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Members of the Congress:

In meeting the constitutional requirement of informing the Congress upon the state of the Union, it is exceedingly gratifying to report that the general condition is one of progress and prosperity. Here and there are comparatively small and apparently temporary difficulties needing adjustment and improved administrative methods, such as are always to be expected, but in the fundamentals of government and business the results demonstrate that we are going in the right direction. The country does not appear to require radical departures from the policies already adopted so much as it needs a further extension of these policies and the improvement of details. The age of perfection is still in the somewhat distant future, but it is more in danger of being retarded by mistaken Government activity than it is from lack of legislation. We are by far the most likely to accomplish permanent good if we proceed with moderation.

In our country the people are sovereign and independent, and must accept the resulting responsibilities. It is their duty to support themselves and support the Government. That is the business of the Nation, whatever the charity of the Nation may require. The functions which the Congress are to discharge are not those of local government but of National Government. The greatest solicitude should be exercised to prevent any encroachment upon the rights of the States or their various political subdivisions. Local self-government is one of our most precious possessions. It is the greatest contributing factor to the stability, strength, liberty, and progress of the Nation. It ought not to be infringed by assault or undermined by purchase. It ought not to abdicate its power through weakness or resign its authority through favor. It does not at all follow that because abuses exist it is the concern of the Federal Government to attempt their reform.

Society is in much more danger from encumbering the National Government beyond its wisdom to comprehend, or its ability to administer, than from leaving the local communities to bear their own burdens and remedy their own evils. Our local habit and custom is so strong, our variety of race and creed is so great, the Federal authority is so tenuous, that the area within which it can function successfully is very limited. The wiser policy is to leave the localities, so far as we can, possessed of their own sources of revenue and charged with their own obligations.

GOVERNMENT ECONOMY

It is a fundamental principle of our country that the people are sovereign. While they recognize the undeniable authority of the state, they have established as its instrument a Government of
limited powers. They hold inviolate in their own hands the jurisdiction over their own freedom and the ownership of their own property. Neither of these can be impaired except by due process of law. The wealth of our country is not public wealth, but private wealth. It does not belong to the Government, it belongs to the people. The Government has no justification in taking private property except for a public purpose. It is always necessary to keep these principles in mind in the laying of taxes and in the making of appropriations. No right exists to levy on a dollar, or to order the expenditure of a dollar, of the money of the people, except for a necessary public purpose duly authorized by the Constitution. The power over the purse is the power over liberty.

That is the legal limitation within which the Congress can act. How it will proceed within this limitation is always a question of policy. When the country is prosperous and free from debt, when the rate of taxation is low, opportunity exists for assuming new burdens and undertaking new enterprises. Such a condition now prevails only to a limited extent. All proposals for assuming new obligations ought to be postponed, unless they are reproductive capital investments or are such as are absolutely necessary at this time. We still have an enormous debt of over $20,000,000,000, on which the interest and sinking-fund requirements are $1,320,000,000. Our appropriations for the Pension Office and the Veterans' Bureau are $600,000,000. The War and Navy Departments call for $642,000,000. Other requirements, exclusive of the Post Office, which is virtually self-sustaining, brought the appropriations for the current year up to almost $3,100,000,000. This shows an expenditure of close to $80 for every inhabitant of our country. For the average family of five it means a tax, directly or indirectly paid, of about $150 for national purposes alone. The local tax adds much more. These enormous expenditures ought not to be increased, but through every possible effort they ought to be reduced.

Only one of these great items can be ultimately extinguished. That is the item of our war debt. Already this has been reduced by about $6,000,000,000, which means an annual saving in interest of close to $250,000,000. The present interest charge is about $820,000,000 yearly. It would seem to be obvious that the sooner this debt can be retired the more the taxpayers will save in interest and the easier it will be to secure funds with which to prosecute needed running expenses, constructions, and improvements. This item of $820,000,000 for interest is a heavy charge on all the people of the country, and it seems to me that we might well consider whether it is not greatly worth while to dispense with it as early as possible by retiring the principal debt which it is required to serve.

It has always been our policy to retire our debts. That of the Revolutionary War period, notwithstanding the additions made in 1812, was paid by 1835, and the Civil War debt within 23 years. Of the amount already paid, over $1,000,000,000 is a reduction in cash balances. That source is exhausted. Over one and two-thirds billions of dollars was derived from excess receipts. Tax reduction eliminates that. The sale of surplus war materials has been another element of our income. That is practically finished. With
these eliminated, the reduction of the debt has been only about $500,000,000 each year, not an excessive sum on so large a debt.

Proposals have been made to extend the payment over a period of 62 years. If $1,000,000,000 is paid at the end of 20 years, the cost to the taxpayers is the principal and, if the interest is 4¼ per cent, a total of $1,850,000,000. If the same sum is paid at the end of 62 years, the cost is $3,633,000,000, or almost double. Here is another consideration: Compared with its purchasing power in 1913, the dollar we borrowed represented but 52 cents. As the value of our dollar increases, due to the falling prices of commodities, the burden of our debt increases. It has now risen to 63½ cents. The taxpayer will be required to produce nearly twice the amount of commodities to pay his debt if the dollar returns to the 1913 value. The more we pay while prices are high, the easier it will be.

Deflation of government after a war period is slower than deflation of business, where curtailment is either prompt and effective or disaster follows. There is room for further economy in the cost of the Federal Government, but a comparison of current expenditures with pre-war expenditures is not unfavorable to the efficiency with which Government business is now being done. The expenditures of 1916, the last pre-war year, were $742,000,000, and in 1925 over $3,500,000,000, or nearly five times as great. If we subtract expenditures for debt retirements and interest, veterans' relief, increase of pensions, and other special outlays, consisting of refunds, trust investments, and like charges, we find that the general expenditures of the Government in 1925 were slightly more than twice as large as in 1916.

As prices in 1925 were approximately 40 per cent higher than in 1916, the cost of the same Government must also have increased. But the Government is not the same. It is more expensive to collect the much greater revenue necessary and to administer our great debt. We have given enlarged and improved services to agriculture and commerce. Above all, America has grown in population and wealth. Government expenditures must always share in this growth. Taking into account the factors I have mentioned, I believe that present Federal expenses are not far out of line with pre-war expenses. We have nearly accomplished the deflation.

This does not mean that further economies will not come. As we reduce our debt our interest charges decline. There are many details yet to correct. The real improvement, however, must come not from additional curtailment of expenses, but by a more intelligent, more ordered spending. Our economy must be constructive. While we should avoid as far as possible increases in permanent current expenditures, oftentimes a capital outlay like internal improvements will result in actual constructive saving. That is economy in its best sense. It is an avoidance of waste that there may be the means for an outlay to-day which will bring larger returns to-morrow. We should constantly engage in scientific studies of our future requirements and adopt an orderly program for their service. Economy is the method by which we prepare to-day to afford the improvements of to-morrow.
A mere policy of economy without any instrumentalities for putting it into operation would be very ineffective. The Congress has wisely set up the Bureau of the Budget to investigate and inform the President what recommendations he ought to make for current appropriations. This gives a centralized authority where a general and comprehensive understanding can be reached of the sources of income and the most equitable distribution of expenditures. How well it has worked is indicated by the fact that the departmental estimates for 1922, before the Budget law, were $4,068,000,000, while the Budget estimates for 1927 are $3,156,000,000. This latter figure shows the reductions in departmental estimates for the coming year made possible by the operation of the Budget system that the Congress has provided.

But it is evidently not enough to have care in making appropriations without any restraint upon expenditure. The Congress has provided that check by establishing the office of Comptroller General. The purpose of maintaining the Budget Director and the Comptroller General is to secure economy and efficiency in Government expenditure. No better method has been devised for the accomplishment of that end. These offices can not be administered in all the various details without making some errors both of fact and of judgment. But the important consideration remains that these are the instrumentalities of the Congress and that no other plan has ever been adopted which was so successful in promoting economy and efficiency. The Congress has absolute authority over the appropriations and is free to exercise its judgment, as the evidence may warrant, in increasing or decreasing budget recommendations. But it ought to resist every effort to weaken or break down this most beneficial system of supervising appropriations and expenditures. Without it all the claim of economy would be a mere pretense.

The purpose of reducing expenditures is to secure a reduction in taxes. That purpose is about to be realized. With commendable promptness the Ways and Means Committee of the House has undertaken in advance of the meeting of the Congress to frame a revenue act. As the bill has proceeded through the committee it has taken on a nonpartisan character, and both Republicans and Democrats have joined in a measure which embodies many sound principles of tax reform. The bill will correct substantially the economic defects injected into the revenue act of 1924, as well as many which have remained as war-time legacies. In its present form it should provide sufficient revenue for the Government.

The excessive surtaxes have been reduced, estate tax rates are restored to more reasonable figures, with every prospect of withdrawing from the field when the States have had the opportunity to correct the abuses in their own inheritance tax laws. The gift tax and publicity section are to be repealed, many miscellaneous taxes are lowered or abandoned, and the Board of Tax Appeals and the administrative features of the law are improved and strengthened. I approve of the bill in principle. In so far as income-tax exemptions
are concerned, it seems to me the committee has gone as far as it is safe to go and somewhat further than I should have gone. Any further extension along these lines would, in my opinion, impair the integrity of our income-tax system.

I am advised that the bill will be through the House by Christmas. For this prompt action the country can thank the good sense of the Ways and Means Committee in framing an economic measure upon economic considerations. If this attitude continues to be reflected through the Congress, the taxpayer will have his relief by the time his March 15th installment of income taxes is due. Nonpartisan effort means certain, quick action. Determination of a revenue law, definitely, promptly and solely as a revenue law, is one of the greatest gifts a legislature can bestow upon its constituents. I commend the example of the Ways and Means Committee. If followed, it will place sound legislation upon the books in time to give the taxpayers the full benefit of tax reduction next year. This means that the bill should reach me prior to March 15.

All these economic results are being sought not to benefit the rich, but to benefit the people. They are for the purpose of encouraging industry in order that employment may be plentiful. They seek to make business good in order that wages may be good. They encourage prosperity in order that poverty may be banished from their home. They seek to lay the foundation which, through increased production, may give the people a more bountiful supply of the necessaries of life, afford more leisure for the improvement of the mind, the appreciation of the arts of music and literature, sculpture and painting, and the beneficial enjoyment of outdoor sports and recreation, enlarge the resources which minister to charity and by all these means attempting to strengthen the spiritual life of their Nation.

FOREIGN RELATIONS

The policy of our foreign relations, casting aside any suggestion of force, rests solely on the foundation of peace, good will, and good works. We have sought, in our intercourse with other nations, better understandings through conference and exchange of views, as befits beings endowed with reason. The results have been the gradual elimination of disputes, the settlement of controversies, and the establishment of a firmer friendship between America and the rest of the world than has ever existed at any previous time.

The example of this attitude has not been without its influence upon other countries. Acting upon it, an adjustment was made of the difficult problem of reparations. This was the second step toward peace in Europe. It paved the way for the agreements which were drawn up at the Locarno Conference. When ratified, these will represent the third step toward peace. While they do not of themselves provide an economic rehabilitation, which is necessary for the progress of Europe, by strengthening the guaranties of peace they diminish the need for great armaments. If the energy which now goes into military effort is transferred to productive endeavor, it will greatly assist economic progress.

The Locarno agreements were made by the European countries directly interested without any formal intervention of America, although on July 31 I publicly advocated such agreements in an address
made in Massachusetts. We have consistently refrained from intervening except when our help has been sought and we have felt it could be effectively given, as in the settlement of reparations and the London Conference. These recent Locarno agreements represent the success of this policy which we have been insisting ought to be adopted, of having European countries settle their own political problems without involving this country. This beginning seems to demonstrate that this policy is sound. It is exceedingly gratifying to observe this progress, which both in its method and in its result promises so much that is beneficial to the world.

When these agreements are finally adopted, they will provide guaranties of peace that make the present prime reliance upon force in some parts of Europe very much less necessary. The natural corollary to these treaties should be further international contracts for the limitation of armaments. This work was successfully begun at the Washington Conference. Nothing was done at that time concerning land forces because of European objection. Our standing army has been reduced to around 118,000, about the necessary police force for 115,000,000 people. We are not proposing to increase it, nor is it supposable that any foreign country looks with the slightest misapprehension upon our land forces. They do not menace anybody. They are rather a protection to everybody.

The question of disarming upon land is so peculiarly European in its practical aspects that our country would look with particular gratitude upon any action which those countries might take to reduce their own military forces. This is in accordance with our policy of not intervening unless the European powers are unable to agree and make request for our assistance. Whenever they are able to agree of their own accord it is especially gratifying to us, and such agreements may be sure of our sympathetic support.

It seems clear that it is the reduction of armies rather than of navies that is of the first importance to the world at the present time. We shall look with great satisfaction upon that effort and give it our approbation and encouragement. If that can be settled, we may more easily consider further reduction and limitation of naval armaments. For that purpose our country has constantly through its Executive, and through repeated acts of Congress, indicated its willingness to call such a conference. Under congressional sanction it would seem to be wise to participate in any conference of the great powers for naval limitation of armament proposed upon such conditions that it would hold a fair promise of being effective. The general policy of our country is for disarmament, and it ought not to hesitate to adopt any practical plan that might reasonably be expected to succeed. But it would not care to attend a conference which from its location or constituency would in all probability prove futile.

In the further pursuit of strengthening the bonds of peace and good will we have joined with other nations in an international conference held at Geneva and signed an agreement which will be laid before the Senate for ratification providing suitable measures for control and for publicity in international trade in arms, ammunition, and implements of war, and also executed a protocol providing for a prohibition of the use of poison gas in war, in accord-
ance with the principles of Article 5 of the treaty relating thereto signed at the Washington Conference. We are supporting the Pan American efforts that are being made toward the codification of international law, and looking with sympathy on the investigations being conducted under philanthropic auspices of the proposal to make agreements outlawing war. In accordance with promises made at the Washington Conference, we have urged the calling of and are now represented at the Chinese Customs Conference and on the Commission on Extraterritoriality, where it will be our policy so far as possible to meet the aspirations of China in all ways consistent with the interests of the countries involved.

COURT OF INTERNATIONAL JUSTICE

Pending before the Senate for nearly three years is the proposal to adhere to the protocol establishing the Permanent Court of International Justice. A well-established line of precedents mark America's effort to effect the establishment of a court of this nature. We took a leading part in laying the foundation on which it rests in the establishment of The Hague Court of Arbitration. It is that tribunal which nominates the judges who are elected by the Council and Assembly of the League of Nations.

The proposal submitted to the Senate was made dependent upon four conditions, the first of which is that by supporting the court we do not assume any obligations under the league; second, that we may participate upon an equality with other States in the election of judges; third, that the Congress shall determine what part of the expenses we shall bear; fourth, that the statute creating the court shall not be amended without our consent; and to these I have proposed an additional condition to the effect that we are not to be bound by advisory opinions rendered without our consent.

The court appears to be independent of the league. It is true the judges are elected by the Assembly and Council, but they are nominated by the Court of Arbitration, which we assisted to create and of which we are a part. The court was created by a statute, so-called, which is really a treaty made among some forty-eight different countries, that might properly be called a constitution of the court. This statute provides a method by which the judges are chosen, so that when the Court of Arbitration nominates them and the Assembly and Council of the League elect them, they are not acting as instruments of the Court of Arbitration or instruments of the league, but as instruments of the statute.

This will be even more apparent if our representatives sit with the members of the council and assembly in electing the judges. It is true they are paid through the league though not by the league, but by the countries which are members of the league and by our country if we accept the protocol. The judges are paid by the league only in the same sense that it could be said United States judges are paid by the Congress. The court derives all its authority from the statute and is so completely independent of the league that it could go on functioning if the league were disbanded, at least until the terms of the judges expired.
The most careful provisions are made in the statute as to the qualifications of judges. Those who make the nominations are recommended to consult with their highest court of justice, their law schools and academies. The judges must be persons of high moral character, qualified to hold the highest judicial offices in that country, or be jurisconsults of recognized competence in international law. It must be assumed that these requirements will continue to be carefully met, and with America joining the countries already concerned, it is difficult to comprehend how human ingenuity could better provide for the establishment of a court which would maintain its independence. It has to be recognized that independence is to a considerable extent a matter of ability, character, and personality. Some effort was made in the early beginnings to interfere with the independence of our Supreme Court. It did not succeed because of the quality of the men who made up that tribunal.

It does not seem that the authority to give advisory opinions interferes with the independence of the court. Advisory opinions in and of themselves are not harmful, but may be used in such a way as to be very beneficial because they undertake to prevent injury rather than merely afford a remedy after the injury has been done. As a principle that only implies that the court shall function when proper application is made to it. Deciding the question involved upon issues submitted for an advisory opinion does not differ materially from deciding the question involved upon issues submitted by contending parties. Up to the present time the court has given an advisory opinion when it judged it had jurisdiction, and refused to give one when it judged it did not have jurisdiction. Nothing in the work of the court has yet been an indication that this is an impairment of its independence or that its practice differs materially from the giving of like opinions under the authority of the constitutions of several of our States.

No provision of the statute seems to me to give this court any authority to be a political rather than a judicial court. We have brought cases in this country before our courts which, when they have been adjudged to be political, have been thereby dismissed. It is not improbable that political questions will be submitted to this court, but again up to the present time the court has refused to pass on political questions and our support would undoubtedly have a tendency to strengthen it in that refusal.

We are not proposing to subject ourselves to any compulsory jurisdiction. If we support the court, we can never be obliged to submit any case which involves our interests for its decision. Our appearance before it would always be voluntary, for the purpose of presenting a case which we had agreed might be presented. There is no more danger that others might bring cases before the court involving our interests which we did not wish to have brought, after we have adhered, and probably not so much, than there would be of bringing such cases if we do not adhere. I think that we would have the same legal or moral right to disregard such a finding in the one case that we would in the other.

If we are going to support any court, it will not be one that we have set up alone or which reflects only our ideals. Other nations have their customs and their institutions, their thoughts and their methods of life. If a court is going to be international, its com-
position will have to yield to what is good in all these various elements. Neither will it be possible to support a court which is exactly perfect, or under which we assume absolutely no obligations. If we are seeking that opportunity, we might as well declare that we are opposed to supporting any court. If any agreement is made, it will be because it undertakes to set up a tribunal which can do some of the things that other nations wish to have done. We shall not find ourselves bearing a disproportionate share of the world’s burdens by our adherence, and we may as well remember that there is absolutely no escape for our country from bearing its share of the world’s burdens in any case. We shall do far better service to ourselves and to others if we admit this and discharge our duties voluntarily, than if we deny it and are forced to meet the same obligations unwillingly.

