

THE
COLORADO
RIVER
COMPACT

By
Reuel Leslie Olson

HD 1695
C 7
O 5
1926

The Colorado River Compact

Reuel Leslie Olson

A. M., J. D., Ph. D.

Professor of Law

*University of Southern California School of Law
Los Angeles, California*

Member of the California Bar

Officier d'Académie

THESIS

Submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the Degree of
Doctor of Philosophy
Division of History, Government, and Economics
Harvard University

CAMBRIDGE, MASSACHUSETTS

JUNE, 1926



PUBLISHED BY THE AUTHOR

SEPTEMBER, 1926

COPYRIGHT
1926

REUEL LESLIE OLSON

All rights reserved,
including that of translation into foreign languages

PUBLISHED BY THE AUTHOR

First Edition
Second Printing

Price \$8.00

NEUNER CORPORATION, LOS ANGELES

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PART I—TEXT

	PAGE
CHAPTER I—INTRODUCTION	1
A. Method of Approach.....	1
B. Physiography of the Colorado River Area.....	2
C. The Movement for Cooperation in Colorado River Development	8
CHAPTER II—ANALYSIS OF COMPACT.....	15
A. The Formative Process.....	16
B. Introductory Articles of the Compact.....	18
1. Objects of the Compact.....	18
2. Definition of Terms.....	20
C. Article III	22
1. The Seven Paragraphs.....	22
a. Apportionment Between the Basins.....	22
b. Lower Basin's Right to Increase Beneficial Con- sumptive Use	22
c. Ten-Year Period of Apportionment.....	22
d. Mexican Claims	22
e. Provision Against Hoarding.....	23
f. Method of Further Apportionment.....	23
2. The Question of Apportionment to States or to Basins	23
3. Discussion of Adequacy of Water Supply.....	24
4. Relative Rapidity of Development of Upper and Lower Basins	27
5. Background of 75,000,000 Acre-Feet Provision.....	28
a. Suggestions of Mr. John C. Hoyt.....	29
b. Discard of the 65-35 Per Cent Plan of Division..	30
6. Guaranteed Minimum Annual Flow Clause Tenta- tively Agreed Upon.....	33
7. Fifty Per Cent Basis of Division Proposed.....	34
8. "Exclusive Beneficial Consumptive Use".....	35
9. Mexican Claims Affecting Division Between the Basins	36
10. Storage Provisions	38
D. The Remaining Articles of the Compact.....	41
1. Article IV	41

	PAGE
2. Article V	41
3. Article VI	42
4. Article VII	43
5. Article VIII	43
6. Article IX.....	43
7. Article X	43
8. Article XI	44
CHAPTER III—ENGINEERING BACKGROUND.....	45
A. The Nature of the Problem.....	45
1. Compact Makes No Reference to Particular Projects	45
2. Relation of Type of Structure to Purposes Served..	45
3. The Question of Silt Control.....	45
4. Distances to Which Electrical Energy May Be Transmitted	46
B. Sufficient or Insufficient Data.....	46
C. Suggested Plans	48
1. A. P. Davis.....	49
2. Frank Weymouth	49
3. Colonel Kelly	50
4. E. C. LaRue.....	51
5. Secretary Work	52
6. G. E. P. Smith.....	52
7. Walter G. Clark.....	53
8. General Goethals	53
D. Engineering Difficulties and a Proposed Colorado River Authority	53
CHAPTER IV—ECONOMIC BACKGROUND.....	55
A. The Colorado River as an Economic Factor in National Life	55
B. Methods of Approach to Economic Problems in Colorado River Development.....	55
C. The Economic Basis of the Present System of Creating Water Rights.....	59
D. Other Bases of Division of the Water of an Interstate Stream	61
1. Irrigable Area	62
2. Contribution to Stream.....	62
3. Political Strength	62
4. Economic Use	62

