



Sierra Club, Dan Jones

Grand Canyon near site of proposed Bridge Canyon Dam —Still a storm center in Arizona's irrigation drive.

Arizona

Water

Project

Blocked

With the Senate apparently ready

to act on the Central Arizona Project,

the collapse of tenuous accords

in the House dims the project's future.

Unless the members of the Arizona Congressional delegation can break a sticky legislative impasse, an end may be in sight to one of the fiercest of all the Southwest's fierce water battles—one that included a threat to a chunk of the Grand Canyon of the Colorado River.

Despite a promise of favorable Senate action, the outlook now seems bleak for the Central Arizona Project—the \$768 million scheme to bring Colorado River water to the area around Phoenix and Tucson.

The area has been booming up to

now with the help of water pumped from a vast subterranean aquifer that lies under central Arizona. An abrupt end to the boom—and perhaps to the economy of central Arizona—is looming, however, as the quantity of water in the aquifer goes steadily down. Every year, the area pumps out of the aquifer 2.2 million acre-feet of water that is not replaced. The Central Arizona Project would help by bringing in 1.2 million acre-feet pumped from the Colorado River at Lake Havasu on the California border.

The CAP has been held up, and now,

15 July 1967 / Vol. 92 / SCIENCE NEWS 55

possibly scuttled, because of violent controversy over several side issues, most notably the construction of dams in the Grand Canyon (SN: 2/18) and California's insistence on a guarantee of at least 4.4 million acre-feet of Colorado water a year.

On the surface, imminent Senate approval of a bill introduced by Senator Carl Hayden (D-Ariz.) authorizing the project would seem to signal a successful effort by the Arizona delegation. But in the House, where there has been the most action in the past, there is this year a deep silence on the CAP legislation.

"Right now there isn't even a glimmering of hope that the House will start to move on this," admits an aide to CAP's chief proponent, Representative Morris K. Udall (D-Ariz.). Though earlier efforts died in the House, that chamber was once the scene of Udall's brightest hope.

The problem is that the contending forces in the Irrigation and Reclamation Subcommittee of the House Interior Committee have simply reached total impasse (SN: 4/1). Even if a bill entirely acceptable to all committee members could be assembled, it might not be reported out because of fears of some members that amendments on the House floor would destroy the provisions they fought to have included.

Among the factions are the Coloradans who feel the CAP shouldn't be authorized without inclusion of the revenue-producing Hualapai Dam in the lower Grand Canyon, conservationists who feel the dam would desecrate the Canyon while wasting water and money, and Californians who would insist on augmentation of the river's flow—by tapping river systems farther

north or by rainmaking—before authorizing additional withdrawals.

Tremendous pressure has also been brought to bear on Congress by such conservationist groups as the Sierra Club, a California-based organization that has done more than any other single group to stir public indignation over the projected dams in the Grand Canyon.

This year Administration support for the dams vanished with the alternate suggestion, incorporated in the Senate bill, that power needed for pumping could be generated just as well in a coal-burning power plant as in a hydroelectric dam.

All this has served mainly to stir up fears and frustrations. And, despite the once hopeful pronouncements of Representative Udall, there seems to be little feeling of desperate urgency on the CAP outside of the Arizona delegation.

So, while S 1004, Senator Hayden's CAP bill, seems destined for clear sailing in the Senate, that may be as far as the Central Arizona Project ever gets.

One outgrowth of the controversy that seems headed for full Congressional approval is establishment of a National Water Commission. The Senate has already passed S. 20, the National Water Commission Act, and House approval of a slightly amended bill is expected this week.

The Commission, to work for five years, is to survey the water resources of the nation and compare them with the needs. It would suggest ways—perhaps similar to CAP—in which available supplies could be conserved, as well as technological developments such as desalination to increase the nation's water supply.

ble sites are located—California, New York, Colorado, Michigan and Wisconsin—has no open housing legislation. The Illinois Senate added fat to the fire by refusing to pass a non-discrimination housing law just before the AEC bill was reported to Congress.

But to the opponents of the Weston site, this action was only the last straw. They point to complaints by AEC Chairman Dr. Glenn T. Seaborg that communities in the area had not come through with commitments to make housing available to all. Opponents wonder how the Commission will be able to influence localities once the decision to build the \$400 million facility there is made final.

The housing issue, once having been raised, is likely to come up in other Federal research projects as well—a thought that startles many Congressmen and adds to the emotion of the debate on Weston.

Although no one has brought it up, the Food and Drug Administration's plans for a new \$17 million laboratory might be affected by the issue. The proposal has been before Congress for two years, and each time either the House or the Senate turned it down, mostly on the issue of site location.

This year the House has appropriated money to start the project, on the proviso that it be located at least 50 miles from Washington. The FDA, which wanted the lab in the Washington suburb of Beltsville, Md., suggested as an alternative Madison, Wis., but House members thought that location would be too expensive. So the location is still up in the air.

PSYCHOPHARMACOLOGY

The STP Mystery

Serenity, tranquility and peace—that translation was given last week for the letters "STP." As it turns out, STP, the new mind-bending drug loosed in California, has meant anything but tranquility.

A dozen users wound up in the hospital with uncontrollable mania—intense excitement—lasting three days.

Investigators found themselves unable to pin down the nature of the drug, since its effects bore no relationship to its chemistry, as analyzed at the Food and Drug Administration.

In California, the drug acted as if it belonged to a class of synthetic compounds known as the anticholinergics. The mental and physical consequences of taking STP all pointed to an anticholinergic—such as the Army's secret nerve gas, BZ. They did not point to such plant-derived hallucinogens as LSD, marijuana or mescaline.

ACCELERATORS

Civil Rights at Weston and Beyond

As the Atomic Energy Commission's \$2.6 billion fiscal 1968 authorization bill comes up for Senate approval when Congress reconvenes this week after its July 4 recess, one small corner of it is attracting the most attention.

This is the \$7.3 million item to start work on an ultrahigh energy accelerator in the Chicago suburb of Weston, Ill. The site for the 200-billion-electron-volt accelerator was chosen by the AEC as the best, scientifically and economically speaking, of six possible locations. But civil rights leaders complain that the area is outstanding in its lack of integrated housing and in the lack of enthusiasm on the part of local and state governments to push integration.

Senator John O. Pastore (D-R.I.),

chairman of the Joint Atomic Energy Committee, says it's the AEC's own fault the controversy has come up. The Commission said publicly, before choosing among the six sites, that it would take the question of civil rights and non-discrimination into account; then it set the issue aside.

Pastore's committee approved the Weston authorization over his head, and in the House the bill was passed after a bitter debate. But Pastore, who, with Senators Henry M. Jackson (D-Wash.) and George D. Aiken (R-Vt.), dissented to the authorization, has promised to bring the issue up again:

The principal item stressed by civil rights leaders is the fact that Illinois, unlike the five states where other possi-