It is difficult to imagine anything that would be more helpful to the world than stability, tranquility and international justice. We may say that we are contributing to these factors independently, but others less fortunately located do not and can not make a like contribution except through mutual cooperation. The old balance of power, mutual alliances, and great military forces were not brought about by any mutual dislike for independence, but resulted from the domination of circumstances. Ultimately they were forced on us. Like all others engaged in the war whatever we said as a matter of fact we joined an alliance, we became a military power, we impaired our independence. We have more at stake than any one else in avoiding a repetition of that calamity. Wars do not spring into existence. They arise from small incidents and trifling irritations which can be adjusted by an international court. We can contribute greatly to the advancement of our ideals by joining with other nations in maintaining such a tribunal.

FOREIGN DEBTS

Gradually, settlements have been made which provide for the liquidation of debts due to our Government from foreign governments. Those made with Great Britain, Finland, Hungary, Lithuania, and Poland have already been approved by the Congress. Since the adjournment, further agreements have been entered into with Belgium, Czechoslovakia, Latvia, Estonia, Italy, and Rumania. These 11 nations, which have already made settlements, represent $6,419,528,641 of the original principal of the loans. The principal sums without interest, still pending, are the debt of France, of $3,340,000,000; Greece, $15,000,000; Yugoslavia, $51,000,000; Liberia, $26,000; Russia, $192,000,000, which those at present in control have undertaken openly to repudiate; Nicaragua, $84,000, which is being paid currently; and Austria, $24,000,000, on which by act of Congress a moratorium of 20 years has been granted. The only remaining sum is $12,000,000, due from Armenia, which has now ceased to exist as an independent nation.

In accordance with the settlements made, the amount of principal and interest which is to be paid to the United States under these agreements aggregates $15,200,688,253.93. It is obvious that the remaining settlements, which will undoubtedly be made, will bring this sum up to an amount which will more than equal the principal
due on our present national debt. While these settlements are very large in the aggregate, it has been felt that the terms granted were in all cases very generous. They impose no undue burden and are mutually beneficial in the observance of international faith and the improvement of international credit.

Every reasonable effort will be made to secure agreements for liquidation with the remaining countries, whenever they are in such condition that they can be made. Those which have already been negotiated under the bipartisan commission established by the Congress have been made only after the most thoroughgoing and painstaking investigation, continued for a long time before meeting with the representatives of the countries concerned. It is believed that they represent in each instance the best that can be done and the wisest settlement that can be secured. One very important result is the stabilization of foreign currency, making exchange assist rather than embarrass our trade. Wherever sacrifices have been made of money, it will be more than amply returned in better understanding and friendship, while in so far as these adjustments will contribute to the financial stability of the debtor countries, to their good order, prosperity, and progress, they represent hope of improved trade relations and mutual contributions to the civilization of the world.

ALIEN PROPERTY

Negotiations are progressing among the interested parties in relation to the final distribution of the assets in the hands of the Alien Property Custodian. Our Government and people are interested as creditors; the German Government and people are interested as debtors and owners of the seized property. Pending the outcome of these negotiations, I do not recommend any affirmative legislation. For the present we should continue in possession of this property which we hold as security for the settlement of claims due to our people and our Government.

IMMIGRATION

While not enough time has elapsed to afford a conclusive demonstration, such results as have been secured indicate that our immigration law is on the whole beneficial. It is undoubtedly a protection to the wage earners of this country. The situation should, however, be carefully surveyed, in order to ascertain whether it is working a needless hardship upon our own inhabitants. If it deprives them of the comfort and society of those bound to them by close family ties, such modifications should be adopted as will afford relief, always in accordance with the principle that our Government owes its first duty to our own people and that no alien, inhabitant of another country, has any legal rights whatever under our Constitution and laws. It is only through treaty, or through residence here, that such rights accrue. But we should not, however, be forgetful of the obligations of a common humanity.

While our country numbers among its best citizens many of those of foreign birth, yet those who now enter in violation of our laws by that very act thereby place themselves in a class of undesirables. If investigation reveals that any considerable number are coming
here in defiance of our immigration restrictions, it will undoubtedly create the necessity for the registration of all aliens. We ought to have no prejudice against an alien because he is an alien. The standard which we apply to our inhabitants is that of manhood, not place of birth. Restrictive immigration is to a large degree for economic purposes. It is applied in order that we may not have a larger annual increment of good people within our borders than we can weave into our economic fabric in such a way as to supply their needs without undue injury to ourselves.

**NATIONAL DEFENSE**

Never before in time of peace has our country maintained so large and effective a military force as it now has. The Army, Navy, Marine Corps, National Guard, and Organized Reserves represent a strength of about 558,400 men. These forces are well trained, well equipped, and high in morale.

A sound selective service act giving broad authority for the mobilization in time of peril of all the resources of the country, both persons and materials, is needed to perfect our defensive policy in accordance with our ideals of equality. The provision for more suitable housing to be paid for out of funds derived from the sale of excess lands, pending before the last Congress, ought to be brought forward and passed. Reasonable replacements ought to be made to maintain a sufficient ammunition reserve.

The Navy has the full treaty tonnage of capital ships. Work is going forward in modernizing the older ones, building aircraft carriers, additional fleet submarines, and fast scout cruisers, but we are carefully avoiding anything that might be construed as a competition in armaments with other nations. The joint Army and Navy maneuvers at Hawaii, followed by the cruise of a full Battle Fleet to Australia and New Zealand, were successfully carried out. These demonstrations revealed a most satisfactory condition of the ships and the men engaged.

Last year at my suggestion the General Board of the Navy made an investigation and report on the relation of aircraft to warships. As a result authorizations and appropriations were made for more scout cruisers and fleet submarines and for completing aircraft carriers and equipping them with necessary planes. Additional training in aviation was begun at the Military and Naval Academies. A method of coordination and cooperation of the Army and Navy and the principal aircraft builders is being perfected. At the suggestion of the Secretaries of War and Navy I appointed a special board to make a further study of the problem of aircraft.

The report of the Air Board ought to be reassuring to the country, gratifying to the service and satisfactory to the Congress. It is thoroughly complete and represents the mature thought of the best talent in the country. No radical change in organization of the service seems necessary. The Departments of War, Navy, and Commerce should each be provided with an additional assistant secretary, not necessarily with statutory duties but who would be available under the direction of the Secretary to give especial attention to air navigation. We must have an air strength worthy of
America. Provision should be made for two additional brigadier generals for the Army Air Service. Temporary rank corresponding to their duties should be awarded to active flying officers in both Army and Navy.

Aviation is of great importance both for national defense and commercial development. We ought to proceed in its improvement by the necessary experiment and investigation. Our country is not behind in this art. It has made records for speed and for the excellence of its planes. It ought to go on maintaining its manufacturing plants capable of rapid production, giving national assistance to the laying out of airways, equipping itself with a moderate number of planes, and keeping an air force trained to the highest efficiency.

While I am a thorough believer in national defense and entirely committed to the policy of adequate preparation, I am just as thoroughly opposed to instigating or participating in a policy of competitive armaments. Nor does preparation mean a policy of militarizing. Our people and industries are solicitous for the cause of our country, and have great respect for the Army and Navy and for the uniform worn by the men who stand ready at all times for our protection to encounter the dangers and perils necessary to military service, but all of these activities are to be taken not in behalf of aggression but in behalf of peace. They are the instruments by which we undertake to do our part to promote good will and support stability among all peoples.

VETERANS

If any one desires to estimate the esteem in which the veterans of America are held by their fellow citizens, it is but necessary to remember that the current budget calls for an expenditure of about $650,000,000 in their behalf. This is nearly the amount of the total cost of the National Government, exclusive of the post office, before we entered the last war.

At the two previous sessions of Congress legislation affecting veterans' relief was enacted and the law liberalized. This legislation brought into being a number of new provisions tending more nearly to meet the needs of our veterans, as well as afford the necessary authority to perfect the administration of these laws.

Experience with the new legislation so far has clearly demonstrated its constructive nature. It has increased the benefits received by many and has made eligible for benefits many others. Direct disbursements to the veteran or his dependents exceeding $21,000,000 have resulted, which otherwise would not have been made. The degree of utilization of our hospitals has increased through making facilities available to the incapacitated veteran regardless of service origin of the disability. This new legislation also has brought about a marked improvement of service to the veteran.

The organizations of ex-service men have proposed additional legislative changes which you will consider, but until the new law and the modifications made at the last session of Congress are given a more thorough test further changes in the basic law should be few and made only after careful though sympathetic consideration.

The principal work now before the Veterans' Bureau is the perfection of its organization and further improvements in service.
Some minor legislative changes are deemed necessary to enable the bureau to retain that high grade of professional talent essential in handling the problems of the bureau. Such changes as tend toward the improvement of service and the carrying forward to completion of the hospital construction program are recommended for the consideration of the proper committees of Congress.

With the enormous outlay that is now being made in behalf of the veterans and their dependents, with a tremendous war debt still requiring great annual expenditure, with the still high rate of taxation, while every provision should be made for the relief of the disabled and the necessary care of dependents, the Congress may well consider whether the financial condition of the Government is not such that further bounty through the enlargement of general pensions and other emoluments ought not to be postponed.

**AGRICULTURE**

No doubt the position of agriculture as a whole has very much improved since the depression of three and four years ago. But there are many localities and many groups of individuals, apparently through no fault of their own, sometimes due to climatic conditions and sometimes to the prevailing price of a certain crop, still in a distressing condition. This is probably temporary, but it is none the less acute. National Government agencies, the Departments of Agriculture and Commerce, the Farm Loan Board, the intermediate credit banks, and the Federal Reserve Board are all cooperating to be of assistance and relief. On the other hand, there are localities and individuals who have had one of their most prosperous years. The general price level is fair, but here again there are exceptions both ways, some items being poor while others are excellent. In spite of a lessened production the farm income for this year will be about the same as last year and much above the three preceding years.

Agriculture is a very complex industry. It does not consist of one problem, but of several. They can not be solved at one stroke. They have to be met in different ways, and small gains are not to be despised.

It has appeared from all the investigations that I have been able to make that the farmers as a whole are determined to maintain the independence of their business. They do not wish to have meddling on the part of the Government or to be placed under the inevitable restrictions involved in any system of direct or indirect price-fixing, which would result from permitting the Government to operate in the agricultural markets. They are showing a very commendable skill in organizing themselves to transact their own business through cooperative marketing, which will this year turn over about $2,500,000,000, or nearly one-fifth of the total agricultural business. In this they are receiving help from the Government. The Department of Agriculture should be strengthened in this facility, in order to be able to respond when these marketing associations want help. While it ought not to undertake undue regulation, it should be equipped to give prompt information on crop prospects, supply, demand, current receipts, imports, exports, and prices.
A bill embodying these principles, which has been drafted under the advice and with the approval of substantially all the leaders and managers in the cooperative movement, will be presented to the Congress for its enactment. Legislation should also be considered to provide for leasing the unappropriated public domain for grazing purposes and adopting a uniform policy relative to grazing on the public lands and in the national forests.

A more intimate relation should be established between agriculture and the other business activities of the Nation. They are mutually dependent and can each advance their own prosperity most by advancing the prosperity of the other. Meantime the Government will continue those activities which have resulted in an unprecedented amount of legislation and the pouring out of great sums of money during the last five years. The work for good roads, better land and water transportation, increased support for agricultural education, extension of credit facilities through the Farm Loan Boards and the intermediate credit banks, the encouragement of orderly marketing and a repression of wasteful speculation, will all be continued.

Following every other depression, after a short period the price of farm produce has taken and maintained the lead in the advance. This advance had reached a climax before the war. Everyone will recall the discussion that went on for four or five years prior to 1914 concerning the high cost of living. This history is apparently beginning to repeat itself. While wholesale prices of other commodities have been declining, farm prices have been increasing. There is every reason to suppose that a new era in agricultural prosperity lies just before us, which will probably be unprecedented.

**MUSCLE SHOALS**

The problem of Muscle Shoals seems to me to have assumed a place all out of proportion with its real importance. It probably does not represent in market value much more than a first-class battleship, yet it has been discussed in the Congress over a period of years and for months at a time. It ought to be developed for the production of nitrates primarily, and incidentally for power purposes. This would serve defensive, agricultural, and industrial purposes. I am in favor of disposing of this property to meet these purposes. The findings of the special commission will be transmitted to the Congress for their information. I am convinced that the best possible disposition can be made by direct authorization of the Congress. As a means of negotiation I recommend the immediate appointment of a small joint special committee chosen from the appropriate general standing committees of the House and Senate to receive bids, which when made should be reported with recommendations as to acceptance, upon which a law should be enacted, effecting a sale to the highest bidder who will agree to carry out these purposes.

If anything were needed to demonstrate the almost utter incapacity of the National Government to deal directly with an industrial and commercial problem, it has been provided by our experience with this property. We have expended vast fortunes, we have taxed everybody, but we are unable to secure results which benefit anybody.
This property ought to be transferred to private management under conditions which will dedicate it to the public purpose for which it was conceived.

**RECLAMATION**

The National Government is committed to a policy of reclamation and irrigation which it desires to establish on a sound basis and continue in the interest of the localities concerned. Exhaustive studies have recently been made of Federal reclamation, which have resulted in improving the projects and adjusting many difficulties. About one third of the projects is in good financial condition, another third can probably be made profitable, while the other third is under unfavorable conditions. The Congress has already provided for a survey which will soon be embodied in a report. That ought to suggest a method of relief which will make unnecessary further appeals to the Congress. Unless this can be done, Federal reclamation will be considerably retarded. With the greatly increased cost of construction and operation, it has become necessary to plan in advance, by community organization and selective agriculture, methods sufficient to repay these increasing outlays.

The human and economic interests of the farmer citizens suggest that the States should be required to exert some effort and assume some responsibility, especially in the intimate, detailed, and difficult work of securing settlers and developing farms which directly profit them, but only indirectly and remotely can reimburse the Nation. It is believed that the Federal Government should continue to be the agency for planning and constructing the great undertakings needed to regulate and bring into use the rivers of the West, many of which are interstate in character, but the detailed work of creating agricultural communities and a rural civilization on the land made ready for reclamation ought to be either transferred to the State in its entirety or made a cooperative effort of the State and Federal Government.

**SHIPPING**

The maintenance of a merchant marine is of the utmost importance for national defense and the service of our commerce. We have a large number of ships engaged in that service. We also have a surplus supply, costly to care for, which ought to be sold. All the investigations that have been made under my direction, and those which have been prosecuted independently, have reached the conclusion that the fleet should be under the direct control of a single executive head, while the Shipping Board should exercise its judicial and regulatory functions in accordance with its original conception. The report of Henry G. Dalton, a business man of broad experience, with a knowledge of shipping, made to me after careful investigation, will be transmitted for the information of the Congress, the studies pursued under the direction of the United States Chamber of Commerce will also be accessible, and added to these will be the report of the special committee of the House.

I do not advocate the elimination of regional considerations, but it has become apparent that without centralized executive action the management of this great business, like the management of any other great business, will flounder in incapacity and languish under
a division of council. A plain and unmistakable reassertion of this principle of unified control, which I have always been advised was the intention of the Congress to apply, is necessary to increase the efficiency of our merchant fleet.

COAL

The perennial conflict in the coal industry is still going on to the great detriment of the wage earners, the owners, and especially to the public. With deposits of coal in this country capable of supplying its needs for hundreds of years, inability to manage and control this great resource for the benefit of all concerned is very close to a national economic failure. It has been the subject of repeated investigation and reiterated recommendation. Yet the industry seems never to have accepted modern methods of adjusting differences between employers and employees. The industry could serve the public much better and become subject to a much more effective method of control if regional consolidations and more freedom in the formation of marketing associations, under the supervision of the Department of Commerce, were permitted.

At the present time the National Government has little or no authority to deal with this vital necessity of the life of the country. It has permitted itself to remain so powerless that its only attitude must be humble supplication. Authority should be lodged with the President and the Departments of Commerce and Labor, giving them power to deal with an emergency. They should be able to appoint temporary boards with authority to call for witnesses and documents, conciliate differences, encourage arbitration, and in case of threatened scarcity exercise control over distribution. Making the facts public under these circumstances through a statement from an authoritative source would be of great public benefit. The report of the last coal commission should be brought forward, reconsidered, and acted upon.

PROHIBITION

Under the orderly processes of our fundamental institutions the Constitution was lately amended providing for national prohibition. The Congress passed an act for its enforcement, and similar acts have been provided by most of the States. It is the law of the land. It is the duty of all who come under its jurisdiction to observe the spirit of that law, and it is the duty of the Department of Justice and the Treasury Department to enforce it. Action to prevent smuggling, illegal transportation in interstate commerce, abuse in the use of permits, and existence of sources of supply for illegal traffic is almost entirely imposed upon the Federal Government.

Through treaties with foreign governments and increased activities of the Coast Guard, revenue agents, district attorneys, and enforcement agents effort is being made to prevent these violations. But the Constitution also puts a concurrent duty on the States. We need their active and energetic cooperation, the vigilant action of their police, and the jurisdiction of their courts to assist in enforcement. I request of the people observance, of the public officers continuing efforts for enforcement, and of the Congress favorable action on the budget recommendation for the prosecution of this work.
WATERWAY DEVELOPMENT

For many years our country has been employed in plans and operations for the development of our intracoastal and inland waterways. This work along our coast is an important adjunct to our commerce. It will be carried on, together with the further opening up of our harbors, as our resources permit. The Government made an agreement during the war to take over the Cape Cod Canal, under which the owners made valuable concessions. This pledged faith of the Government ought to be redeemed.

Two other main fields are under consideration. One is the Great Lakes and St. Lawrence, including the Erie Canal. This includes stabilizing the lake level, and is both a waterway and power project. A joint commission of the United States and Canada is working on plans and surveys which will not be completed until next April. No final determination can be made, apparently, except under treaty as to the participation of both countries. The other is the Mississippi River system. This is almost entirely devoted to navigation. Work on the Ohio River will be completed in about three years. A modern channel connecting Chicago, New Orleans, Kansas City, and Pittsburgh should be laid out and work on the tributaries prosecuted. Some work is being done of a preparatory nature along the Missouri, and large expenditures are being made yearly in the lower reaches of the Mississippi and its tributaries which contribute both to flood control and navigation. Preliminary measures are being taken on the Colorado River project, which is exceedingly important for flood control, irrigation, power development, and water supply to the area concerned. It would seem to be very doubtful, however, whether it is practical to secure affirmative action of the Congress, except under a joint agreement of the several States.

