Secretary UDALL. This is a broad problem. This committee may be discussing it 25 years from now. I would rather not be drawn into it at this time, because it presents policy questions that none of us has had a chance to seriously analyze. I do not think I could be helpful.

Mr. Hosmer. Well, I was thinking of the possibility that we could see Arizona with a tremendous supply of water within her boundaries, yet the possibility of her six sisters on the river still suffering from a lack of augmentation and so forth I am wondering if this should

really be a basin asset.

Secretary Udall. Congressman, it seems to me that if the plowshare program involving peaceful uses of nuclear energy proves able to augment the underground sources, improve the acquifers, this would probably be true in all States or most States. It would depend on geological conditions. Another problem in the Colorado River Basin would involve use of a development fund to support various projects Also involved would be the manner of crediting the augmented supply. This is a very broad subject and it will be discussed in the future if the system works.

Mr. Hosmer. Very well. One final question.

On this M & I water, about the biggest customer there would be is Phoenix. Is there any problem about Phoenix actually buying it?

Secretary Udall. Phoenix and Tucson would purchase M & I water. Tucson has a far more crucial problem than Phoenix. Both, of course, are very much interested in having this augmentation supply for future growth.

Mr. Hosmer. Tucson is?

Secretary Udall. Tucson has a much more critical problem. Phoenix

is in the Salt River watershed.

Mr. Hosmer. But Phoenix uses much more water and if we are going to sell a lot of this at M & I prices, we must at least be questioning whether Phoenix is going to want to pay that.

Secretary Udall. The Commissioner tells me we already have ap-

plications for the supplies that we will be able to provide.

Mr. Hosmer. For whom?

Mr. Dominy. Phoenix and Tucson both have indicated firm applications for even more water than we think we will be able to supply.

Mr. Hosmer. Would these be under long-term contracts?

And what prices are we talking about?

Mr. Dominy. We have not, of course, finalized any contractors. This depends on the kind of legislation finally enacted. We have been talking of a \$50 plus per acre foot rate for M & I water. Mr. Hosmer. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. Johnson. The gentleman from California, Mr. Tunney.

Mr. Tunney. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Secretary, assuming that there is no augmentation water on the Colorado River, and assuming also that the central Arizona project is constructed with 2,500-cubic-feet-per-second capacity, at what year would California go below the 5.2 million acre-feet she is now using? Mr. Dominy. We estimate, Congressman Tunney, that as soon as

CAP was actually functioning, it would probably get to that point

very quickly.

Mr. Tunney. It would go below 5 million two?

Mr. Dominy. Yes, very quickly.