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ix

	PAGE
CHAPTER V—CONSTITUTIONAL QUESTIONS.....	65
A. General Statement Concerning Interstate Compacts...	65
1. Resolution and Report of Committee of National Conference of Commissioners on Uniform State Laws	65
2. Charles Warren, "The Supreme Court and Sover- eign States"	69
3. Particular Compacts	70
4. The Colorado River Compact.....	71
a. Representatives of the States.....	71
b. Congressional Consent	71
c. Personnel	72
d. Preliminary Hearings	73
B. The Respective Spheres of Authority of the State and Federal Governments in the Control of the Use of Water in the Colorado River.....	73
1. The Wyoming v. Colorado Decision.....	75
a. Argument	76
b. Issues	76
c. Principles Affirmed	86
d. Inadequacies of the Wyoming v. Colorado De- cision	95
2. The Source of the Right to Use the Water of In- terstate Streams	97
a. The Hamele-Bannister Controversy.....	97
b. The California Doctrine.....	118
c. The Colorado Doctrine.....	120
d. The Nature of the Property Right in the Use of Percolating Water	128
C. Grounds of Federal Action.....	136
1. Navigability	136
2. Public Lands	139
3. Federal Power Commission.....	140
4. Reclamation Service	146
5. International Status	146
6. Interstate Status	148
7. Rivers and Harbors Act and Flood Control Act...149	
8. The Power of Eminent Domain and the Police Power of the Federal Government.....	151
D. Grounds of State Action.....	152
1. Regulation of Rates.....	155
2. Taxation	161

THE COLORADO RIVER COMPACT

	PAGE
E. Effect of the Compact.....	166
1. Upon Respective Spheres of Authority of Federal and State Governments.....	167
2. Upon System of Cooperation Between Federal and State Governments	169
3. Upon Property Rights in Appropriated and Unap- propriated Water	170
a. Vested Rights	170
b. Rights Created by the Compact.....	170
c. System of Creating New Water Rights.....	171
4. Upon Preferred Uses of Water.....	172
CHAPTER VI—POLITICAL ISSUES.....	175
A. Sectionalism	175
B. Political Issues between Public and Private Interests.....	177
C. The Mexican Situation.....	179
D. Political Issues between the Upper Basin and the Lower Basin	185
E. Political Issues between Separate States.....	188
F. Attempts at Coercion.....	190
CHAPTER VII—CONCLUSION	195
A. Creation of a Proposed Colorado River Authority.....	195
B. Its Relation to Engineering Problems in Colorado River Development	198
C. Its Relation to Economic Problems.....	199
D. Its Relation to Constitutional and Legal Questions....	200
E. Its Relation to Political Issues.....	203

PART II—APPENDICES

APPENDIX I

FAC-SIMILE AND PHOTOGRAPHS

Exhibit A—Fac-Simile of President Harding's Appointment of Herbert Hoover to Represent the United States in Colorado River Negotiations.....	215
Exhibit B—Photograph of the Colorado River Commission.....	216
Exhibit C—Photograph of Commissioners Upon Signing Compact	217
Exhibit D—Official Photographs of the Colorado River, U. S. Army Air Service.....	219

TABLE OF CONTENTS

xi

APPENDIX II		PAGE
MINUTES OF THE COLORADO RIVER COMMISSION AND DOCUMENTARY DATA		
Exhibit A—Text of Compact.....		225
Exhibit B—The Relation of the Corporate Structure of the Electric Power Business to Problems of Regulation		231
Exhibit C—Opposes Federal Utilities Control.....		233
Exhibit D—The Untaxable Port Authority.....		235
Exhibit E—Arizona Claim Refuted; Records of Land Office Show Water Rights of Colorado River Re- served to Government.....		237
Exhibit E ¹ —State Retention of Natural Resources.....		239
Exhibit F—Power Development Should be Secondary to Other Uses		241
Exhibit G—The Urgency of Colorado River Development..		243
1. The Flood Danger.....		243
2. There is No Serious Danger of Floods.....		245
3. The Demand for Power.....		247
4. There is No Shortage of Power.....		248
5. Reclamation		249
6. There is no Need for Reclamation.....		249
7. Need for Domestic Water Supply.....		250
a. Los Angeles		250
b. Denver		251
Exhibit G ¹ —Hierarchy of Priorities.....		253
Exhibit H—The Genesis of the Colorado River Movement— Early History		257
Exhibit I—America's Dead Sea is Curbed Forever.....		259
Exhibit J—Preface to Proceedings of the Convention of the League of the Southwest at the Trinity Audi- torium, Los Angeles, California.....		263
Exhibit K—Officers of the League of the Southwest.....		265
Exhibit L—The Legality of Transmountain Diversion.....		267
Exhibit M—Proposed Drafts		271
Exhibit N—Origin of the Compact.....		279
Exhibit O—Procedural Technique of the Colorado River Commission		283
Exhibit P—Adequacy of Colorado River Water Supply.....		287
1. The Amount of Water is not Adequate to Supply All Needs.....		287
2. The Amount of Water is Adequate to Sup- ply All Needs.....		288