The Government has already expended large sums upon scientific research and engineering investigation in promotion of this Colorado River project. The actual progress has been retarded for many years by differences among the seven States in the basin over their relative water rights and among different groups as to methods. In an attempt to settle the primary difficulty of the water rights, Congress authorized the Colorado River Commission which agreed on November 24, 1922, upon an interstate compact to settle these rights, subject to the ratification of the State legislatures and Congress. All seven States except Arizona at one time ratified, the Arizona Legislature making certain reservations which failed to meet the approval of the governor. Subsequently an attempt was made to establish the compact upon a six-State basis, but in this case California imposed reservations. There appears to be no division of opinion upon the major principles of the compact, but difficulty in separating contentions as to methods of development from the discussion of it. It is imperative that flood control be undertaken for California and Arizona, preparation made for irrigation, for power, and for domestic water.

Some or all of these questions are combined in every proposed development. The Federal Government is interested in some of these phases, State governments and municipalities and irrigation districts in others, and private corporations in still others. Because of all this difference of view it is most desirable that Congress should consider the creation of some agency that will be able to determine
methods of improvement solely upon economic and engineering facts, that would be authorized to negotiate and settle, subject to the approval of Congress, the participation, rights, and obligations of each group in any particular works. Only by some such method can early construction be secured.

**WATER POWER**

Along with the development of navigation should go every possible encouragement for the development of our water power. While steam still plays a dominant part, this is more and more becoming an era of electricity. Once installed, the cost is moderate, has not tended greatly to increase, and is entirely free from the unavoidable dirt and disagreeable features attendant upon the burning of coal. Every facility should be extended for the connection of the various units into a superpower plant, capable at all times of a current increasing uniformity over the entire system.

**RAILROADS**

The railroads throughout the country are in a fair state of prosperity. Their service is good and their supply of cars is abundant. Their condition would be improved and the public better served by a system of consolidations. I recommend that the Congress authorize such consolidations under the supervision of the Interstate Commerce Commission, with power to approve or disapprove when proposed parts are excluded or new parts added. I am informed that the railroad managers and their employees have reached a substantial agreement as to what legislation is necessary to regulate and improve their relationship. Whenever they bring forward such proposals, which seem sufficient also to protect the interests of the public, they should be enacted into law.

It is gratifying to report that both the railroad managers and railroad employees are providing boards for the mutual adjustment of differences in harmony with the principles of conference, conciliation, and arbitration. The solution of their problems ought to be an example to all other industries. Those who ask the protections of civilization should be ready to use the methods of civilization.

A strike in modern industry has many of the aspects of war in the modern world. It injures labor and it injures capital. If the industry involved is a basic one, it reduces the necessary economic surplus and, increasing the cost of living, it injures the economic welfare and general comfort of the whole people. It also involves a deeper cost. It tends to embitter and divide the community into warring classes and thus weakens the unity and power of our national life.

Labor can make no permanent gains at the cost of the general welfare. All the victories won by organized labor in the past generation have been won through the support of public opinion. The manifest inclination of the managers and employees of the railroads to adopt a policy of action in harmony with these principles marks a new epoch in our industrial life.
The time has come for careful investigation of the expenditures and success of the laws by which we have undertaken to administer our outlying possessions. A very large amount of money is being expended for administration in Alaska. It appears so far out of proportion to the number of inhabitants and the amount of production as to indicate cause for thorough investigation. Likewise consideration should be given to the experience under the law which governs the Philippines. From such reports as reach me there are indications that more authority should be given to the Governor General, so that he will not be so dependent upon the local legislative body to render effective our efforts to set an example of the sound administration and good government, which is so necessary for the preparation of the Philippine people for self-government under ultimate independence. If they are to be trained in these arts, it is our duty to provide for them the best that there is.

RETIREMENT OF JUDGES

The act of March 3, 1911, ought to be amended so that the term of years of service of judges of any court of the United States requisite for retirement with pay shall be computed to include not only continuous but aggregate service.

MOTHERS' AID

The Government ought always to be alert on the side of the humanities. It ought to encourage provisions for economic justice for the defenseless. It ought to extend its relief through its national and local agencies, as may be appropriate in each case, to the suffering and the needy. It ought to be charitable.

Although more than 40 of our States have enacted measures in aid of motherhood, the District of Columbia is still without such a law. A carefully considered bill will be presented, which ought to have most thoughtful consideration in order that the Congress may adopt a measure which will be hereafter a model for all parts of the Union.

CIVIL SERVICE

In 1883 the Congress passed the civil service act, which from a modest beginning of 14,000 employees has grown until there are now 425,000 in the classified service. This has removed the clerical force of the Nation from the wasteful effects of the spoils system and made it more stable and efficient. The time has come to consider classifying all postmasters, collectors of customs, collectors of internal revenue, and prohibition agents, by an act covering in those at present in office, except when otherwise provided by Executive order.

The necessary statistics are now being gathered to form the basis of a valuation of the civil service retirement fund based on current conditions of the service. It is confidently expected that this valuation will be completed in time to be made available to the Congress during the present session. It will afford definite knowledge of
existing and future liabilities under the present law and determination of liabilities under any proposed change in the present law. We should have this information before creating further obligations for retirement annuities which will become liabilities to be met in the future from the money of the taxpayer.

The classification act of 1923, with the subsequent legislative action providing for adjustment of the compensation of field service positions, has operated materially to improve employment conditions in the Federal service. The administration of the act is in the hands of an impartial board, functioning without the necessity of a direct appropriation. It would be unadvisable at this time to place in other hands the administration of this act.

**FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION**

The proper function of the Federal Trade Commission is to supervise and correct those practices in commerce which are detrimental to fair competition. In this it performs a useful function and should be continued and supported. It was designed also to be a help to honest business. In my message to the Sixty-eighth Congress I recommended that changes in the procedure then existing be made. Since then the commission by its own action has reformed its rules, giving greater speed and economy in the disposal of its cases and full opportunity for those accused to be heard. These changes are improvements and, if necessary, provision should be made for their permanency.

**REORGANIZATION**

No final action has yet been taken on the measure providing for the reorganization of the various departments. I therefore suggest that this measure, which will be of great benefit to the efficient and economical administration of the business of the Government, be brought forward and passed.

**THE NEGRO**

Nearly one-tenth of our population consists of the Negro race. The progress which they have made in all the arts of civilization in the last 60 years is almost beyond belief. Our country has no more loyal citizens. But they do still need sympathy, kindness, and helpfulness. They need reassurance that the requirements of the Government and society to deal out to them even-handed justice will be met. They should be protected from all violence and supported in the peaceable enjoyment of the fruits of their labor. Those who do violence to them should be punished for their crimes. No other course of action is worthy of the American people.

Our country has many elements in its population, many different modes of thinking and living, all of which are striving in their own way to be loyal to the high ideals worthy of the crown of American citizenship. It is fundamental of our institutions that they seek to guarantee to all our inhabitants the right to live their own lives under the protection of the public law. This does not include any license to injure others materially, physically, morally, to incite revo-
lution, or to violate the established customs which have long had the
sanction of enlightened society.
But it does mean the full right to liberty and equality before the
law without distinction of race or creed. This condition can not be
granted to others, or enjoyed by ourselves, except by the application
of the principle of broadest tolerance. Bigotry is only another name
for slavery. It reduces to serfdom not only those against whom it is
directed, but also those who seek to apply it. An enlarged freedom
can only be secured by the application of the golden rule. No other
utterance ever presented such a practical rule of life.

CONCLUSION

It is apparent that we are reaching into an era of great general
prosperity. It will continue only so long as we shall use it properly.
After all, there is but a fixed quantity of wealth in this country at
any fixed time. The only way that we can all secure more of it is
to create more. The element of time enters into production. If the
people have sufficient moderation and contentment to be willing to
improve their condition by the process of enlarging production,
eliminating waste, and distributing equitably, a prosperity almost
without limit lies before us. If the people are to be dominated by
selfishness, seeking immediate riches by nonproductive speculation
and by wasteful quarreling over the returns from industry, they will
be confronted by the inevitable results of depression and privation.
If they will continue industrious and thrifty, contented with fair
wages and moderate profits, and the returns which accrue from the
development of our natural resources, our prosperity will extend
itself indefinitely.

In all your deliberations you should remember that the purpose of
legislation is to translate principles into action. It is an effort to
have our country be better by doing better. Because the thoughts
and ways of people are firmly fixed and not easily changed, the field
within which immediate improvement can be secured is very narrow.
Legislation can provide opportunity. Whether it is taken advantage
of or not depends upon the people themselves. The Government of
the United States has been created by the people. It is solely respon-
sible to them. It will be most successful if it is conducted solely for
their benefit. All its efforts would be of little avail unless they
brought more justice, more enlightenment, more happiness and pros-
perity into the home. This means an opportunity to observe re-
ligion, secure education, and earn a living under a reign of law and
order. It is the growth and improvement of the material and
spiritual life of the Nation. We shall not be able to gain these ends
merely by our own action. If they come at all, it will be because we
have been willing to work in harmony with the abiding purpose of
a Divine Providence.

CALVIN COOLIDGE.
THE COLORADO PUBLIC SERVICE ASSOCIATION

AND

THE ROCKY MOUNTAIN DIVISION

NATIONAL ELECTRIC LIGHT ASSOCIATION

cordially invite you to be present at their

COMBINED ANNUAL CONVENTION

SEPTEMBER FOURTEEN, FIFTEEN, SIXTEEN AND SEVENTEEN

HOTEL COLORADO

GLENWOOD SPRINGS, COLORADO

attended by Colo. River
Hon. Delph Carpenter,
Greeley, Colorado

Dear Mr. Carpenter:

Hereewith find copy of letter which I am writing to Mr. Herbert Hoover in regard to the Colorado River development which is self-explanatory. I suggest that you take steps to further protest the granting of the Diamond Creek permit. I hope to arrange for a meeting of interested agencies the latter part of October.

In the meantime, I understand that Mr. Mulford Winsor, President of the Arizona Senate and Mr. Charles McMillian, Speaker of the House of Representatives, will meet with representatives of the southern California interests and endeavor to arrive at a tentative understanding as to method of further procedure.

Please advise me as to your views in the matter.

Yours truly,

[Signature]

Governor

JGS:LB
Epc.
September 12, 1925

Mr. Herbert Hoover,
Secretary of Commerce,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Hoover:

I am reliably informed that the Girand interests expect to secure the Diamond Creek power permit from the Federal Power Commission at a meeting to be held on October 20, 1925.

On behalf of the state of Nevada, I ask you to use your influence to prevent this permit from being granted at this time. Official representatives of California and Nevada are now negotiating with the President of the Arizona Senate and Speaker of the House of Representatives looking to an amicable solution of the Colorado River problem in Arizona. We have reached a common ground on the majority of points involved and it appears that a practicable working agreement can be evolved at some early date. Any permits granted by the Federal Power Commission on the Colorado River at this time will inevitably precipitate litigation and seriously delay proper development of the River for years to come.

We expect to hold a formal conference with Arizona representatives the latter part of October. You will be duly advised as to further progress in the matter.

Yours truly,

[Signature]

Governor
September 25, 1925

Federal Power Commission,
Washington, D.C.

Gentlemen:

I am informed that a hearing has been called for October 20th to which it is proposed to consider the matter of the application of Mr. Girand for a power permit at Diamond Creek on the Colorado River.

On behalf of the State of Nevada, I desire to enter a strenuous protest against the granting of this application. Negotiations are now pending between the interested states for the development of the Colorado River in a manner satisfactory to all the interests. Any permit granted on the river at this time would be a serious menace to the success of the negotiations.

Yours truly,

JCS: LB
Governor

Delph Carpenter. Greeley, Colo.
October 8, 1925.

Gov. J.G. Scougham,
Carson City, Nevada.

My Dear Governor:

I am in receipt of yours of recent date containing a carbon copy of your communication to the Federal Power Commission protesting the Girand application. Although your protest is couched in tense language, it seems to cover the situation.

We enjoyed interviews with leading Southern California and Arizona parties (except Governor Hunt). Hopkins and I were joined by Wallace and State Engineer Bacon at Sacramento. They remained with us until we left Phoenix for Santa Fe. We are convinced that if Senator Winsor and his immediate sympathizers can get in touch with Ralph Swing and a few of his ablest men there will be little difficulty in arriving at a common understanding between Arizona, California and Nevada. We did not get to see Swing but did interview most of the other parties who are interested. There is more truth than fiction in the Mexican menace. This of course works to the benefit of the advocates of the All-American Canal. In looking over the ground I am convinced that the canal is perfectly feasible, providing the yardage can be moved within the bounds of reasonable cost. The sand hills are nothing but a blow sand cap resting on a firm mesa on which the canal will be cut for its entire length through the sand hills. The sand banks above the mesa formation can be controlled by planting tamarisk trees and watering the same with pumps operating on barges in the canal. I have no information of the amount of yardage involved and the construction of such a canal would of course be an enormous undertaking but it is not a difficult feat. While I am not as yet an advocate of the All-American Canal I must admit that some of my previous opinions have changed.

I wish you could go to Washington and be with us on the 20th. It is very important that the Governors appear in person wherever possible, as I am convinced that the Federal Power Commission has made up its mind to grant the application and nothing but the most heroic effort will save the day.

Very truly yours,

[Signature]
My dear Mr. Carpenter:

Upon my return to my office this morning, after an absence of several days, I was advised that you had called. I am indeed sorry that I missed you, and hope the next time you are in Arizona, I shall have the pleasure of seeing you.

Yours sincerely,

GEO. W. P. HUNT
Governor.

Mr. Delph E. Carpenter,
Greeley, Colorado.
October 8, 1925.

My Dear Governor Hunt:

I shall take pleasure in accepting your invitation to call upon the occasion of my next visit to Phoenix. Mr. Hopkins, Mr. Wallace and myself greatly regretted not having the privilege of a short visit with you. Our trip to your section bore no special significance. Mr. Hopkins and the State Engineer of Utah were on their first visit to Southern California and Arizona looking over the country and obtaining first hand information.

Very truly yours,

Commissioner for Colorado.

To Hon. George W.P. Hunt,
Governor of Arizona,
Phoenix, Arizona.
Mr. Delph E. Carpenter,
Greeley,
Colorado.

My dear Mr. Carpenter:

I am enclosing picture taken at Roosevelt Dam which I am not altogether satisfied is the best that could be done. I can only plead inexperience with a new camera.

Very truly yours,

P. J. Lynch,
Assistant Gen'l Supt. & Chief Engineer.

PJL:N
Enc. 1 Picture.
October 8, 1925.

P. J. Lynch,
Chief Engineer,
Water Users Bldg.,
Phoenix, Ariz.

My Dear Mr. Lynch:

I am in receipt of your valued communication with the enclosed photograph.

Please accept my sincere thanks. I think the photograph excellent and the artist need make no apology. Thank you ever so much.

You really cannot estimate the good the upper state men derived from the day spent with you in the Salt Creek Valley. For my own part, I enjoyed every minute and my opinions of a number of matters underwent a radical change. I was especially pleased with the Mormon Flat dam and the location and work in progress on the Horse Mesa structure. I am glad to know that we have engineers outside of government service who are capable of doing such work and that too without loud trumpeting. You deserve not only the confidence but the gratitude of your people. When you get through I may have some of my own clients borrow you for a time.

My impression, gleaned from the general view of the subject throughout the trip, is that the Federal Power Commission will grant Girand's application for power development near Diamond Creek. I am very fond of Girand and his people but regret that they insist on pressing the application at this time. If everybody would "keep the pig from squealing" for awhile Arizona, California and Nevada would agree upon their program and the whole Colorado river development would move forward in a well-regulated manner. But I fear the granting of the permit in question will tend to develop various lines of cleavage and delay the ultimate results desired.

I am deeply indebted to you for a very pleasant
day's visit and inspection of your irrigation system. I take pleasure in saying that I took quite a fancy to both you and Cragin and hoped that the fortunes and events will again throw us together. In the meantime, believe me,

Sincerely yours,

DECBB
October 8, 1925.

C.C. Cragin,
Water Users Bldg.,
Phoenix, Ariz.

Dear Mr. Cragin:

I want to thank you for permitting us to have the very enjoyable day's visit to Roosevelt and other units of your system. It was very instructive and every moment was enjoyed. I want to especially compliment you on your choice of engineers. Lynch looks good to me and something about him impresses me with the conviction that he is not only a gentleman but can take his part in any combat either with brains or fists. It is just such men as you and he that will drag western reclamation out of the quick sands.

Very truly yours,

DEC: BB
Collection title: Papers of Delph E. Carpenter and Family

Collection code: WDEC

Description of item(s) separated:
1 8x10" black-and-white photo of DEC and others at Roosevelt Dam

Old location:

New location:
Subseries 9.1

Name of processor: [Signature]

Date: 12/18/15
October 16, 1925.

Hon. Delph E. Carpenter,  
c/o Leehouse Hotel,  
Washington, D.C.

My dear Delph:

Hereewith copies of wire received today from the Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce and my reply.

There is, of course, no one here now to send as a representative of Colorado at the hearing and particularly as there is involved an element of possible authority to act for Colorado. Confidentially, you are my only choice for this job and I am wondering if you could get through in Washington in time to reach Los Angeles and be present at this hearing.

Yours,

[Signature]

Please wire.

CJM: A
GOVERNOR C J MORLEY
DENVER COLO

MAY I NOT RESPECTFULLY SUGGEST THAT YOUR STATE HAVE REPRESENTATIVE PRESENT IN LOS ANGELES AT TIME HEARING IS HELD BY SENATE IRRIGATION AND RECLAMATION COMMITTEE COMMENCING OCTOBER TWENTY SIX STOP ... MY PURPOSE IN SUGGESTING THIS IS THE HOPE THAT DURING TIME COMMITTEE IS IN SESSION THE SERIES OF CONFERENCES BETWEEN YOUR REPRESENTATIVE AND THOSE OF SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA MIGHT BRING ABOUT HARMONIOUS SOLUTION OF COLORADO RIVER SITUATION LOS ANGELES CHAMBER OF COMMERCE PLEDGES ITSELF TO TAKE LEAD IN THESE HEARINGS AND TO ENDEAVOR IN EVERY WAY POSSIBLE TO SECURE SOLUTION SATISFACTORY TO ALL YOUR REPLY WILL BE APPRECIATED

R W PRIDHAM

PRESIDENT LOS ANGELES CHAMBER OF COMMERCE.
October 16, 1925.

