would like to direct your attention to page 10 of your statement in connection with the 4.4. You use the term "California priority." The gentleman from Arizona, Mr. Udall, has spoken in terms of a guarantee.

Isn't this rather a shortage formula? Does it not put the burden first of any shortages because of CAP diversions on California and then at a point shift a share of the shortages to Arizona?

Secretary UDALL. Well, Congressman, there are two strong arguments. California has one, Arizona has the other. The committee is simply going to have to evaluate them. I am glad we can sort of toss it back to you and step aside on this one, because California on the one hand can say that it has put works in place and that it is entitled to have its uses that are keyed to these works protected.

On the other hand, Arizona very strongly feels in terms of equity and justice that for the Congress at California's behest to take away water that was given to Arizona by the U.S. Supreme Court is not right and fair. There you have the argument and I do not propose to get in the middle of it.

Mr. HOSMER. Could it not be, and is it not truly, a shortage formula?

Mr. UDALL. Would the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOSMER. I ask Mr. Dominy.

Secretary UDALL. My people say yes. I suppose it is in a sense a way of dealing with a shortage.

Mr. DOMINY. Certainly, if there is enough water for everybody, there is no objection to their taking it.

Mr. UDALL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOSMER. Yes.

Mr. UDALL. I also believe the term "priority" is more accurate than "guarantee." We have lapsed into using that term. It is a shortage-sharing formula, if you want to call it that.

Mr. HOSMER. Carrying forward this question about the Indians and recalling that you, I think, initiated withdrawal of the Hualapai Dam, how is the morale of the Hualapai Indians these days?

Secretary UDALL. Well, quite naturally they are not happy. They would like to see their resources developed. But we just have to find some other ways of helping this tribe at the present time.

Mr. ASPINALL. Will my colleague yield?

Mr. HOSMER. Yes.

Mr. ASPINALL. My colleague is not suggesting that there is any question about Federal relations with the Indians, is that right?

Mr. HOSMER. That is the way it appeared to me. The Indians came out second.