EVIDENTLY THE POISON SQUAD HAVE WIRED YOU ABOUT BOULDER DAM YOU NEED
HAVE NO FEAR BUT WHAT YOUR STAND WILL BE PROTECTED HEARST PAPERS AND
SWING PLAYING DIRTY POLITICS THATS WHY WE ARE WORRYING THEM IN COMMITTEE
DENVER MAYOR WIRED YESTERDAY HE HAD BETTER KEEP HIS FINGER OUT OF PIE

E O LEATHERWOOD
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Mr. Delph E. Carpenter,
Greeley, Colorado.

My dear Mr. Carpenter:

Your wire of the twelfth instant just received.

Evidently the Swing crowd have wired you an alarming story. The facts are that Congress is not going to take up Colorado River legislation at this session and the further fact is that that being the case it is not to the interest and harmony to have this bill reported out of the committee only to find that when the administration is ready to act that we may have a different scheme altogether.

In strict confidence, I know the President has a different plan in his head right now.

We are worrying Swing and his crowd in the committee, but I assure you that the fundamental articles of protection which you so carefully worked out will be adhered to in the last analysis. In other words, when this bill goes to the House you will not be ashamed of the child. Do not get alarmed at what you may see in the press. Before anything was done whatever to antagonize the California bunch they tried to start a dirty little fight on me and my district. Now I propose to give them all of the fight they want because the Government is not ready to go ahead and we might just as well entertain them if they are looking for a scrap.

Yesterday the Mayor of Denver sent a very urgent wire. I presume that he was requested to do so by our mutual friend. If Mr. Mayor don't keep his finger out of the pie he may find that he has a hold of the hot end of the poker. I shall do everything that Bannister would do to protect Denver and her water supply, but reporting this bill out is not hastening the event. In my judgment,

Denver will get water quicker if she lets her friends in Washington handle this matter according to their best judgment. If the reporting of this bill is not forced at this time I feel confident that Arizona is going to come in and I have about reached the conclusion that there is not going to be any development on the river without a law-suit until the Seven-State Compact is ratified.

With kind personal regards, I am,

Yours very truly,

E. O. LEATHERWOOD.
January 28, 1930.

Hon. Delph E. Carpenter,
Care Colorado River Conference,
Reno, Nevada.

Dear Mr. Carpenter:

I have read your letter dated January 18, 1930, to the Secretary of the Interior, carried in full in the Arizona Republican yesterday, and wish to express my appreciation of the masterly presentation of the Colorado river problem,

I know every citizen in Arizona, except the few remaining in the SKY*LINE crowd—and who are opposed to any kind of compact—will thank you for this clear exposé of the situation.

I would like to have the pleasure of expressing my appreciation to you personally, but since I cannot I hasten to do so by letter.

As always, with the highest esteem and best regards,

Sincerely,

C. O. Lewis.
Colorado Commissioner Cites Boulder Dam Practical Phases

Arizona's Rights Held Paramount

Fear that the practical phase of the Colorado river problem confronting the Secretary of the Interior will be a failure in obtaining revenue, has obscured the fundamental principles upon which the future storage of the river and the future navigation of the river, are expressed in a letter written to him by Mr. Carpenter, river commissioner from Colorado, and made public in Denver in close proximity to the tri-state Colorado river conference.

The letter was sent by Mr. Carpenter, river commissioner from Colorado, and made public in Denver in close proximity to the tri-state Colorado river conference.

The letter was sent by Secretary Wilbur relative to the sale of power at the Boulder dam canyons. The letter, requiring a solution of the 1912 Colorado river act, is as follows:

January 18, 1920.

Dear Sir:

Your letter of the 15th inst., in reply to the letter of December 4, 1919, from the commissioners for the States of Montana, Wyoming, Dacor, Utah and Nevada, relative to the sale of power for irrigating and industrial purposes to the metropolitan water district of California, for installation in the reservoir, was received and answer has been delayed, as it was understood that the committee of experts which you forwarded, but which has not arrived, is under the care of this department and the consent of these examining commissions, Mr. Carpenter says, are the proposers of the 1912 Colorado river act, as the basis upon which the law was passed by the United States in two of the three states.

The states, through the congress, enacted the act to provide for the sale of power and water with due regard to the states, it is the purpose of this letter to express the principles of the interior, dated January 13, 1920, as follows:

Arizona's Case

Arizona is wholly arid and water and water must be artificially supplied to make the land fruitful and to fill human wants. Much of this water must be pumped. Much power will be required for marketing and industrial purposes, and other purposes incident to the development of Arizona's land. There may be to 1,000 miles of canal or 1,000 miles of power. Water power is a more valuable resource.

Nevada offers a large proportion of the water supply of Arizona. The state is in process of development and requires both a large proportion of the power developed at Boulder and revenues from power.