R. W. Pridham,
President, Chamber of Commerce,
Los Angeles, California.

All of our people familiar with situation or who could properly represent us are out of state but will be represented there twenty-sixth if possible to make timely arrangements.

CLARENCE J. MORLEY.

Charge Acct.
Governor's Office.
RECEIVED AT
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HOTEL US GRANT SAN DIEGO CALIF

FOLLOWING TELEGRAM RECEIVED FROM GRAND JUNCTION CHAMBER OF COMMERCE

STOP WILL HEAR HERE HELP CAUSE STOP WILL REQUEST ONE IF YOU SO DESIRE

STATE ENGINEER.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OLD BALANCE</th>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>ROOM</th>
<th>RESTAURANT</th>
<th>PHONE</th>
<th>ITEMS</th>
<th>MISCELLANEOUS</th>
<th>CREDITS</th>
<th>BALANCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>26 OCT 600</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4 12</td>
<td>2 00</td>
<td>LAUNDRY 232</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>26</td>
<td>600</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>VALET 200</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>22</td>
<td>600</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1225 SDK 75</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>22</td>
<td>600</td>
<td></td>
<td>5 25</td>
<td>TELEGRAM 50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>27</td>
<td>600</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>335</td>
<td></td>
<td>34 09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GUESTS</td>
<td>ROOM</td>
<td>TIME</td>
<td>DAYS</td>
<td>RATE</td>
<td>AMOUNT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>06</td>
<td>10/28 TO 29</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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U. S. Grant Hotel
An Arizona Argument

PRESENTED TO THE
U. S. SENATE COMMITTEE ON
IRRIGATION AND RECLAMATION

AT
Phoenix, Arizona, Nov. 3rd, 1925

by
THOMAS MADDOCK
Tho's. Maddock
306 E. McDowell
Phoenix, Arizona.
GENTLEMEN OF THE COMMITTEE:

You are here to secure Arizona's viewpoint on the Swing-Johnson bill. Your time is brief, so I will not waste it by trying to be diplomatic. No man may speak assuredly for a state, so I but express my own opinion. The real question at issue is the division among the seven states of the southwest of the resources of the Colorado River.

Investigation has shown clearly there is not enough water for all ultimate demands. Someone must go without. No one wants to do so. Some form of division must be agreed upon.

Congress may not want to make this division. Some authorities deny congress possesses the legal authority to directly divide the waters among the states. But it is self-evident that congress can take no action nor make any appropriation for any dam, reservoir or canal at any location without automatically influencing the division among the states of the future benefits to come with the taming of the Colorado River.

This fact warrants a complete investigation of the whole basin, prior to action. You have spent the last week or so in hearing what California wanted and what could be done by her if she were permitted to invade Arizona and Nevada, take our natural resources and develop them for herself.

I doubt if there is a single thing that the citizens of California have told you they want that Arizona cannot easily and cheerfully give to them. We admit their necessity for flood and drought protection. We admit their need for cheap electric power and that their additional easily irrigated land should be developed and cultivated. We only object when they try to advance present necessities as reasons for securing a future monopoly of the river. We object when they not only demand dams for flood and drought protection, but insist on saying just where, how and when these shall be built in our own state.

We want to know NOW how the water of the Colorado is to be divided. Apparently the division can be accomplished in four different ways:

1. An act of congress directly nationalizing the river and indirectly dividing its waters. This is the plan of the Swing-Johnson bill. It may not be constitutional to enforce it against the will of a single sovereign state.

2. The supreme court might divide the water as was done in the Kansas-Colorado decision of 1906 and the Colorado-Wyoming case of 1922. The one is based on equity, the other on priority and beneficial and economic use. Another different decision in 20 years may change matters again. If the Colorado is to be divided by the supreme court decision based on prior use it is wrong for congress to make a big appropriation which will increase the beneficial use in one state faster than the natural laws of competition would do so.

3. The division might occur by the gradual economic development of the river regardless of state or national boundaries, with irrigation and power projects to be installed as financed, those first beneficially using the water being entitled to it. This is the present method. However, it is not working now because it is opposed by a politically powerful group of Upper Basin States, who realize that the Lower Basin is susceptible of the quicker economic development.

4. The states might divide the water among themselves by joint agreement. This plan was adopted by congress and accepted by the seven state legislatures in 1921. It was attempted at Santa Fe to follow out this plan, but the delegates failed to carry out the instructions of congress and their state legislatures. They divided the water between basins instead of among the states. Their work was incomplete, so this problem is still with us. It is still with congress.

Arizona has not and should not accept the Santa Fe Compact as it stands. She can justify this position before the world.

Arizona could accept an economic division of the water regardless of state lines or she could accept the political division proposed by congress.

The Upper Basin opposes the former and California refuses to discuss the latter. Arizona cannot accept an unfair combination of these two plans as proposed at Santa Fe. She cannot allocate half the water to the Upper Basin for their slow development and let California and Mexico take the other half by their quick development.
Arizona could compete with the Upper Basin states. We are alike in slow development. We cannot compete as far as time is concerned with richer and more populous California if congress intervenes and becomes her ally.

Arizona possesses the best reservoir sites. California has the land easiest to irrigate. As the low water flow of the river is over appropriated, both reservoirs and land are needed for additional development.

Can congress in justice nationalize Arizona resources of reservoirs and allow California to keep hers of lands and expect us to have a fair chance in a future division of water and power?

We know the short red sword of Rome conquered the world, but we are not afraid of the long green currency of Los Angeles making Arizona its economic vassal unless you betray us to her with the Swing-Johnson bill.

The astounding things to me in this whole Colorado question are, that while justly demanding and receiving at Santa Fe time for its slow development, the Upper Basin should criticize Arizona for asking for the same protection, and while California consented to the definite allocation of water to the politically powerful Upper Basin, her governor and legislature for more than two years have refused to even discuss a division of the Colorado River with politically weak Arizona, and she accuses us of being the dog in the manger. I cannot understand how anyone can fail to see that the Santa Fe Compact in protecting the Upper Basin against the danger of the quick development in California, increased and transferred this danger to Arizona.

Arizona is for development and improvement. Nature has given this state neither in agriculture nor mining small units of natural resources easily developed. Our problems are large. I think you will find our viewpoint large accordingly. We realize the need of co-operation. I think you will find no one in Arizona opposing the All-American canal, unless you try to make Arizona's resources instead of the national treasury pay for it.

We are opposed to the Santa Fe Compact and the Swing-Johnson bill because they hurt Arizona, just as the other states are against certain actions in the Colorado River which they feel are harmful to them.

Santa Fe is not Sinai. The compact is nothing but a contract between interested parties. It is not divine. No other state has shown any altruism in this transaction, but Arizona, alone, has not posed as being benevolent. We admit that this is a business proposition, that each state is fighting for its future. We have been anxious for two years to arbitrate and do not want you to disarm us until the treaty of peace is signed.

Part of the fight is over. The Upper Basin won at Santa Fe all of the water she can ever use; naturally they would like to close the deal. They are politically strong enough to keep what they have won. They may even ask for a new conference to fix a few matters they overlooked in the last one.

Personally, I do not begrudge them the use of their own water on their own soil. They are entitled to an opportunity to grow. Distribution of wealth and population among all the states will make a far better country than their concentration in a few districts. If congress should make Los Angeles the only port of entry for foreign commerce on our Pacific coast, and congress could legally thus regulate commerce, the resultant boom would put buildings on every one of the extensive subdivided lots of that city, but would it be fair to the other coast cities?

The Swing-Johnson bill is equally unfair.

Is it logical for congress to inaugurate a program that will pump Colorado River water 1,500 feet to irrigate land outside of the Colorado basin in the vicinity of Los Angeles while there are nearly a million acres of land in Arizona that can be irrigated with one-sixth of that water pumping lift?

There is no question there or here of drinking water for a thirsty people. Testimony at the congressional hearings showed there was enough water in the Owens and Mono valleys to supply a hundred gallons per day to ten million people in Los Angeles. They are now asking for 2000 second feet out of the Colorado. This amount would provide a daily supply for thirteen million more people. If you are going to begin now to plan for drinking water for Los Angeles after her pop-
ulation becomes twenty-three million, would it not be advisable for someone to worry about getting water onto Arizona land in order to raise food for this population?

Southern California can get everything that she needs from Arizona in exchange for a definite allotment of water to us. Based on present best practice, there will be two or two and one-half million acres of land irrigated in the Lower Basin in the United States. Approximately half of this can be quickly irrigated in California. Once reservoirs are constructed, most of this California land can be irrigated cheaper than the bulk of the land in Arizona and it can be more readily financed, as California has the advantage of population and wealth in her favor.

We want the opportunity to develop the second million acres in this state. We have the land and know we can irrigate it. Some say our ideas are chimerical, that they are "pipe dreams". We think not, but should we fail, a succeeding generation in Arizona can relinquish our right to the unused water. No state controlled by American people will ever hold what it cannot use, against the needs of a sister commonwealth.

If you pass the Swing-Johnson bill before the water is divided, you compel our power resources to pay for California irrigation, and when our irrigation projects come they must pay their own way. Should they be pumping projects and use electrical power, part of the Arizona farmer's power bill must go to subsidize the California farmer's irrigation project.

We have heard that the federal government is desirous of getting rid of their merchant marine and of the Muscle Shoals power project, that they wish the states to assume more of the responsibilities of government, that you would like us to pave our own roads, build our own reclamation projects, drain our own swamps, collect our own inheritance tax, and even enforce prohibition.

Why should the government go into the power business in the southwest, after failing in the southeast, by making an appropriation of money that we do not need? Are the national taxpayers now satisfied? Or do they want the federal government in the Colorado to follow its blundering course in the Tennesssee? The southwest can finance its own Colorado River development just as congress can, by bonds to be repaid by southwest power consumers. We do not need the federal government for a collection agency. We need no intermediary between southwest producer and southwest consumer.

If you will definitely kill the Swing-Johnson bill early in December, the lower basin states can quickly get together on a supplemental agreement to the Santa Fe Compact.

There is no individual or group in Arizona to blame for the failure of the last conference between the lower basin states. Had California's representatives been sincere in their statement that there was no hope in the attitude of our governor, then they could have readily conferred with a waiting Arizona legislative committee and put up so fair a proposition that they could have appealed to our people over the head of our chief executive.

The fact that a senatorial committee was due here early in November precluded a tri-state agreement in August. California would be foolish to trade with Arizona if she can get what she wants from congress for nothing. She knows that if the states agree on a construction program that a federal appropriation is not necessary.

We are both playing a game, with the future as the stakes. Arizona is risking some slight possible damage in the vicinity of Yuma, but California is gambling that a flood like that of 1884 will not drown out her whole Imperial valley before flood protection is finally secured. The levee systems may take care of the water and silt for fifteen years if the floods are limited to 200,000 second feet, but what will they do with a 350,000 or 400,000 second foot flood?

We are approaching the wet portion of our cycle in rainfall. Two years have been wasted already in talk. It is possible that a quickly built dam at Topoc is the only thing that can save the Imperial valley from the next big flood.

I am opposed to a high dam at Boulder because it is poor engineering to spend two dollars for what you can get for one, and to waste good material in doing so, such as 260,
000 horse power and 680,000 acre feet of water per annum.

A series of dams built after the completion of one at Glenn canyon would need one-third of the spillway capacity that they would require if built from Boulder canyon up the river.

Cutting off the silt above will tend to deepen the river channel and thus reduce the depth to rock foundation. Control of the floods above will greatly reduce the cost of taking care of the river while lower dams are being built. These items will much more than offset the additional cost of immediate interest necessary to pay on the additional cost of a dam at Glenn canyon and the longer transmission lines to where the power is to be used.

I think that it is poor engineering to experiment on so vital a matter as a dam to be two or three times as high as any existing structures when it is possible to proceed with a program that conforms to standard practice.

But mainly I am opposed to the Swing-Johnson-Boulder canyon dam because it constitutes an indirect and unfair division of the Colorado River as between Arizona and California. Even if we are protected by a treaty with Mexico, Arizona would be hurt by the Boulder canyon dam, or any dam built before a division of the water is made. I am not only opposed to the Boulder canyon dam, but I am opposed to even throwing a pebble in the stream that will hold back the floods, increase the normal flow and permit Mexico to get the stored water.

Any flood control dam will result in the quick irrigation of approximately a million acres in California as against some two hundred and sixty thousand acres in Arizona, of which some one hundred and ten thousand acres would be economically outside of Arizona in an Indian reservation. A flood control dam would therefore constitute an immediate division of the Colorado waters in which California would secure seven times as much as Arizona.

The increased wealth and population going to California with this new land would increase our difficulty of competing with that state for the remainder of the water.

I have no responsibilities of office and not a great deal of timidity, for I am going to suggest a possible solution in view of the fact that several senators have suggested that Arizona's position is purely negative.

A fair division is possible. No man can guarantee what a state will do, but I feel sure Arizona would accept the following agreement with California and Nevada:

1. Notify Mexico that the United States will use all of the water of the Colorado River developed by the storage within the United States.

(This would not prohibit the treaty making branch of our government negotiating a treaty with Mexico which will give that nation out of the normal flow of the river the water to which she is morally entitled.)

2. Reserve the tributaries of the Colorado River, located in Arizona, California and Nevada, to these respective states.

(There is more land than water to irrigate the valley tributaries in the lower basin. They are therefore entitled to it. They should not be exposed to litigation or anything which will hinder the sale of bonds and thus add expense to these local projects.)

3. Allot Nevada whatever reasonable amount of the water of the main Colorado River that she can use. Divide the remainder, received at Lee's Ferry, equally between Arizona and California, permitting each state to decide the location of its water diversion.

(This would merely recognize that the water which arrives at Lee's Ferry is a surplus which cannot be used in the valleys in which it originates. If this excess water is thus equally divided, California would get all she can use immediately and Arizona's future would be secure.)

4. Reserve to Arizona the right to control, and secure revenue from, hydro-electric development located entirely within Arizona, and to possess an equal authority in such matters with other states where the river forms the boundary.

(This would give Arizona the right now possessed by every other state in the Union.)

5. Encourage every private or public devel-
opment at any site on the Colorado River that will not interfere with some more important location.

(We do not want development delayed because of differences between advocates of public and private ownership.)

The Upper Basin is opposing any construction in the Colorado until they are protected. Arizona should take an identical position.

The Upper Basin at Santa Fe only surrendered the right to her water that she could not use. By the law of gravitation Arizona is next entitled to this excess water. We could eventually receive and use nearly all of it through our control of reservoir sites, but Arizona has repeatedly expressed her willingness to divide with California and Nevada.

Why are we criticized when the Upper Basin gives only from her excess, but every gallon of water we allot to California and Nevada deprives us of the greatest need of an arid country?

There are six million acres now irrigated in California. Arizona does not possess one-tenth that amount. Eventually California will be able to put from twelve to eighteen million acres under irrigation. Arizona will never be able to possess one-fifth this many.

The water in the San Joaquin and Sacramento Rivers, alone, in California's great central valley, amounts to twice that of the Colorado River.

The maximum power development of California will some day be nine million horse power. You gentlemen are not seeking to divide that with any other state. Arizona's, including the Colorado, will never be over two-thirds this amount. Should Arizona agree to equally divide the water of the Colorado with California under these circumstances, what more can be asked?

Should congress, by passing the Swing-Johnson bill, nationalize the Colorado and give our great resource to California, you will not have settled this question. Lincoln said, "No question is settled until settled right," and it is not right for any state to be forced to surrender its present resources or future opportunities. If Arizona does not consent to such an action, some day when a larger and more powerful, politically, state is involved their resistance will be successful and Arizona will secure restitution on the precedent established by the large and politically powerful state. In the meantime, however, congress will be a governing body that followed the old unfair injunction, "To him that hath shall be given and from him that hath not, shall be taken even that which he hath."
November 19, 1925.

George Neel,
State Capitol Bldg.,
Santa Fe, New Mexico.

Dear Mr. Neel:

I am enclosing herewith a copy of my letter of this date to W.R. Wallace, which will be self-explanatory. I presume you have already read the interview of last Saturday with Attorney General Boatright and myself in which we expressed our views respecting the attitude of the southern states as revealed at the various hearings. Briefly, all the southern group, with the exception of a few individuals in Arizona are satisfied with the allotment made between the upper and lower basins by the terms of the Colorado River compact. The whole trouble lies between Arizona and California. Arizona wants royalties and tax returns. Therefore would like to have all development made in her territory. California wants to develop the river in Nevada and Arizona for California's profit with Government money and without payment of royalty or toll to Arizona and Nevada. California is very anxious to get somewhere and Governor Hunt is very shrewdly letting them scuttle about, knowing full well that he can come in and make his demand when the proper time arrives. The Senate Committee openly stated to the California people at a banquet at Las Vegas, Nevada, that the three lower states would have to get together on their local problems and agree upon same before they could expect any help from Congress or the upper states.

All in all, the situation is in pretty good shape and if the upper states stand firm upon the policy that nothing will be done until the three lower states agree among themselves, such an agreement will be arrived at, notwithstanding protestations to the contrary.

Let me have your views on the matters contained in the Wallace letter, also advise where it would be convenient for you to meet with the rest of us in case a preliminary meeting would be necessary.

Very truly yours,

Delph E. Carpenter
Commissioner for Colorado.
November 19, 1925.

Hon. Mr. R. Wallace,
Salt Lake City, Utah.

My Dear Mr. Wallace:

Mr. Hopkins, Mr. Bostright and myself conferred most of Tuesday regarding the appearance of representatives of the Upper Basin states before the Senate Committee at Washington commencing December 14th and continuing until our material is in.

What do you think? Should we confer right away before preparing the case for each of the four states? Or is it your judgment that we can safely separately prepare the case of each state, then meet and compare notes at Washington Dec. 10. The departmental testimony before the Committee will be submitted on December 10, 11 and 12. Senator Phipps thinks we should be there to listen in.

I feel that there should be a carefully prepared discussion of historical and legal matters which lead up to the formation of the Colorado River Commission and the conclusion of the compact; that Committee record has been taken backward and that at present the main thing before the Committee is the building of the reservoir when the first consideration should be given to the physical and other conditions out of which the necessity of the reservoir comes as a mere incident to the proper and comprehensive development of the river. If a cool, dispassionate and comprehensive review of the physical and legal problems were first put into the record, then our four states could submit their individual cases and the record would be strong enough to warrant the committee in telling the two lower states just what will be required. What is your thought in this regard?