	PAGE
Exhibit Q—Allocation to States versus Allocation to Basins.	291
Exhibit R—Rate of Development of Upper and Lower Basins	295
Exhibit S—Guaranteed Minimum Annual Flow.....	299
Exhibit T—Storage as a Condition Precedent to a Division of the Water.....	305
Exhibit U—The 75,000,000 Acre-Feet Provision.....	309
Exhibit W—Exclusive Beneficial Consumptive Use.....	317
Exhibit Y—Relation of Mexican Claims to the Division of Water in the United States.....	325
1. Correspondence Asserting Mexican Claims.	325
2. Upon Whom Will the Mexican Burden Rest.	330
3. Increase of Irrigated Acres in Mexico.....	330
4. May Mexican Claims be Disregarded.....	331
5. Treaty Provisions and References.....	332
Exhibit Z—Political Aspects of Mexican Claims to Colorado River Water	337
1. Fear that there will not be Adequate Water for Mexican and American Lands.....	337
2. A Letter Urging Mexico to Safeguard Her Rights	338
3. American Interests in Mexico Believe there will be Sufficient Water.....	339
4. Deleted Portions of the Minutes of the Colorado River Commission Concerning Mexican Claims	340
5. Letters of Secretary of the Interior Albert B. Fall Concerning Mexican Claims to Colorado River Water.....	345
6. The Asiatic Menace Argument.....	347
Exhibit AA—The Question of Storage in the Negotiations of the Colorado River Commission.....	349
Exhibit BB—The Provision for Reapportionment in 1963...	355
Exhibit CC—The All-American Canal.....	361
1. The Origin of The Idea.....	361
2. Opponents of the All-American Canal.....	362
3. Those who Favor the All-American Canal.	365
4. The Practicability of the All-American Canal	366
Exhibit DD—Code Telegrams	369

TABLE OF CONTENTS

xiii

	PAGE
Exhibit EE—Opposition Between Cities and Country Areas.	371
1. The Los Angeles—Owens Valley Controversy	371
2. Difficulties Met in Securing Cooperation Between Southern California Cities and Towns	376
3. Preferences to Municipalities under Federal Water Power Act of 1920 will Benefit Only Large Cities.....	377
Exhibit FF—The Ten-Year Provision.....	379
Exhibit GG—Activities of Private Power Companies in Colorado River Development.....	381
1. Money Spent by Private Companies in a California Election Involving Water Power	381
2. Private Power Companies Wish to Operate Under the Federal Water Power Act....	383
3. Interlocking Interests of Private Corporations in Colorado River Development....	384
4. Private Companies Declared Essential for Efficient Administration	387
5. Government Officials Favoring Private Ownership	387
Exhibit HH—Activities of the Boulder Dam Association and Other Public Ownership Groups in Colorado River Development	389
1. Expenditures to Promote Colorado River Development	389
a. Cooperation with Agencies of the Federal Government	389
b. Payments by the City of Los Angeles to the Boulder Dam Association.....	390
c. The Boulder Dam Association's Use of Funds Received from Cities and Other Sources	391
(1) Sources of Revenue of the Boulder Dam Association	391
(2) Expenditures of the Boulder Dam Association	392
d. Sending of Representatives to Washington	395
e. Los Angeles Retains Mr. A. P. Davis as Consulting Engineer	396