Nevada, likewise, is an arid state, but rich in minerals requiring much power for development. There are no deposits of coal or oil. The state is dependent on water to the Colorado river which furnishes its water supply. Coal and petroleum are to the Colorado river are only two or two to two miles, and then the state is in process of development and requires both a large proportion of the power developed at Boulder and revenues from power.

Nevada's Needs

Nevada's needs are indicated by the fact that it is not feasible to sell power at more than 1.63 mills per kilowatt hour fixed by the secretary of the interior. Nevada is in process of development and requires both a large proportion of the power developed at Boulder and revenues from power.

Colorado's Needs

While the Colorado river forms the southeasterly boundary of California and furnishes a part of the water supply of the state, it is not feasible to sell power at more than 1.63 mills per kilowatt hour fixed by the secretary of the interior. Nevada is in process of development and requires both a large proportion of the power developed at Boulder and revenues from power.

The United States can ill afford to contract for the sale of power at a lower figure than 1.78 mills. The price would be a complete and pay for the project for the competition of other states.

Domestic Water

In his letter the secretary states that it is not feasible to sell power at more than 1.63 mills per kilowatt hour fixed by the secretary of the interior. Nevada is in process of development and requires both a large proportion of the power developed at Boulder and revenues from power.

Domestic Water

Nevada has ranged a great public service in offering to the people of the United States a contract for the purchase of one-third or all of the power at 1.63 mills per kilowatt hour fixed by the secretary of the interior. Nevada's water is sold in order upon the power to be sold for power. In other words, the power must be sold at 1.63 mills per kilowatt hour.

A thorough study of the condition of the Colorado river water supply and the conditions of the market shows that the cost of power at 1.63 mills per kilowatt hour is not feasible for the metropolitan water district.

The basis for federal action on the condition of the Colorado river water supply and the conditions of the market shows that the cost of power at 1.63 mills per kilowatt hour is not feasible for the metropolitan water district. The cost of power at 1.63 mills per kilowatt hour is not feasible for the metropolitan water district. The cost of power at 1.63 mills per kilowatt hour is not feasible for the metropolitan water district. The cost of power at 1.63 mills per kilowatt hour is not feasible for the metropolitan water district.
Be Ignored
Norvaio offers likewise the resistance of eminent exerts. This offer by a commonwealth of its citizens in this one side without violating the entire state’s power of power. To deny law to the state of higher and within the power of the state. To deny law to the state of higher and within the power of the state. To deny law to the state of higher and within the power of the state.

Solution Required
In the words, the problems requiring solution appear to be:

1. Protection of the rights of the other Colorado river states and particularly the states of Arizona and Nevada; and
2. Sale of power of water with good and beneficial intentions.

The states of Arizona and Nevada have the right to control in the sale of water and water rights. They have the right to control in the sale of water and water rights. They have the right to control in the sale of water and water rights.

The jurisdiction of the United States lies in connection with the flow of the Colorado river, except as modified by the Colorado river compact. The jurisdiction is greater than the jurisdiction respecting any other stream.
January 28, 1930.

Honorable Delph E. Carpenter
Greeley, Colorado

My dear Mr. Carpenter:

I beg leave to invite your attention to the accompanying resolution which I have introduced in the House of Representatives. For more than fifty years there has been discussion in this country about the centralization of government. During recent decades bureaucratic power has grown by leaps and bounds until Washington dominates, regulates and controls the nation even in the most intimate concerns of its citizens. Business is being spied upon and harassed by federal agents and subjected to countless unreasonable exactions. Local self-government is vanishing in the rush to "let Washington do it". America is becoming strongly and firmly centralized. Priceless rights and privileges which the forefathers intended to be exercised locally are being surrendered without a struggle into the vortex of federal authority. Government is being removed every day farther from home and fireside, instead of being left with the people where it belongs.

What can be done about it?

A great deal of good may result if we stop, look and listen. No harm can come if we pause and give to the subject the most earnest thought that can be bestowed upon it. The purpose of my resolution is not only to enlist the competent efforts of a commission composed of great legal experts and publicists in trying to find a solution, but also to throw the subject open for national discussion to the end that the people themselves may be considering whether their government, after more than seven score of years as a going concern, has veered so far in
the direction of centralized control that it would be wise now to undertake to redirect the course of government in a way that will guarantee to all future generations the sort of freedom and popular rule the forefathers envisioned. There is absolutely no politics about my resolution. Republicans and Democrats alike admit the facts about the trend of government. They concede that the federal authority is every year growing more supreme; that it is everywhere invading the provinces of the states and the local sub-divisions and that the constant enlargement of federal bureaucratic powers is serious. The only money outlay involved in this resolution is a trivial sum for expenses of the commission. No member of the commission is to be paid a salary, which is not likely in any wise to be a deterrent in securing the highest and best talent, as any man who might be chosen on a commission of such superlative importance would consider the call as an honor and would regard service as an obligation he owes to his country.