We received word yesterday that Criswell and Committee will call at Denver November 25 and Cheyenne November 26 to discuss Colorado River matters. I do not understand why they are bothering us when our attitude is so well understood, but we will have to meet them and talk over whatever they have to offer. I presume that our discussions will follow the line of the address by the Governors. I think that I should be present at Cheyenne and Hopkins at Denver etc., so that there will not be any semblance of partiality. What do you think of that? Let me have your views.

Very truly yours,

Delph E. Carpenter
Commissioner for Colorado
November 19, 1925.

Hon. Mr. R. Wallace,
Salt Lake City, Utah.

My Dear Mr. Wallace:

Mr. Hopkins, Mr. Bentright and myself conferred yesterday on Tuesday regarding the appearance of representatives of the Upper Basin States before the Senate Committee at Washington commencing December 14th and continuing until our material is in.

What do you think? Should we confer right away before preparing the case for each of the four states? Or is it your judgment that we can safely separately prepare the case of each state, then meet and compare notes at Washington Dec. 19. The departmental testimony before the Committee will be submitted on December 10, 11 and 12. Senator Phippe thinks we should be there to listen in.

I feel that there should be a carefully prepared discussion of historical and legal matters which lead up to the formation of the Colorado River Commission and the conclusion of the compact; that Committee record has been taken backward and that at present the main thing before the Committee is the building of the reservoir when the first consideration should be given to the physical and other conditions out of which the necessity of the reservoir came as a more incident to the proper and comprehensive development of the river. If a complete, dispassionate and comprehensive review of the physical and legal problems were first put into the record, then our four states could submit their individual cases and the record would be strong enough to warrant the committee in telling the two lower states just what will be required. What is your thought in this regard?

We received word yesterday that Criswell and Committee will call at Denver November 25 and Cheyenne November 28 to discuss Colorado River matters. I do not understand why they are bothering us when our attitude is so well understood, but we will have to meet them and talk over whatever they have to offer. I presume that our discussions will follow the line of the address by the Governors. I think that I should be present at Cheyenne and Hopkins at Denver etc., so that there will not be any semblance of partiality. What do you think of that? Let me have your views.

Very truly yours,

Delph B. Carpenter
Commissioner for Colorado
December 3rd, 1925.

Mr. Delph E. Carpenter,
Interstate Rivers Compact Commr.,
Denver, Colorado.

Dear Mr. Carpenter:

Herewith enclosed please find the following data concerning the Colorado River Basin and Colorado River Compact:

1. Analysis of proposed Lower Basin Compact, Colorado River, by California and Nevada, December 2, 1925.


3. Table A, Colorado River Basin Water Supply by States. This is a revised statement of water supplies contributed by the various states.

4. Colorado River Basin Water Supply, Tables 1 to 6, giving the total water supply of the Basin (21,600,000 acre-feet) as revised, water supply contributed by the Lower Basin states, Gila River Water Supply and Arizona Water Contribution.

Under separate cover I am mailing you to the New Willard Hotel, Washington, D.C., cloth-mounted copy of the map of the Colorado portion of the Colorado River Basin showing the irrigated areas, irrigable areas, constructed reservoirs, reservoir sites, hydro-power plants, and constructed and projected trans-mountain diversions.

By express I am sending you at the New Willard Hotel, Washington, D.C., the life-sized map of the Colorado River Basin which was used at the Denver hearings.

Referring to Table A, Revised Estimate of the Colorado River Basin Water Supply, you will please note that the Upper Basin states contribute 79% of the basin water supply; also that the Upper Basin allotment under the terms of the compact
#2. D.E. Carpenter.

will be 35% of the Basin water supply and 44% of the Upper Basin production.

The original tables on water supply of the Colorado River Basin, Upper and Lower Basin production and related data, will be found in your printed report on the Colorado River Compact.

Very truly yours,

[Signature]

RIM/bo
encls.
**SUMMARY OF WATER SUPPLY DATA ON COLORADO RIVER**

*from pages 101 to 123*

**U.S. Geo. Survey Water Supply Paper No. 556,**

**Water Power and Flood Control of Colorado River below Green River, Utah, by E. C. LaFue.**

**Prepared by R. I. Meeker, November 30, 1925.**

**Values in Acre-Feet per year.**

**COLORADO RIVER AT LEE'S FERRY.**
- Average recorded flow 1911-1923 computed from records of Green, Grand & San Juan: 16,100,000 A-ft. (Table 2, Col. 6, pp. 104-06.)
- 1911-23 records extended back to 1895 to include dry cycle 95-06: 15,200,000 A-ft. (Table 3, Col. 5, p. 108.)
- Corrected for depletion by irrigation period 1895 to 1922, one complete cycle: 14,400,000 A-ft. (Deduced from Table 6, Cols. 4 & 5, p. 110.)

**COLORADO RIVER AT LEE'S FERRY.**
- Estimated present consumption upper Colorado basin above Lee's Ferry: 2,365,000 A-ft. (Table 8, Col. 3, p. 112.)
- Estimated future consumption in river flow, upper Colorado basin above Lee's Ferry: 5,815,000 A-ft. (Table 6, Col. 4, p. 110.)
- Estimated total present and future consumption in upper Colorado river basin above Lee's Ferry: 8,180,000 A-ft. (Table 8, Col. 4, p. 112.)

**FUTURE AVERAGE YEARLY RIVER FLOW AT LEE'S FERRY AFTER DEDUCTION OF COMBINED PRESENT AND FUTURE WATER CONSUMPTION BY IRRIGATION IN UPPER COLORADO RIVER BASIN.**
- 8,880,000 A-ft. (Table 8, Col. 5, p. 112.)

**LOWER COLORADO BASIN COMPACT OBLIGATION AT LEE'S FERRY.**
- 7,500,000 A-ft. (Estimated for long time mean.)

**INFLOW TO RIVER BETWEEN LEE'S FERRY AND NEEDLES, BASED ON RECORDS 1922-25 AT LEE'S FERRY AND TOPOCK, U.S.G.S.**
- 1,500,000 A-ft. (Table 14, Col. 3, p. 123.)

**FUTURE AVERAGE YEARLY FLOW AT NEEDLES AFTER CORRECTION FOR PRESENT AND FUTURE WATER CONSUMPTION.**
- 10,100,000 A-ft. (Table 6, p. 110 plus inflow below Lee's Ferry & reconstructed Gila.)

**TOTAL WATER SUPPLY COLORADO RIVER BASIN (Reconstructed River)***
- 21,200,000 A-ft. (Table 8, Col. 5 p. 112 plus 15,000,000 A-ft. inflow between Lee's Ferry & Topock.)

**RIVER FLOW AVAILABLE TO LOWER COLORADO RIVER BASIN AFTER FUTURE DEPLETION BY UPPER BASIN. MAIN RIVER.**
- 10,380,000 A-ft. (Includes Gila River Basin: derived as follows by Meeker:
  - Reconstructed Colorado River at Lee's Ferry,
  - Yearly inflow between Lee's Ferry and Topock, U.S.G.S. 1920-1925,
  - Reconstructed Gila River at Yuma,
  - 16,600,000 A-ft.
  - 1,500,000 "
  - 3,100,000 "
  - 21,200,000 "

*Includes Gila River Basin: derived as follows by Meeker: Reconstructed Colorado River at Lee's Ferry, Yearly inflow between Lee's Ferry and Topock, U.S.G.S. 1920-1925, Reconstructed Gila River at Yuma,*
## SUMMARY OF WATER SUPPLY DATA ON COLORADO RIVER
from pages 101 to 123
U.S. Geo. Survey Water Supply Paper No. 556,
Water Power and Flood Control of Colorado River below
Green River, Utah, by E. C. Lafleur.
Prepared by R. I. Meeker, November 30, 1925.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Values in Acre-Feet per year.</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>COLORADO RIVER AT LEE'S FERRY.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average recorded flow 1911-1923</td>
<td>16,100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>computed from records of Green, Grand &amp; San Juan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>COLORADO RIVER AT LEE'S FERRY.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1911-23 records extended back to 1895 to include dry cycle 95-06.</td>
<td>15,300,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>RECONSTRUCTED RIVER AT LEE'S FERRY.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corrected for depletion by irrigation period 1895 to 1923, one complete cycle.</td>
<td>16,600,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ESTIMATED PRESENT CONSUMPTION UPPER COLORADO BASIN ABOVE LEE'S FERRY.</strong></td>
<td>2,365,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ESTIMATED FUTURE CONSUMPTION IN RIVER FLOW, UPPER COLORADO BASIN ABOVE LEE'S FERRY.</strong></td>
<td>5,615,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ESTIMATED TOTAL PRESENT AND FUTURE CONSUMPTION IN UPPER COLORADO RIVER BASIN ABOVE LEE'S FERRY.</strong></td>
<td>8,120,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FUTURE AVERAGE YEARLY RIVER FLOW AT LEE'S FERRY AFTER DEDUCTION OF COMBINED PRESENT AND FUTURE WATER CONSUMPTION BY IRRIGATION IN UPPER COLORADO RIVER BASIN.</strong></td>
<td>8,880,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LOWER COLORADO BASIN COMPACT OBLIGATION AT LEE'S FERRY.</strong></td>
<td>7,500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>INFLOW TO RIVER BETWEEN LEE'S FERRY AND NEEDLES, BASED ON RECORDS 1922-25 AT LEE'S FERRY AND TOPOCK, U.S.C.S.</strong></td>
<td>1,500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FUTURE AVERAGE YEARLY FLOW AT NEEDLES AFTER CORRECTION FOR PRESENT AND FUTURE WATER CONSUMPTION.</strong></td>
<td>10,100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*<em>TOTAL WATER SUPPLY COLORADO RIVER BASIN (Reconstructed River)</em></td>
<td>21,200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>RIVER FLOW AVAILABLE TO LOWER COLORADO RIVER BASIN AFTER FUTURE DEPLETION BY UPPER BASIN, MAIN RIVER.</strong></td>
<td>10,380,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Includes Gila River Basin: derived as follows by Meeker:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reconstructed Colorado River at Lee's Ferry,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yearly inflow between Lee's Ferry and Topock, U.S.C.S.1920-1925,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reconstructed Gila River at Yuma,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16,600,000 A-ft.</td>
<td>1,500,000 &quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3,100,000 &quot;</td>
<td>21,200,000 &quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Table A**

**COLORADO RIVER BASIN WATER SUPPLY**

Contributions by States.

Compiled by R.I. Hecker, Irrigation Engineer, December 2, 1923.

These figures represent conditions of reconstructed river or river-flow unreduced by irrigation uses. Actual river-flow are now less due to consumption by irrigation. The Arizona figures include the Gila River which is a part of the Colorado River System.

**Approximate Values Only.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Acre-feet</th>
<th>Percent of Basin Supply</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td>13,000,000</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td>3,850,000</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utah</td>
<td>3,100,000</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wyoming</td>
<td>2,200,000</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Mexico</td>
<td>500,000</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nevada</td>
<td>75,000</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>21,725,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Colorado produces 55% of the Colorado River Water Supply.

The Upper Basin States contribute 75% of the Basin Water Supply.

Upper Basin allotment under the terms of the Compact will be 35% of the Basin Water Supply and 44% of Upper Basin Production.
COLORADO RIVER BASIN WATER SUPPLY.
Average Yearly Flow of Basin.
Revised data by R.I. Meeker, Irrigation Engineer,
December 2, 1925.

Based on long time mean covering wet and dry cycles.
Recorded flow corrected for depletion by irrigation.

These figures represent approximately the total yearly
flow of the Colorado River Basin unreduced by irrigation
consumption; in other words, the run-off of the reconstructed river. Upper and Lower Basin terms fit
definitions of same in Colorado River Compact as drafted
at Santa Fe, New Mexico, November 1922.

TABLE 1.

TOTAL BASIN WATER SUPPLY:
Reconstructed River.
Values in Acre-feet.

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Upper Colorado River</td>
<td>17,000</td>
<td>79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basin</td>
<td>000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower Colorado River</td>
<td>4,600</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basin</td>
<td>000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Total Basin Supply   | 21,600 | 100%
|                      | 000    |   |

TABLE 2.

COLORADO RIVER COMPACT ALLOCATIONS.
Compact of November 1922.
Values in Acre-feet.

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Upper Colorado River</td>
<td>7,500</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basin</td>
<td>000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower Colorado River</td>
<td>8,500</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basin</td>
<td>000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unallotted Surplus</td>
<td>5,600</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Total Basin Supply   | 21,600 | 100%
|                      | 000    |   |
COLORADO RIVER BASIN.

TABLE 3.

WATER SUPPLY DATA.
Values in Acre-feet.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reconstructed Colorado River at Lee's Ferry</td>
<td>17,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inflow to Colorado River between Lee's Ferry and above mouth of Gila River</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utah (Paria, Kanab, Virgin Rivers)</td>
<td>225,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nevada (Virgin)</td>
<td>75,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona (other tributaries)</td>
<td>1,475,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Water Resources Colorado River Basin</td>
<td>1,475,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reconstructed Gila River</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Mexico Supply</td>
<td>443,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona Supply</td>
<td>2,677,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3,120,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average yearly Water Supply</td>
<td>4,600,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utah</td>
<td>225,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nevada</td>
<td>75,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Mexico</td>
<td>443,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td>3,682,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4,595,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 5.

**ARIZONA WATER PRODUCTION.**

**COLORADO RIVER BASIN.**

Average Yearly Water Supply.
Values in Acre-Feet.

**GILA RIVER SYSTEM.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Acre-Feet</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gila River at Kelvin</td>
<td>767,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salt River at McDowell</td>
<td>1,470,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verde River</td>
<td>609,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aqua Fria at Glendales</td>
<td>181,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hassayampa</td>
<td>23,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consumption above Gaging Stations</td>
<td>50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>3,120,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**New Mexico Production**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Acre-Feet</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gila at Guthrie, Arizona</td>
<td>244,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Francisco at Clifton</td>
<td>122,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>443,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Gila System Production in Arizona** 2,677,000

### Table 6.

**SUMMARY - ARIZONA WATER CONTRIBUTION.**

Average Yearly.
Values in Acre-Feet.

**Gila System Production** 2,677,000

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>River</th>
<th>Acre-Feet</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Main Colorado River</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Little Colorado River</td>
<td>200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Williams River</td>
<td>75,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other tributaries</td>
<td>900,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>1,175,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Water Production, Arizona** 3,852,000
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DC WASHINGTON DC 1208P DEC 3 1925

DELPH E CARPENTER

GREELEY COLORADO

CHIEF HAS BEEN SUMMONED TO APPEAR BEFORE SENATE IRRIGATION COMMITTEE

DECEMBER TENTH STOP HE WOULD BE GLAD TO SEE YOU BEFORE THAT DAY

LEO C MONAHAN SECRETARY TO MR HOOVER
SALT LAKE UTAH DEC 3 25
DELPH E CARPENTER
RIVER COMMISSIONER STATE CAPITOL BLDG DENVER COL
MCIVER IMPERIAL VALLEY WIRES ASKING IF CONFERENCES WILL BE HELD
WASHINGTON ELEVENTH AND FOURTEENTH AS AGREED HAVE WIRED HIM
YES STOP ALSO TO HIM YOU WILL WIRE HIM DIRECTLY CONFIRMING THIS
UNDERSTANDING PLEASE DO SO ALSO PLEASE WIRE ME
WM R WALLACE
230PM
Send the following message, subject to the terms on back hereof, which are hereby agreed to

To

Mr. R. Wallace

Street and No. (or Telephone) Number

Place Salt Lake City, Utah

On present program supper to be served. Representatives of each State to meet Tuesday, December 17th. Open meeting of all States to be held Wednesday. Thursday afternoon for work. Missiles to avoid. Telegrams stop. Necessary letters-testifies tenth. Stop

Mr. R. Wallace, President

SENDER'S ADDRESS FOR REFERENCE

J. C. Willever, First Vice-President
Send the following message, subject to the terms on back hereof, which are hereby agreed to

To

Street and No. (or Telephone Number)

Place

and will propose postponement immediately arriving Washington unless change mind residence.

and will advise stop Am McIntosh

McIntosh and caring for interests all upper states and have assured money we will treat silence till lower three three otherwise agreed.

[Handwritten signature]
Send the following message, subject to the terms on back hereof, which are hereby agreed to:

To：

Street and No. (or Telephone)：Ellenbro Oly

Place：

In present program proposed state representatives meet my room No. 114 and conduct electric representatives and other states some public afternoon of 14th stop.

I feel every session should be suspended pending 3 state negotiations and are proposing that 3 will issue results.

I hope to hear from you.

[Signature]

[Typed address]

[Sender's address]

[Sender's telephone number]
To:

Street and No. (or Telephone) Number

Place

City: Representative homemade proposals Arr.
3 / 11th compact and Artz considering same Stg.
what would you think after Artz postponement
of all schedule hearings 5/19. Ext. Com. Review
Colo. Air matters until conclusion of negotiations
and after holidays stay. Don't forget crossing
wire some phone stuff. Aug. 16th, 1975.

Delph E. Comp. Jr.
To: Herbert Hoover  

Street and No. (or Telephone Number): 200 A Street  

Place: Washington, D.C.

Via train 12 Dec 1925

General Boontight and self enroute to Washington preparatory to

hoar, hearings this. Only proposals being seriously considered

by Opper Bollin Pobblekates company (tag) Kasa

were send M. Nary suggesting postponement all Col.

Pire, hearings to be held not to avoid crossing wires. Shy

will arrive at Saturday evening and if convenient

for conference with your best impression at

New Willard Hotel. Sorry, Adria, Lee McKay

Self E. Carpenter
WASHINGTON, Dec. 7, 1935

H.S. McClusky
SECRETARY TO GOVERNOR
PHOENIX, ARIZ.

SENATE COMMITTEE HEARING WILL NOT BE POSTPONED BUT WILL PROCEED AS PER SCHEDULE STOP MEETING my ROOM NEW WILLLARD TO WHICH ALL REPRESENTATIVES ALL STATES INVITED POSTPONED FROM FOURTEENTH TO FIFTEENTH XXXX XX XXXX XX AFTERNOON STOP KINDLY ADVISE ALL INTERESTED PARTIES

DELPH E CARPENTER
Secretary to Governor
State House
Cheyenne, Wyo.

Advise Governor Ross and Commissioner Hopkins Hearings regarding Colorado River proceed tomorrow as per schedule upper states to commence their testimony Monday Fourteenth stop meeting my rooms New Willard Representatives all seven states called upon urgent request Wallace Utah will be held afternoon Tuesday Fifteenth

Delph E Carpenter
Send the following Telegram, subject to the terms on back hereof, which are hereby agreed to.

