

# ARIZONA'S WATER CASE EXPLAINED

## State's Counsel Challenges Validity of Boulder Canyon Act.

WASHINGTON, March 10.—(AP)—  
Oral argument in the attempt to  
throw out of the supreme court  
Arizona's challenge of the validity of  
the Boulder canyon act ended today  
with counsel for that state occupy-  
ing most of the time.

Argument advanced for Secretary  
Wilbur and the states of California,  
Utah, New Mexico, Colorado, Wyo-  
ming and Nevada that the suit be  
dismissed was presented yesterday.

Clifton Mathews, counsel for Ari-  
zona, emphasized the injustice and  
inequity of the act of congress and  
the compact from the viewpoint of  
that state, asserting it would deprive  
Arizona of all water in the river  
unless it was willing to join the  
compact of the other six states.

Assailing the validity of the act  
for the construction of the dam,  
Arizona's lawyers insisted that con-  
gress as a last thought in the hope  
of making the act valid had de-  
clared it was for the purpose of pro-  
moting navigation. The Colorado  
river never was navigable, they as-  
serted, and it would not contribute  
to the navigation of any stream to  
withdraw one half of its flow for  
irrigation and power purposes.

There could be no question of the  
right of Arizona to appeal at this  
time to the supreme court, they con-  
tended, to save it water to which it  
was entitled.

Solicitor General Thatcher closed  
the argument. He said the court  
could not go behind the declared  
purpose of congress and must inter-  
pret the Hoover dam act as intend-  
ing to aid navigation. Further,  
Mathews said, congress discrimi-  
nated in favor of the Imperial valley  
and against Arizona by providing  
that Imperial valley should have  
water from the river without charge  
but that Arizona must pay for any it  
obtained. He stated the water which  
Arizona might use would in part re-  
turn to the river while none that  
went into Imperial valley would