I hope the resolution will pass unanimously. If you can find time to send me a line stating your views on this matter, I will be very much obliged.

Sincerely yours,

[Signature]
February 4, 1930.

Hon. Louis Ludlow, M. C.,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

My dear Ludlow:

I am in receipt of yours of the 30th ult enclosing a copy of H. J. Res. 185. Needless to say, I am in hearty accord with the reasons prompting the resolution. I fear that the Commission method will prove inadequate. Commissions are getting very unpopular and are having less and less effect upon public sentiment. People are getting tired of Commissions and pay no attention to their findings.

I realize that one who criticises should be able to offer a substitute, which I am unable to do. If any method occurs to me, I will drop you a line.

If every Congressman and Senator would strike at every measure which undermines state autonomy, they would gradually awaken public sentiment. The "business men" of the country are largely responsible for the trend toward federal control. They care nothing for the Constitution and nothing for our principles of government. They want immediate results regardless of source or methods of procurement.

In the western states, water is the first essential to life and existence of government. Federal bureaucracy is undermining state control and the Attorney General is afraid to act. By one short executive order, the whole diabolical scheme could be annulled but he fears to act, although Attorney General Gregory originated the scheme without legislative authority. If the members of Congress would demand correction of this error upon the grounds of usurpation of state authority and were successful, the effect would be very beneficial in the inauguration of a general program of return to the Constitution. I believe more can be accomplished by proceeding step by step and getting actual results than can be accomplished by reports of Commissions.

I enclose herewith copies of two addressed dealing with this subject. Senator Key Pittman and Senator Karl Hayden can amplify the statements therein made.

Very truly yours,

[Signature]

Delph E. Carpenter.
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

JANUARY 6, 1930

Mr. Ludlow introduced the following joint resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Rules and ordered to be printed.

JOINT RESOLUTION

Creating a Commission on Centralization.

Whereas the year 1930 is the one hundred and forty-third anniversary of the adoption of the Constitution of the United States of America; and

Whereas it is a matter of common knowledge that during the seven score and three years of the existence of the Republic there has been a substantial and significant change in government in the direction of everincreasing centralization of power in departments, bureaus, and independent establishments at Washington; and

Whereas such eminent modern authorities as President Hoover, former President Calvin Coolidge, the late Woodrow Wilson, former Chief Justice Charles E. Hughes, Thomas A. Edison, and many others in positions to judge accurately have expressed concern over the trend of the times and have warned that an overshadowing bureaucracy is a menace to
free institutions, or, as President Hoover has expressed it, "unless the growing encroachment of Federal authority is checked it will ultimately break down our Government"; and

Whereas the Government of the United States is founded upon the idea that the individual is entitled to live his life and work out his destiny with a minimum of governmental interference and direction; and

Whereas many thoughtful persons of all political parties sincerely believe that in the submerging of local self-government and the vanishing rights of the States there is a danger signal that should not longer be disregarded: Therefore be it

1 Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives
2 of the United States of America in Congress assembled,
3 That a commission to be known as the Commission on Centralization is hereby created, to be composed of three Members of the House of Representatives to be appointed by the Speaker, three Members of the Senate to be chosen by the Vice President, and three outstanding authorities on constitutional law to be chosen by the President of the United States upon recommendation of the American Bar Association. The President of the United States shall designate the chairman of the commission. The life of the commission shall terminate when the commission makes its report to Congress. Any officer or employee of the United States may supply the commission with such information, relating to any matter under investigation or study by the commission and contained in the records of the office of such
officer or employee, as the commission may request. In administering this joint resolution the commission is authorized to make use, so far as consistent with the best interests of the public service, of agencies, officers, and employees of the executive branch of the Government. The members of the commission shall serve without pay. The commission may make such expenditures, including expenditures for actual traveling and subsistence expenses, for personal services at the seat of government and elsewhere, as are necessary for the efficient administration of its functions under this joint resolution. Expenses of the commission shall be allowed and paid upon the presentation of itemized vouchers therefor, approved by the chairman of the commission.

The duty of said commission shall be to consider centralization of government in all of its aspects and to report to the Speaker of the House and the President of the Senate not later than the opening of the regular session of Congress in December, 1931 (1) whether in its opinion the Government has departed from the concept of the founding fathers who wrote the Constitution of the United States and, if so, in what direction or directions; (2) what steps, if any, should be taken to restore the Government to its original purposes and sphere of activity as contemplated by the forefathers, whose lives and sacrifices established a free
and independent nation; and (3) whether or not it would be advisable to hold another constitutional convention to redistribute the powers of government in such a way as more clearly to delineate the limits of Federal power, counteract centralization, and to make secure to all coming generations the inestimable benefits and blessings of local self-government.

Referred to the Committee on Rules and ordered to be printed.

By Mr. Longut

Creating a Commission on Centralization.

January 6, 1839

71st Congress
2nd Session
H. J. Res. 185