WASHINGTON DEC 7, 1925

W.R. WALLACE,
SALT LAKE CITY, UTAH

HEARINGS SENATE COMMITTEE PROCEED AS PER SCHEDULE STOP
MEETING MY ROOM SET FOR FOURTEENTH POSTPONED UNTIL TUESDAY
FIFTEENTH STOP PLEASE ADVISE INTERESTED PARTIES

DELPH E. CARPENTER
Send the following Telegram, subject to the terms on back hereof, which are hereby agreed to.

Washington, D.C. Dec. 7, 1925

Secretary Mc Iver,
Imperial Valley Irr. Dist.,
El Centro, Calif.

Senate committee hearings will not be postponed stop meeting at my rooms New Willard Hotel at which representaives all seven states invited will be held Tuesday fifteenth instead of Monday fourteenth stop kind ly inform Pound Ross Criswell and others interested parties.

DELPH E. CARPENTER
Send the following Telegram, subject to the terms on back hereof, which are hereby agreed to.

WASHINGTON D.C. DEC. 7, 1925.

GOV. J. Q. SCRUGHAM
CARSON CITY, NEVADA.

SENATE COMMITTEE HEARINGS COLORADO RIVER PROCEED TOMORROW AS PER SCHEDULE AND WITHOUT POSTPONEMENT STOP MEETING MY ROOM NEW WILLARD ORIGINALLY SET FOR MONDAY FOURTEENTH KE AT URGENT REQUEST WALLACE UTAH FOR PURPOSE DISCUSSION BY REPRESENTATIVES ALL SEVEN STATES POSTPONED UNTIL TUESDAY AFTERNOON FIFTEENTH STOP I SEE VERY LITTLE ADVANTAGE TO BE GAINED BY WALLACE PROPOSAL ESPECIALLY WHEN THREE LOWER STATES ARE ENGAGED THEIR OWN NEGOTIATIONS STOP HOW DO YOU FEEL ABOUT IT

DELPH E. CARPENTER
Westinghouse Electric & Manufacturing Company

The data extracted from the Reclamation Report which you took to Washington is from United States Reclamation Service Report on Colorado River Basin in four volumes stop page numbers refers to volume four part nineteen five hundred fifteen pages total stop from discussion on state interstate national and international water rights by W J Eggleston District Counsel United States Reclamation Service stop.
CB70 2/9

THIS REPORT MADE ABOUT NINETEEN SIXTEEN OR NINETEEN SEVENTEEN

R I MEEKER.
December 7, 1925.

Mr. Delph Carpenter,
c/o The Willard Hotel,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Mr. Carpenter:

The Chief would like you to read over the enclosed clipping and give him your general impressions of it.

Congressman Swing's office told me the other day they had some telegrams for you but I suppose you have received them by now.

Sincerely yours,

Leo C. Monahan,
Secretary to Mr. Hoover.

LCM-E.

Enclosure.
San Francisco, December 8, 1925.

Hon. Delph E. Carpenter,
Commissioner for Colorado,
New Williard Hotel,
Washington, D. C.

My dear Mr. Carpenter:

Replying to yours of the 2nd inst., I have to say that your information respecting the Colorado River Compact Resolution passed at the last session of the California legislature is correct. This resolution was not signed by the Governor, but the Constitution of this State does not require that the Governor approve resolutions of this character. The resolution, therefore, has the same status as though it had been approved by the Governor.

Very truly yours,

[Signature]

W/G.
NC200 35 1 EXTRA RUSH

GK GREATNECK NY 14 1015A

DELPH CARPENTER 856

NEW WILLARD HOTEL WASHINGTON DC

PLEASE CALL ME LONG DISTANCE GREATNECK NY ONE AUGHT AUGHT NINE REGARDING TELEGRAM RECEIVED GOVERNOR CRUGHAM ON COLORADO RIVER DEVELOPMENT IF NOT POSSIBLE ADVISE ME WHERE I CAN CALL YOU TODAY OR TONIGHT IMPORTANT

RALPH ELSMAN.
## Colorado Basin Data

Rough Analysis by R.I. Meeker

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land</th>
<th>Water</th>
<th>Total Regiments Present Ft.</th>
<th>Total Water Supply</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Irriagble</td>
<td>Future Irrigable</td>
<td>Irrigated</td>
<td>Water now consumed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,775,000</td>
<td>1,925,000</td>
<td>850,000</td>
<td>Colorado</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>970,000</td>
<td>600,000</td>
<td>370,000</td>
<td>Utah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,210,000</td>
<td>700,000</td>
<td>510,000</td>
<td>Arizona</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>950,000</td>
<td>580,000</td>
<td>370,000</td>
<td>Wyoming</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>560,000</td>
<td>500,000</td>
<td>60,000</td>
<td>New Mexico</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91,000</td>
<td>82,000</td>
<td>9,000</td>
<td>Nevada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9,390,000</td>
<td>479,000</td>
<td>460,000</td>
<td>California</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>920,000</td>
<td>620,000</td>
<td>200,000</td>
<td>Mexico</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8,315,000</td>
<td>5,486,000</td>
<td>2,829,000</td>
<td>Totals</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Includes Gila River

*Includes Reservoir losses by evaporation Boulder Canyon & Glen Canyon Reservoirs*
REPLYING YOUR TELEGRAM WATER TABULATION COLORADORIVER BASIN STOP
SUBTRACTION CONSUMPTION CALIFORNIA AND MEXICO FROM SUMMATION UNUSED
FLOW TO LOWER STATES GIVES BOTTOM TOTAL UNUSED FLOW TO PACIFIC STOP
ALSO DERIVED BY SUBTRACTING TOTAL COLUMN ONE FROM TOTAL COLUMN THREE
R I MEEEKER.
NOTES ON COLORADO RIVER HEARING

1. Number of Witnesses lower basin.

2. Physical Aspects:
   a. Topography
   b. Climate
   c. Water Supply

3. Economical Aspects:
   A. a. Growing season
      b. Character of crops—only of temperate zone
      c. Scattered projects
      d. Transportation, market facilities and opportunities

   Compare,
   a. Non-competing semi-tropical lower basin crops
   b. Proximity to market
   c. Transportation

   B. Comparative speed of development in two basins

   C. Effect of monopolistic appropriation of lower basin

4. Legal Aspects:
   a. Previous experience embargo
   b. Legal doctrines:
      Kas vs. Colo.
      Priority
      Government ownership
   c. Seven states, United States-International
   d. Compact only method of speedy and satisfactory settlement
   e. Article Eight of compact
   f. Congressional legislation ad interim

5. Conclusion:
   a. Compact—legal difficulties must be settled and upper states protected by seven state compact before construction proceeds on the main Colorado or Gila Rivers.
   b. Six state ratification unsatisfactory because uncertain in view of California condition.
   c. Inadequacy of protective clauses in congressional act because
      1. Want of jurisdiction of subject matter, and
      2. Inability to protect against lower appropriations of the equated flow.
   d. Gila project-Governor's address-New Mexico rights.
   e. High dam and other development of the river in the lower basin for irrigation, power, etc., according to the method and manner satisfactory to lower states will be supported by upper states upon proper protection of their rights.
   f. Levies in Mexico.
Mr. Delph E. Carpenter

// Stephen B. Davis

Solicitor

Dept of Commerce

Washington, D.C.
Pacific Palisades
Los Angeles
The old wish—but always new
“Merry Christmas”
Mr. and Mrs. W. B. Clausen
Hon. Delph E. Carpenter,
Greeley, Colorado.

My dear Mr. Carpenter:

I have received your letter of January 13th. When you return from your trip down the Arkansas I should be glad indeed to talk over with you the present situation on the Colorado.

When I was in Washington recently getting rights of way for the city of Denver's gathering ditches on the Western Slope, the Work-Hoover proposal was communicated by Secretary Work to the McNary Committee of the Senate.

I remained in Washington a couple of days after finishing up my right of way work in order to get the full significance of the proposal and the reaction of various Representatives and Senators to it. The reaction so far as I could ascertain proved to be favorable and apparently the proposal is stronger today than ever and it would seem to provide the best basis yet for the Upper States and the Lower States to get together upon a six-state basis, if not a seven.

The proposal expressly states that the "benefits" of the Boulder Canon project are to be confined to the ratifying states. That means that all deliveries of water for irrigation or other purposes must be made in ratifying states and that deliveries of electric power likewise must be made in ratifying states. Under this requirement these appropriations then would become governed by the Compact and the Upper States would be protected so far as appropriations connected with the proposed project are concerned.

The only disappointment I had in respect to the proposal was its failure to state expressly that the power plant should be located on the Nevada side of the river so that the great power appropriation, which is the one of all appropriations to be most feared connected with the project, would be governed by the Compact. As I construe the proposal, however, I think that by implication such a location of the power plant must be intended, since otherwise one of the "benefits" of the project might on fairly good grounds be said to be thrown into a non-ratifying state. Cabinet officials cannot say all that we of the Upper States may say and since the proposal referred to no states by name, I can see good reasons of diplomacy why the proposal could not very well expressly locate the power plant in Nevada, although probably doing so by implication.

I am curious to know your own reaction to the proposal. As for myself, I feel that it means that we of the Upper States must undergo a little change of attitude; that we no longer should content ourselves with a negative attitude toward a bill for the
Boulder Canon project, but that we should come forward either in support of a redraft of the Swing-Johnson bill embodying the proposal above referred to, together with all the necessary protective provisions for the Upper States, or affirmatively get behind some other bill of the same general nature. We must remember that the Federal Power Commission's embargo upon power licenses is only for a reasonable time. We therefore must accomplish as much as we can in the way of Upper State protection before that time expires. The enactment by the Congress of the proposal which Secretary Work sent to the Committee and which has the back of Secretary Hoover also, would furnish Upper State interests with a great measure of protection whether the Compact is ratified by seven states or by six, and it would seem that we should obtain for ourselves all of the protection possible before any resumption of the granting of licenses by the Power Commission.

As for the Arizona-California situation, it would seem that this should be worked out independently of the attitude of Upper State interests toward the Boulder Canon project as now sponsored by Secretaries Work and Hoover, since with the help of these cabinet officials we may hope for much and without it, for little.

Arizona can make California so much trouble over the question of ownership of the river bed of the Colorado and California can give to Arizona so much concern over that same question and over the annual appropriations toward the proposed Coolidge Dam at San Carlos on the Gila and over the proposed federal power plant at Laguna Dam for the irrigation of additional lands in Arizona, that neither of these states can be arbitrary with the other and out of their controversy a tri-state agreement must come measurably fair to both.

I understand that the Swing-Johnson bill is being re-drafted and believe that the water officials, attorneys-general and governors of the Upper States, the city of Denver, and the Colorado River League should consult together upon the redraft at the proper time in order to make sure that the provisions designed for the protection of the Upper States will be sufficient and also, what appears to be equally important, to arrange to get behind the measure and assist to bring about its passage by the Congress.

The road ahead against doubtful Representatives and Senators of the non-Colorado Basin states to win them over to the measure will be a hard one, needing every assisting resource we can muster. If, however, we give the cause our united energy, I am sure we can win. This is no ordinary project for the reclamation of lands or for the generation of power. It is that and it is more. It is the settlement of a long time controversy between the Colorado River states, and I think the Senators and Representatives of other states will see this and in time extend their aid.

Very truly yours,

[Signature]

President
CHB120-69 NL
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DELPHE CARPENTER

CARE WILLARD HOTEL WASHINGTON DC

WE DO NOT THINK THAT SENATE COMMITTEE SESSION SHOULD BE SUSPENDED PENDING THREE STATES NEGOTIATIONS AND ASK THAT YOU WITHHOLD PROPOSING SUCH SUSPENSION BECAUSE IT GIVES ARIZONA THE VERY THING SHE NEEDS TO DRIVE A BETTER BARGAIN I RATHER THINK IF THE COMMITTEE AND CONGRESS WERE URGED TO PROCEED THAT ARIZONA WOULD BE MORE INCLINED TO TAKE QUICKER ACTION IN THE MATTER AND BE MORE LIBERAL IN HER VIEWS

EARL C POUND.
TO THE SENATE COMMITTEE ON
IRRIGATION AND RECLAMATION.

GENTLEMEN:

Because of certain vital misrepresentations to your committee of the attitude of the Los Angeles Times and of myself as its publisher with regard to means proposed for the control and development of the Colorado River, and because it seems that a correct statement of the facts may be helpful to you, the following is respectfully submitted.

The principal misrepresentations to which I refer are that for selfish interests, because of the ownership of lands in Lower California, my associates and I have:

(1) Been in favor of a "low" dam instead of a "high" dam in the river.
(2) Opposed the construction of an"all-American canal".

The contrary is true, as it may be easily demonstrated that construction of either or both would be of great economic advantage to my company.

First, as to dams: Anticipating the objections and obstacles that would be raised by representatives of other States, and that are now being raised before your committee, I have supported a low dam, simply because I felt that the Federal Government, already committed to a policy of flood control, would be more inclined to act at once on a flood control dam than to undertake the expenditure or the financial guarantees for a program calling for more than $100,000,000 for a high dam.

If a high dam can be constructed by contributions from municipalities and power corporations without burden upon California and Arizona farmers, and can be constructed at once, it would serve a greater purpose than a low dam and I should favor it. However, if discussion of the high dam shall continue to prevent flood protection and a regulated supply of water for Imperial Valley, it should not be supported.

Frankly, construction of a high dam in the Colorado River at Boulder Canyon or Black Canyon would greatly enhance the value and productivity not only of lands in California, but of lands in Lower California owned by my company, as it would enable the better equation of the spring flood and the variation of annual flow over the irrigation season.

There is no reasonable ground for apprehension that for the next
hundred years there will not be a great surplus of water over any requirements on either side of the international border. If at any time there should not be sufficient water to supply all the lands that can profitably be irrigated in the United States, I shall be fully reconciled to any shortage of water or complete lack thereof which may result below the border. Engineers and hydrographers of unequalled experience and ability are, after years of exhaustive study of the river, convinced there will be adequate water for all beneficial purposes once proper storage and flood control facilities have been provided.

Second, as to the all-American canal: At the present time, lands in Lower California owned by myself and associates are entitled to one-half of the water brought through the present canal, which also serves the Imperial Valley. This right has never been exercised. It will not be exercised at any time in a manner prejudicial to any holding in California.

The construction of an all-American canal would be vastly to the interests of lands in Lower California, for in the event of such construction, the present canal, representing an expenditure by California farmers of approximately $6,000,000, would revert wholly to my company and could be used to extend operations south of the border without further outlay for water intake.

Opposition to construction of an all-American canal does not arise primarily from any source outside the Imperial Valley itself, where owners of farm lands now satisfactorily served by the present canal, object to the additional cost of construction and the added taxes which would follow construction of canal works not now needed.

From my own standpoint, opposition to an all-American canal has been based on the fact that tremendous economic depression in Imperial Valley would be the immediate result of such a canal, and that fully 70 percent of the farmers who have already paid for the present water system would be ruined by the cost of a new system. These land owners already have large obligations in respect to their present system; they have outstanding obligations for their schools and roads. Many are purchasing their farms and paying for improvements in orchards and homes.

If my company had supported an all-American canal, or should support it now, the charge might justly be made that our own interests had prompted us to approve a project destined to ruin hundreds of owners of farm lands in California.
It may be that years hence water will become so scarce by use on the American side as to require a specific division with the Lower California side. In such a case, construction of an all-American canal might become necessary.

The cost of an all-American canal is said to be estimated at $31,000,000. If this cost is assessed against land now irrigated as well as against land not now irrigated, owners of irrigated lands will be forced to assume a debt for which they will receive no advantage in return. Such action would amount virtually to confiscation in cases where the added costs could not be met.

If the charge were confined to the new lands, they would amount, with interest, to $125 or $150 an acre, which, with the additional cost of developing the land with homes, orchards, schools, roads and other necessities, renders the whole proposal impractical.

There has been either a deliberate or an unintentional misrepresentation made concerning the lands to be irrigated by the all-American canal. The purpose has been to show that such a canal would open up a vast tract of publicly owned acreage. Of the 335,000 acres in Imperial Valley not now irrigated by water from the present canal, which serves at this time 450,000 acres and can be made to serve an additional 65,000 acres, 142,000 acres belonging to private citizens and but 193,000 acres to the Government.

Hence, almost half of the all-American canal benefits will accrue to private individuals.

The vote in the Imperial Valley on irrigation matters does not, necessarily represent the best interests or the wishes of the actual owners of the land, as it embraces all the townfolk and is influenced to a large extent by propaganda and by those seeking a new canal system for their own undeveloped lands at the expense of the existing irrigators.

Obstacles in the way of any solution of the Colorado problem can not be removed, as members of your committee frankly stated during your hearings on the Pacific Coast, until the interested States compose their differences. It is a fact, however, that these differences actually do not exist so much in the minds of the people of the several States as among individuals and groups with specific localized and political interests to serve. It is the activity of such groups which has from the beginning stood chiefly in the way of such fundamental agreements among the States at interest as those set forth in the Colorado Compact.

The great majority of the people of the Southwest who have given open-minded consideration to the problem, are earnestly desirous of arriving at a
speedy and equitable adjustment of the differences which have so long prevented a realization of the enormous benefits of a controlled river. They are cognizant of the rights of others in the question and are prepared to accept just compromises that those rights may be secured. They are sincere in seeking to serve only the best interests of the Southwest as a whole and are anxious only that there shall be no further needless delay in solving the problem so important to these interests.

Included in this category are my associates and myself, the TIMES and such other interests as I represent. Your committee has in its possession many copies of my testimony before the Arid Lands Committee of the House of Representatives, in which I formally waived any demands or rights to which I may be entitled with regard to a guaranteed supply of water for the irrigable lands owned by the Colorado River Land Company in Lower California.

As a temporary expedient designed to meet a possible shortage of water, following one of the annual low water periods of the river, my company has plans to construct large reservoirs by the building of levees on our property in Lower California. If this plan is carried out—as it will be if it appears probable there will be a further long delay in the building of a dam on the river—water will thus be made available to overcome any temporary shortage either above or below the international line. Such a project is, of course, merely a makeshift and will in no way diminish the vital need for protection to be afforded by an adequate dam. While expensive, the cost of such reservoirs would be returned many times in the value of crops they would save in an emergency.

I have purposely refrained herein from dealing with the politicians and propagandists who have long sought maliciously to falsify and to distort my attitude and that of the TIMES toward these questions. If these mischievous representations were calculated to damage no others than myself and my associates, they would be of slight consequence. It is only so far as they prejudice the interests of the Southwest through developing conditions inimical to an early settlement of the Colorado problem, that they are worthy of refutation. It is to that end that I have ventured to set forth the facts.
Following 3 items probably handouts
at the hearing.
MEMORANDUM ON THE COLORADO RIVER COMPACT SIGNED BY COLORADO RIVER COMMISSION AT SANTA FE, N. MEX. NOVEMBER 24, 1922.

This Compact, executed under the provisions of the Constitution, is the first interstate treaty involving more than two States, which has been executed in our history. The treaty was signed by delegates of the various States under the chairmanship of Secretary of Commerce Hoover, representing the Federal Government, on November 24, 1922, at Santa Fe, N. Mex.

This special commission, created by the legislatures and by Congress, had held some forty sessions during the previous year and finally arrived at the terms of the agreement for a settlement of rights in the Colorado River between the seven States of Arizona, California, Colorado, Nevada, New Mexico, Utah, and Wyoming.

The purpose of the Compact was to put an end to the litigation which has held up the development of the river for many years, and which threatened to hold it up for another generation. The good sense of the Western States had led them to the conclusion that a physical problem of this character can not be dealt with on legalistic principles but must be settled on physical and engineering grounds.

The following digest gives a clear view of the situation.

RATIFICATION OF THIS COMPACT MEANS:

(1) Elimination of litigation, thus removing blockade on development of 242,000 square miles, a territory larger than Republic of France.
(2) Orderly development through irrigation and cultivation of 4,000,000 acres of land, now desert.

(3) Utilization, as economic conditions warrant, of waste waters in generation of over 6,000,000 horsepower with resultant saving in diminishing fuel resources.

(4) Construction of dams urgently needed for control of floods annually, threatening Imperial and Palo Verde Valleys in California and Yuma project in Arizona—rich communities assessed at over $100,000,000, where 75,000 to 100,000 Americans gain their living.

(5) New homes for 3,000,000 American citizens, including ex-service men and women.

(6) New communities which will furnish increased markets for the whole country.

(7) Increased wealth to meet our tax burden.

SIGNATURE OF COMPACT:

The Compact was signed at Santa Fe, N. Mex., on November 24, 1922, by the members of the Colorado River Commission, who are: Herbert Hoover, Chairman and Federal Representative; W. S. Norviel, Commissioner for Arizona; W. F. McClure, Commissioner for California; Delph E. Carpenter, Commissioner for Colorado; J. G. Scrugham, Commissioner for Nevada; Stephen B. Davis, jr., Commissioner for New Mexico; R. E. Caldwell, Commissioner for Utah; and Frank C. Emerson, Commissioner for Wyoming.
THE COMPACT IN OUTLINE:

Divides river system into an upper and a lower basin and on natural boundaries and economic lines; i.e., two basins are separated by a thousand miles of canyon and in time in which two basins would normally develop, and crops are different. Allocates in perpetuity 16,000,000 acre-feet or 80 per cent of the total natural flow of 20,000,000 acre-feet of the river, more than sufficient to water all lands now being irrigated and all lands which can be economically developed for forty years to come; provides for appointment of new commission at end of forty years and leaves to that commission 4,000,000 acre-feet or 20 per cent of total natural flow for second apportionment among States; gives agriculture precedence over power; river being practically unnavigable, makes navigation subservient to other uses; leaves all questions of Mexican rights to water to Federal State Department, the only organ of American people having any right to deal therewith.

HISTORIC STEP IN INTERSTATE RELATIONS:

This Compact, which adequately protects the interests of all the States and of the Federal Government, is a historic step in interstate relations, as it is the first time that more than two States have availed themselves of constitutional privilege of settling their differences by negotiations and compact. It will serve as a precedent in substitution of peaceful medium of negotiation for that of costly litigation with resultant delays in development. It has settled, after
eleven months of intensive and exhaustive study, important questions of conflict covering a whole river system and affecting seven States and the Federal Government, whereas similar disputes between two States relative to small tributaries have taken years when submitted for settlement to the courts, e.g. Wyoming vs. Colorado, decided by United States Supreme Court June 5, 1922, after eleven years of argument.

RATIFICATION:

This Compact, to become operative, must be ratified by all the legislatures of the seven States and approved by the Federal Congress. This it is anticipated will be done within the next three months as the State legislatures are now in session.

FAILURE OF RATIFICATION MEANS BLOCKADE OF DEVELOPMENT:

Delay in the ratification of this Compact by any one of the seven States leaves the road still open for litigation with the resultant blockade of this great national asset for a generation at least.
The big thing about the Colorado River Compact is that it breaks the blockade on development of the whole river. It allows us all to get ahead with river development and with flood protection to the Imperial and Yuma Valleys.

The worst thing about the compact is that it will destroy much oratory. It makes for growing spuds and not for glowing speech.

One can get great emotion over conflict and quarrel, but there is no great oratory about the fact that the northern basin is separated from the southern basin by a thousand miles of barren canyon; that the agriculture and economic life of the two basins are wholly different, and that the logical thing is to divide the water between them so they can make homes instead of defend injunctions.

Nor can one make great oratory out of the fact that there is ample water and to spare after the apportionment of enough water to each basin in perpetuity to cover all of the present uses plus all of the known feasible projects, plus 20 per cent for good measure, then holding in reserve 20 per cent for 40 years to see where it is most needed. There is nothing sensational about a compact that leaves all question of Mexican rights to water to the State Department, which is the only organ of the American people which has any right to deal with it.
There is nothing especially romantic about the provisions in the compact for complete priority of agriculture over power forever in the use of water of this river.

Yet, behind all the precise and commonplace language of this compact lies the greatness and romance of the West, the building of a million more homes out under the blue sky in security and good will.

The compact has a side interest, for with the exception of two other cases, and these only between two States, this compact marks the first time that a considerable number of States have settled fundamental interstate rights by process of treaty instead of resort to the Supreme Court.
STATEMENT BY ARTHUR P. DAVIS, DIRECTOR,
U. S. RECLAMATION SERVICE, DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
ON THE COLORADO RIVER COMPACT.

The unanimous agreement by the Colorado River Commission
upon the details of a compact for the Division of Uses and
Protection of Rights to the use of the waters of the Colorado
River and its Tributaries is a signal victory for those qualities
and impulses which distinguish the civilized man from the savage.
It will obviate the delay and the acrimonious litigations which
a year ago seemed imminent and has cleared the way for the
provision of flood control and irrigation storage urgently needed
and indispensable to further development in the Colorado River
Basin. The original contentions of the seven States were so far
apart that an agreement seemed hopeless, but a discussion of the
various needs led to closer acquaintance with the facts and the
various points of view, and the conclusions may be said to award
to each claimant more than he expected. In view of the original
contentions, the satisfactory settlement of all these disputes
at small expense within a year after the organization of the
Commission is in strong contrast to the alternative of litigation.
The recent decision of the Supreme Court in the Wyoming–Colorado
case was rendered about eleven years after its inception and
dealt only with a single controversy in a small stream basin.
The Colorado Basin lies in seven States in which thousands of
users are diverting its waters. Its development involves some of
the largest and most difficult engineering problems ever
attempted, and a multitude of complicated interests and possible
disputes which have been settled within eleven months instead of eleven years. All good citizens should rejoice in this substitution of reason and progress for conflict and stagnation.

This happy result is due largely to the broad-minded attitude of the members of the Commission, and especially to the patience, tact, and diplomatic ability of the Chairman of the Commission, Hon. Herbert Hoover.

The natural flow of the Colorado River averages nearly 20,000,000 acre-feet per annum. Of this, about one-third is now used, and this includes the low-water flow in the lower basin which can not further develop safely without storage. The present users in the lower basin take about 3,700,000 acre-feet. The compact awards this portion of the basin a total annual flow of 8,500,000 acre-feet, or more than double its present needs and sufficient to develop all feasible projects and some of doubtful feasibility. The upper basin is awarded 7,500,000 acre-feet, which is also more than double its present needs and sufficient to serve nearly 3,000,000 acres additional, which will be sufficient for all feasible projects and some of doubtful feasibility. If this water is not consumed in irrigation, it will run down through the canyons for use below. There remains an apportioned quantity of over 4,000,000 acre-feet for future division as unforeseen needs may appear. Such a further division is provided for in the compact. Thus both basins are fully provided for, their present development protected, and their future development unhampered by water disputes.
RESOLUTION OF COLORADO RIVER COMMISSION
CONCERNING FLOOD CONTROL FOR PROTECTION OF IMPERIAL
AND PALO VERDE VALLEYS AND YUMA PROJECT.

The Colorado River Commission at its 27th meeting, held
November 24, 1922, adopted the following resolution concerning
flood control:

The members of the Colorado River Commission have had
constantly before them the great menace by annual floods to the
lives and property of the people of the Imperial and Palo Verde
Valleys in California, and the Yuma Valley in Arizona, and the
anxiety of their thousands of citizens.

Therefore, they earnestly recommend and urge the early
construction of works in the Colorado River to control the floods
and permanently avoid the menace, such construction to be made
subject to the Colorado River Compact.

(1b)
HISTORY OF COLORADO RIVER COMMISSION UP TO TIME OF
SANTA FE MEETING, AND IMPORTANT FACTS REGARDING ENGINEERING
AND IRRIGATION POSSIBILITIES OF THE RIVER.

The Colorado Basin lies mostly in American territory, where
it embraces 242,000 square miles. It also includes some 2,000
square miles of Mexican territory. The American section of the
basin takes in portions of seven States—the southwestern corner
of Wyoming, the western half of Colorado, the eastern half and
southwest corner of Utah, a portion of the western half of New
Mexico, the southeastern corner of Nevada, practically all of
Arizona, and the southeastern part of California. The Mexican
section takes in portions of the states of Sonora and Lower
California.

The problem of the Colorado has two main phases—legal and
engineering—the last mentioned being subdivided into flood
control, irrigation, and power. It is national in its scope, for
the projects involved are of great magnitude, and the river
itself is interstate, international, and navigable. In addition,
the Federal Government has a peculiar interest in the development,
as large areas of public lands, now desert, can be brought under
irrigation and made to yield a profitable return.

This question is to-day receiving more than ordinary atten-
tion, due to the fact that the Federal Government and the seven
interested States appointed, on the initiative of Colorado, a
Commission to prepare a compact for the apportionment between
the States of the waters of the river.
Attention has also been focused on the questions involved by the introduction in Congress of a bill for the construction of the world's largest dam at or near Boulder Canyon, or its extension, Black Canyon, in the northwestern corner of Arizona, on the Arizona-Nevada border.

For purposes of convenience, the Colorado River Basin may be divided into three main sections—the upper, the middle, and the lower reaches of the river.

The first or upper section lies above the Arizona-Utah boundary. Generally speaking, the topography is rugged; the slope of land steep; the valley beds comparatively narrow; the irrigable acreage lies in both large and spotted areas, and the reservoir sites, although more numerous, have individually smaller capacity and potential power development than in the middle reaches of the basin. In this 900 miles the river drops some 3,500 feet.

On the irrigated lands are found to-day fine cattle, sugar beets, potatoes, fodder, garden truck, small fruits, and orchards of deciduous fruits.

This section, although comprising but 96,000 square miles, or 39 per cent of the total drainage area, furnishes an average of 15,000,000 acre-feet,¹ or 87 per cent of the total average discharge of the river as recorded at Yuma, Arizona. In view of the claims of the various States, it is interesting to note the fact that the upper States are the large contributors and have at

---

¹An acre-foot of water is the amount of water required to cover an acre of land one foot deep.
the present time, compared with their ultimate needs, relatively smaller immediate uses for the water of the river, although, when more fully developed, some fifty or a hundred years hence, their demands will materially increase.

The records of the Reclamation Service of the United States Department of the Interior show that there are some million and a half acres already irrigated in this section and that another two million and a half acres are susceptible of being put under water. The four States of this section—Colorado, New Mexico, Utah, and Wyoming—claim that they have under irrigation 1,495,000 acres and that their additional acreage ultimately susceptible of irrigation amounts to 4,300,000 acres. There is also a slight difference between the estimates of the Reclamation Service and those of the States as to the amount of water actually required to irrigate each acre of land.

In this section are found eight of the lesser reservoir sites of the basin. These sites are capable of developing some 2,000,000 horsepower, or about one-third of the potential power on the river. When built, they will serve to stabilize the flow of the river so that the waters may be used for irrigation of additional acreage. They will also operate to a certain extent as flood control and at the same time would increase the capacity of the water-power sites in the canyon section of the middle reaches of the river.

This section of the river is half-and-half an irrigation and a power project, although for the moment irrigation is the more important.
The middle reaches of the river, which extend from the Arizona-Utah border to the mouth of Bill Williams Creek on the Arizona-California boundary, a distance by the river of about 500 miles, contains the high-walled canyon region of the basin. In this distance the river drops some 3,000 feet.

This section, which comprises about 77,000 square miles, or 32 per cent of the basin, contributes but a small percentage of the total discharge of the river.

Owing to the contour of the land, there is probably but little acreage which is susceptible of irrigation from the main river, although the Little Colorado River in Arizona and the Virgin River and its tributaries in Utah and Nevada have some 250,000 acres of land actually under irrigation or that may be put under water. In this section are found practically all the agricultural products of the upper reaches, together with some of those found in the lower reaches.

As the irrigation possibilities are small and as there are latent here some 4,000,000 horsepower, this section is primarily a power proposition.

In this section are many dam sites, three of which have been investigated—Lee Ferry, Diamond Creek, and Boulder Canyon. At two of these sites, Lee Ferry and Boulder Canyon, the possibilities of building dams far larger than any now in existence are under consideration. Progressing down the river the first of these great sites is found at Lee Ferry, in Glen Canyon, at which point it is thought possible to build a dam 600 feet high, capable of storing 30,000,000 acre-feet of water and developing
600,000 horsepower. This dam would have as its primary purpose the generation of power, as there is little irrigable land immediately below it. It could also exert an influence on flood control and equalization of the flow of the river for irrigation of lands in the lower reaches, but this could be more effectively done by a dam nearer to the land which is to be protected from the floods and which is susceptible of irrigation. Some 250 miles farther down the river the second large proposed reservoir site is found at or near Boulder or Black Canyons. This dam, if built to its full height of 600 feet above present low-water level, would store some 31,400,000 acre-feet of water and develop 700,000 primary horsepower, while, if built to a height of 550 feet above present low-water level, would store 26,500,000 acre-feet and develop 600,000 primary horsepower after due allowance has been made for the irrigation requirements. Between these two large sites are possible sites of relatively small importance but which would be utilized for concentrating head, development of power, and regulation of the load. Among these is the Diamond Creek site, where a power dam, which will create but little storage, is under present consideration as a medium of furnishing cheap power, which is greatly needed by the Arizona mining districts.

The third section, or lower reaches of the river, comprises that portion of the basin in the southern half of Arizona and the southeastern portion of California, east and south of the Sierra Nevadas, where the Palo Verde, Coachella, and Imperial Valleys lie. This area, which includes about 69,000 square miles, or 29 per cent of the basin, contributes about 6 per cent of the
discharge, the majority of this coming from the Gila River in Arizona, on whose tributary, the Salt River, is the Roosevelt Dam.\footnote{The Roosevelt Dam, which has helped to transform Phoenix from a hamlet of 5,000 to the present modern and flourishing city of about 30,000 inhabitants, is 230 feet high and impounds 1,365,000 acre-feet, small in size compared to the dams proposed at Boulder and Black Canyons and Lee Ferry, and in the benefits that will accrue.} In this stretch of some 300 miles the main river drops but about 500 feet.

The land here, generally speaking, lies in large concentrated level blocks. The climate is more gentle, almost semitropical, thus permitting continuous agricultural operations throughout the year. It is economically easier of development. All this means that it will go ahead much faster than the more broken lands of the uppermost States with their harsher and more rigorous weather and their shorter growing seasons.

This section is primarily an irrigation project, as the power potentialities are relatively small when compared with the upper and middle reaches of the river. There are grown on the irrigated lands fodder, garden truck, long staple cotton, and citrus fruits.

In this section the Reclamation Service estimates that there are under irrigation to-day approximately a million acres and that slightly over a million more acres are susceptible of irrigation. While the estimates of the two States of Arizona and California and that of the Reclamation Service as to present irrigated areas are in practical accord, the estimates of the two States as to additional area susceptible of irrigation show an excess of some
four hundred thousand acres over those of the Federal service.

Records of the Geological Survey made over a period of nine years at Yuma, Arizona, about 10 miles above the Mexican line, show the annual average discharge of the Colorado River and all its tributaries to be about 17,300,000 acre-feet. The range of flow has been from 9,870,000 acre-feet in 1903-04 to 26,100,000 acre-feet in 1908-09. Frequently the discharge falls below 5,000 cubic feet per second, while in flood seasons the discharge sometimes surpasses 200,000 cubic feet per second. This flow or discharge, of course, shows the approximate quantity of water at present available to develop power and to irrigate lands susceptible of irrigation in the basin above Yuma and the new and old lands in California, which diverts its water below Yuma.

It is the opinion of those who have studied the question that there is sufficient water to meet the irrigation needs of all the States and, at the same time, to develop 6,000,000 horse-power provided proper reservoirs for storage are built. Such reservoirs would overcome the present variability of flow, and would not only be of benefit to the States in the lower basin, but would be of assistance to the States in the upper basin in that, during years of low run-off, the upper States could utilize to the fullest possible extent the entire discharge, if necessary, without damage to the lower States, which could draw upon the surplus water impounded.

At the present time the normal low-water flow of the river is practically all absorbed. The necessity of a control reservoir, if for no other reason than to permit further development of the river, is recognized by all.
As to where the storage shall be effected—there are advocates of building dams simultaneously at several of the lesser reservoir sites in the upper basin. There are advocates of constructing one large reservoir at Lee Ferry. There are advocates of placing a large dam at or near Boulder Canyon or its continuation, Black Canyon. Any dam to be economically feasible must be constructed at the point where the three purposes for its construction—flood control, irrigation, and power—are best accomplished. The Boulder Canyon or Black Canyon sites, according to present available information, seem to answer these purposes more completely than any other large reservoir sites, in that they control more tributaries of the main river than any other of the sites under consideration, thereby giving better flood protection; they are nearer to the largest concentrated area of irrigable lands and those which will come under development the most rapidly, and are nearer to the largest present power markets, namely, Southern California, the mining districts of Arizona, Nevada, and Utah, and the greatest number of railways. In addition, construction materials could be more easily brought to these sites, as they are closer to existing railways, forty miles, as compared with Lee Ferry, which is one hundred and forty miles from the Santa Fe Railroad.

Probably the most urgent of the engineering aspects of the problems involved in the Colorado River Basin is that of flood control for the protection of the Imperial, Coachella, and Palo Verde Valleys in Southern California from the spring floods of the main river and the winter flash floods of the Gila River.
To relieve this situation, and in accordance with recommendations of the Reclamation Service of the U. S. Department of the Interior, Representative Swing, of California, on April 25, 1922, introduced a bill in Congress asking for authorization of an appropriation of $70,000,000. Fifty millions of this amount is to be spent by the Federal Government for the construction by it of a dam at Boulder Canyon or Black Canyon which will act not only as a flood control, but will be a source of income by generating some 600,000 horsepower, and making possible the irrigation of over a million acres of land in Nevada, Arizona, and California. The balance of $20,000,000 is to go toward Federal construction of an All-American Canal which will divert the water at Laguna Dam and lead it to the Imperial Valley entirely through American territory. This will relieve the valley and its American citizens from practically the entire maintenance of the present International Canal which diverts the water at Hanlon Heading below Yuma, takes it through American territory for a short distance, then passes into Mexico and back again to the American side of the line. The Federal Government, it is estimated, will, in about forty years, be reimbursed for these projects by the sale of power and by fees charged for delivery of the water to the irrigated lands.

Hearings have been held on this bill before the House Committee on Irrigation of Arid Lands.\(^1\) Delegations from California appeared in support of the bill as drawn. Secretary Hoover, Chairman of the Colorado River Commission, likewise testified.

\(^1\)This bill is still before the Committee (Jan. 15, 1923), pending action by the States on the compact.
urging, because of the emergent situation, immediate legislative action for the construction of the dam provided proper clauses were inserted in the bill preserving the present legal status and rights of the seven States and providing that no priority rights as against the upper States be created by the dam itself.

The hearings developed on the part of the upper basin States certain opposition to the construction of the dam on the ground that the Colorado River Commission, which had under consideration the question of partition of the waters of the river among the seven States, had not reached its final conclusions and also on the ground that under the interstate priority rule recently established in the case of Wyoming vs. Colorado, the dam at Boulder Canyon might create as against them and their appropriators a prior water right for the full amount of the water impounded. When it is realized that the dam at Boulder Canyon would store more than a year and one-half's average flow of the river it will be seen that the creation of such a right would prevent further development in the upper reaches.

The recent unanimous decision of the United States Supreme Court in the case of Wyoming vs. Colorado, handed down in June, 1922, by Justice Van Devanter, has added a new chapter to the law on water rights in the arid West.

The Western law varies from the water law of the humid East, where the common-law doctrine of riparian rights prevails. This latter doctrine in general terms is that he who owns land adjacent to a stream owns to the thread of the stream, is entitled to the natural flow of the stream by his lands, and, if using the water,
must use it on lands adjacent to the stream.

In the old mining days another doctrine was initiated in the West. A man desiring to secure water for washing out his gold went to the nearest stream, dug his ditch and led the water to his claim which might or might not be adjacent to the stream. He applied a certain number of second or acre-feet to a beneficial use, namely, for mining or for domestic or for irrigation purposes. By this application he acquired a prior or absolute title or right to the use of the quantity of water so applied and no one could come upon the stream at a later date and appropriate waters therefrom so as to interfere with the right so acquired. The doctrine of law dealing with this right is called "the doctrine of prior appropriation," which is that he who is first in time is first in right.

This doctrine of prior appropriation has for some time been pretty generally recognized by the arid land States as applying between appropriators within the boundaries of a given State.

The question of the rights of appropriators in different States to the waters of an interstate stream has never been definitely settled until the recent decision in Wyoming vs. Colorado, although the Supreme Court did treat this question in an earlier leading case, Kansas vs. Colorado, 206 U. S. 46, "wherein the relative rights of the two States, the United States, certain Kansas riparians and certain Colorado appropriators and users in and to the waters of the Arkansas River, an interstate stream, were thought to be involved." In the Wyoming-Colorado case, brought by the former State to prevent diversions by appropriators
in the latter State out of the basin of the Laramie River, which rises in Colorado, the following principles were recognized by the U. S. Supreme Court:

(1) That, as between appropriators on an interstate stream flowing through two States both of which recognize the doctrine of prior appropriation within their boundaries, the rule of "first in time is first in right" shall apply regardless of State lines.

(2) That, where two States both recognize the principle of diversion of water from one watershed to another within their boundaries, one of these States could not object to such diversion by appropriators within the other State.

(3) That the State within whose boundaries an interstate stream originates, can not utilize the waters of such stream as she chooses regardless of any prejudice that such use may work to others having rights in the stream beyond her boundary, as a river throughout its course in both States is but a single stream.

(4) Distinguishes the case from that of Kansas vs. Colorado, which applied the doctrine of equitable apportionment on the ground that the latter case was between two States which recognized different doctrines—Kansas following the riparian theory, while Colorado employed the doctrine of prior appropriation—while in the Wyoming-Colorado case both States recognize the doctrine of prior appropriation.

This case has been gone into more or less fully because of the similarity of questions involved to those affecting the Colorado River and because of the importance of the decision with regard to the rights of the seven States to the Colorado waters.
To-day all seven States of the basin recognize within their boundaries the doctrine of prior appropriation, with the possible exception of California, which recognizes both the riparian and appropriation doctrines, but which contends that the doctrine of priority is applied to the Colorado waters used within her boundaries for beneficial use.

These were some of the conflicting and complex questions confronting the Colorado River Commission at the time of the Santa Fe meeting. This Commission was created by legislative action of the seven States of the basin in 1921. It was recognized by the seven States at that time that the low-water flow of the river was practically appropriated and that the way was open for endless litigation respecting rights to the water of the river—endless litigation which might tie up for years to come further development of the untold latent wealth of the basin as it had done for the past ten years in the case of the Laramie River. To avoid just such delays the Commission was appointed to apportion the waters of the river among the several States—primarily a legal question, yet one involving the careful study of the complicated irrigation and engineering features of the basin. As the Constitution of the United States contains a clause forbidding the States of the Union to enter into an agreement inter se without its consent, it was necessary for the Federal Government to give its approval to the proposed negotiations. This was done in August, 1921, by legislation authorizing the negotiations, providing for the appointment of a representative who should par-
participate in the negotiations to protect the interests of the Federal Government and specifying that the negotiations between the States should be terminated by January 1, 1923.

The President in December, 1921, appointed Secretary Hoover as Federal Representative. The first meetings of the Commission were held in Washington in late January, 1922. At these meetings, at which Secretary Hoover was elected permanent Chairman of the Commission, and after serious discussion of various forms of compact, it was decided that before reaching a definite determination it would be best to hold a series of hearings in the seven States, where the viewpoints of the different States could be heard at first hand by the Commissioners.

Accordingly, hearings were held in March and April at Phoenix, Arizona; Los Angeles, California; Salt Lake City, Utah; Grand Junction and Denver, Colorado; and Cheyenne, Wyoming. On completion of these hearings the Commissioners desired further time in which to study the records and agreed to adjourn to meet again in early November at Santa Fe, New Mexico. At this meeting the Colorado River Compact was signed under date of November 24, 1922.
COLORADO RIVER COMPACT.

The States of Arizona, California, Colorado, Nevada, New Mexico, Utah, and Wyoming, having resolved to enter into a compact under the Act of the Congress of the United States of America approved August 10, 1921 (42 Statutes at Large, Page 771), and the Acts of the Legislatures of the said States, have through their Governors appointed as their Commissioners:

W. S. Norrall for the State of Arizona,
W. W. Harrington for the State of California,
J. C. Bogueham for the State of Nevada,
Stephen H. Davis, Jr., for the State of New Mexico,
H. K. Caldwell for the State of Colorado.

Frank G. Coe, Commissioner for the State of Arizona,
W. E. Molitor, Commissioner for the State of California,
W. E. Genebra, Commissioner for the State of Colorado,
Mr. Commissioner for the State of Nevada,
Mr. Commissioner for the State of New Mexico.

SIGNED AT SANTA FE, NEW MEXICO

NOVEMBER 24, 1922

Commissioner of the Interior of Commerce

The major purposes of this compact are to provide an equitable division and apportionment of the use of the waters of the Colorado River System; to establish the relative importance of different beneficial uses of water; to promote interstate commerce; to remove causes of present and future controversies; and to secure the expeditious, agricultural, and industrial development of the Colorado River Basin, the storage of its waters, and the protection of life and property from floods. To these ends the Colorado River Basin is divided into two Basins, and an apportionment of the use of part of the water of the Colorado River System is made to each of them with the provision that further equitable apportionments may be made.

Article II.

As used in this compact:

(a) The term "Colorado River System" means that portion of the Colorado River and its tributaries within the United States of America.
COLORADO RIVER COMMISSION.

HERBERT HOOVER, Chairman.

W. S. NORVELL, Commissioner for the State of Arizona.
W. F. McCURIE, Commissioner for the State of California.
DELM E. CARPENTER, Commissioner for the State of Colorado.
J. G. SCRUGHAM, Commissioner for the State of Nevada.
STEPHEN B. DAVIS, Jr., Commissioner for the State of New Mexico.
R. E. CALDWELL, Commissioner for the State of Utah.
FRANK C. EMERSON, Commissioner for the State of Wyoming.
CLARENCE C. STETSON, Executive Secretary, Department of Commerce,
Washington, D. C.
COLORADO RIVER COMPACT.

The States of Arizona, California, Colorado, Nevada, New Mexico, Utah, and Wyoming, having resolved to enter into a compact under the Act of the Congress of the United States of America approved August 19, 1921 (42 Statutes at Large, Page 171), and the Acts of the Legislatures of the said States, have through their Governors appointed as their Commissioners:

W. S. Norviel for the State of Arizona,
W. F. McClure for the State of California,
Delph E. Carpenter for the State of Colorado,
J. G. Scruigham for the State of Nevada,
Stephen B. Davis, jr., for the State of New Mexico,
R. E. Caldwell for the State of Utah,
Frank C. Emerson for the State of Wyoming,

who, after negotiations participated in by Herbert Hoover appointed by The President as the representative of the United States of America, have agreed upon the following articles:

ARTICLE I.

The major purposes of this compact are to provide for the equitable division and apportionment of the use of the waters of the Colorado River System; to establish the relative importance of different beneficial uses of water; to promote interstate comity; to remove causes of present and future controversies; and to secure the expeditious agricultural and industrial development of the Colorado River Basin, the storage of its waters, and the protection of life and property from floods. To these ends the Colorado River Basin is divided into two Basins, and an apportionment of the use of part of the water of the Colorado River System is made to each of them with the provision that further equitable apportionments may be made.

ARTICLE II.

As used in this compact:

(a) The term "Colorado River System" means that portion of the Colorado River and its tributaries within the United States of America.
(b) The term "Colorado River Basin" means all of the drainage area of the Colorado River System and all other territory within the United States of America to which the waters of the Colorado River System shall be beneficially applied.

(c) The term "States of the Upper Division" means the States of Colorado, New Mexico, Utah, and Wyoming.

(d) The term "States of the Lower Division" means the States of Arizona, California, and Nevada.

(e) The term "Lee Ferry" means a point in the main stream of the Colorado River one mile below the mouth of the Paria River.

(f) The term "Upper Basin" means those parts of the States of Arizona, Colorado, New Mexico, Utah, and Wyoming within and from which waters naturally drain into the Colorado River System above Lee Ferry, and also all parts of said States located without the drainage area of the Colorado River System which are now or shall hereafter be beneficially served by waters diverted from the System above Lee Ferry.

(g) The term "Lower Basin" means those parts of the States of Arizona, California, Nevada, New Mexico, and Utah within and from which waters naturally drain into the Colorado River System below Lee Ferry, and also all parts of said States located without the drainage area of the Colorado River System which are now or shall hereafter be beneficially served by waters diverted from the System below Lee Ferry.

(h) The term "domestic use" shall include the use of water for household, stock, municipal, mining, milling, industrial, and other like purposes, but shall exclude the generation of electrical power.

**ARTICLE III.**

(a) There is hereby apportioned from the Colorado River System in perpetuity to the Upper Basin and to the Lower Basin respectively the exclusive beneficial consumptive use of 7,500,000 acre feet of water per annum, which shall include all water necessary for the supply of any rights which may now exist.

(b) In addition to the apportionment in paragraph (a), the Lower Basin is hereby given the right to increase its beneficial consumptive use of such waters by one million acre feet per annum.

(c) If, as a matter of international comity, the United States of America shall hereafter recognize in the United States of Mexico any right to the use of any waters of the Colorado River System, such waters shall be supplied first from the waters which are surplus over and above the aggregate of the quantities specified in paragraphs (a) and (b); and if such surplus shall prove insufficient for this purpose, then, the burden of such deficiency shall be equally borne by the Upper Basin and the Lower Basin, and whenever neces-
sary the States of the Upper Division shall deliver at Lee Ferry water to supply one-half of the deficiency so recognized in addition to that provided in paragraph (d).

(d) The States of the Upper Division will not cause the flow of the river at Lee Ferry to be depleted below an aggregate of 75,000,000 acre feet for any period of ten consecutive years reckoned in continuing progressive series beginning with the first day of October next succeeding the ratification of this compact.

(e) The States of the Upper Division shall not withhold water, and the States of the Lower Division shall not require the delivery of water, which can not reasonably be applied to domestic and agricultural uses.

(f) Further equitable apportionment of the beneficial uses of the waters of the Colorado River System unapportioned by paragraphs (a), (b), and (c) may be made in the manner provided in paragraph (g) at any time after October first, 1963, if and when either Basin shall have reached its total beneficial consumptive use as set out in paragraphs (a) and (b).

(g) In the event of a desire for a further apportionment as provided in paragraph (f) any two signatory States, acting through their Governors, may give joint notice of such desire to the Governors of the other signatory States and to The President of the United States of America, and it shall be the duty of the Governors of the signatory States and of The President of the United States of America forthwith to appoint representatives, whose duty it shall be to divide and apportion equitably between the Upper Basin and Lower Basin the beneficial use of the unapportioned water of the Colorado River System as mentioned in paragraph (f), subject to the legislative ratification of the signatory States and the Congress of the United States of America.

ARTICLE IV.

(a) Inasmuch as the Colorado River has ceased to be navigable for commerce and the reservation of its waters for navigation would seriously limit the development of its Basin, the use of its waters for purposes of navigation shall be subservient to the uses of such waters for domestic, agricultural, and power purposes. If the Congress shall not consent to this paragraph, the other provisions of this compact shall nevertheless remain binding.

(b) Subject to the provisions of this compact, water of the Colorado River System may be impounded and used for the generation of electrical power, but such impounding and use shall be subservient to the use and consumption of such water for agricultural and domestic purposes and shall not interfere with or prevent use for such dominant purposes.
(c) The provisions of this article shall not apply to or interfere with the regulation and control by any State within its boundaries of the appropriation, use, and distribution of water.

ARTICLE V.

The chief official of each signatory State charged with the administration of water rights, together with the Director of the United States Reclamation Service and the Director of the United States Geological Survey shall cooperate, ex officio:

(a) To promote the systematic determination and coordination of the facts as to flow, appropriation, consumption, and use of water in the Colorado River Basin, and the interchange of available information in such matters.

(b) To secure the ascertainment and publication of the annual flow of the Colorado River at Lee Ferry.

(c) To perform such other duties as may be assigned by mutual consent of the signatories from time to time.

ARTICLE VI.

Should any claim or controversy arise between any two or more of the signatory States: (a) with respect to the waters of the Colorado River System not covered by the terms of this compact; (b) over the meaning or performance of any of the terms of this compact; (c) as to the allocation of the burdens incident to the performance of any article of this compact or the delivery of waters as herein provided; (d) as to the construction or operation of works within the Colorado River Basin to be situated in two or more States, or to be constructed in one State for the benefit of another State; or (e) as to the diversion of water in one State for the benefit of another State; the Governors of the States affected, upon the request of one of them, shall forthwith appoint Commissioners with power to consider and adjust such claim or controversy, subject to ratification by the Legislatures of the States so affected.

Nothing herein contained shall prevent the adjustment of any such claim or controversy by any present method or by direct future legislative action of the interested States.

ARTICLE VII.

Nothing in this compact shall be construed as affecting the obligations of the United States of America to Indian tribes.

ARTICLE VIII.

Present perfected rights to the beneficial use of waters of the Colorado River System are unimpaired by this compact. Whenever storage capacity of 5,000,000 acre-feet shall have been provided on
the main Colorado River within or for the benefit of the Lower Basin, then claims of such rights, if any, by appropriators or users of water in the Lower Basin against appropriators or users of water in the Upper Basin shall attach to and be satisfied from water that may be stored not in conflict with Article III.

All other rights to beneficial use of waters of the Colorado River System shall be satisfied solely from the water apportioned to that Basin in which they are situate.

Article IX.

Nothing in this compact shall be construed to limit or prevent any State from instituting or maintaining any action or proceeding, legal or equitable, for the protection of any right under this compact or the enforcement of any of its provisions.

Article X.

This compact may be terminated at any time by the unanimous agreement of the signatory States. In the event of such termination all rights established under it shall continue unimpaired.

Article XI.

This compact shall become binding and obligatory when it shall have been approved by the Legislatures of each of the signatory States and by the Congress of the United States. Notice of approval by the Legislatures shall be given by the Governor of each signatory State to the Governors of the other signatory States and to the President of the United States, and the President of the United States is requested to give notice to the Governors of the signatory States of approval by the Congress of the United States.

In Witness Whereof, the Commissioners have signed this compact in a single original, which shall be deposited in the archives of the Department of State of the United States of America and of which a duly certified copy shall be forwarded to the Governor of each of the signatory States.

Done at the City of Santa Fe, New Mexico, this twenty-fourth day of November, A. D. One Thousand Nine Hundred and Twenty-two.

W. S. Norvill.
W. F. McClure.
Delph E. Carpenter.
J. G. Scrugham.
Stephen B. Davis, Jr.
R. E. Caldwell.
Frank C. Emerson.

Approved:
Herbert Hoover.
THE AREA AFFECTED BY THE COLORADO RIVER PROJECT

Hundreds of thousands of acres of arid land will be made into fertile farms by the development of the Colorado River, and great hydro-electric plants will distribute power from Los Angeles to Denver.