	PAGE
2. Adaptation of Local Government to Colorado River Development.....	396
3. Preference to Municipalities under the Federal Water Power Act.....	399
Exhibit JJ—High-Line Canals for American Lands.....	401
1. Projects for Serving California Lands.....	401
a. Walter G. Clark.....	401
b. W. F. McClure.....	401
c. William Mulholland	401
d. E. C. LaRue.....	402
2. Projects for Serving Arizona Lands.....	403
a. The Arizona High-Line Canal.....	403
Exhibit KK—The Six-State Compact.....	409
Exhibit LL—Supplementary Tri-State Agreements.....	413
1. Proposed Compact of December 1, 1925.....	413
2. Arizona's Analysis of Proposed Compact of December 1, 1925.....	416
3. Arizona's Counter-Proposal of December 14, 1925	418
Exhibit MM—Protection to Upper Basin States by Provisions in Federal Legislation.....	423
1. The Two Theories Involved.....	423
2. The Position of Representatives of the Upper Basin States.....	423
3. The Position of Representatives of the Lower Basin States.....	424
4. The Hamele-Bannister Controversy.....	426
5. A Somewhat Similar Problem in the History of the United States.....	428
Exhibit NN—The James B. Girard Project.....	429
Exhibit PP—Diversion from the Colorado to the Mississippi Watershed	433
Exhibit RR—Proposed Litigation.....	437
Exhibit WW—Federal Power Commission to Withhold Licenses until Ratification of Compact.....	439
Exhibit ZZ—The Question of the Return Flow.....	441
1. Return Flow Data from the Great Salt Lake Basin Declared Applicable to the Colorado River Basin.....	441
2. Reference to the Sevier River as an Illustration of the Manner in which Return Flow Augments the Water Supply.....	443

TABLE OF CONTENTS

xv

	PAGE
3. How Return Flow at Julesburg on the Platte River Increased the Supply of Water.....	444
4. Statement of Judge S. R. Thomas on the Question of Return Flow.....	444
5. Return Flow and Water-Logged Soil.....	445
6. Return Flow Tends to an Improvement in Silt Conditions.....	445
7. The Effect of Artificial Drainage upon Return Flow.....	446
8. Return Flow and Transmountain Diversion.....	446
9. Measuring the Return Flow.....	446
Exhibit AAA—Proper Centralization Required in Colorado River Development.....	447
1. General Considerations.....	447
2. Centralization by Means of the Federal Government	447
3. Centralization through Private Companies.....	448
4. Certain Legal Considerations.....	449
Exhibit BBB—Desirability of a Treaty with Mexico.....	451
Exhibit EEE—Arguments for a Rock-Filled Dam.....	453
Exhibit HHH—The Extent of Irrigable Areas in the Colorado River Basin.....	457
1. Area under Irrigation in the Entire Colorado River Area, including Mexico.....	457
2. Preponderance of Land in the Lower Basin and Preponderance of Water in the Upper Basin	457
3. Irrigable Area above Boulder Canyon.....	457
4. Irrigable Area below Boulder Canyon.....	458
a. In General.....	458
b. Below Laguna Dam.....	458
c. In Arizona.....	458
d. In California.....	459
e. In Nevada.....	459
5. Argument used to Justify Division of Water upon the Basis of Irrigable Area.....	459
Exhibit JJJ—Contributions to the Flow of the Colorado River	461

	PAGE
Exhibit LLL—Economic Basis of an Equitable Division to Promote Maximum Productivity.....	463
1. The Economic Interests of the Seven States in Colorado River Development.....	464
a. Arizona.....	464
b. California	464
c. Colorado	464
d. Nevada	465
e. New Mexico.....	467
f. Utah	467
g. Wyoming	468
2. The Relation of Products and Water Requirements of the Colorado River Area to the Problem of Securing the Proper Combination of the Factors of Production	469
a. Comparative Statement by the Bureau of Agricultural Economics Showing Returns per Acre from Irrigated Land in the Drainage Basin of the Colorado River above Boulder Canyon and below Boulder Canyon.....	469
(1) Correspondence with the United States Department of Agriculture, Bureau of Agricultural Economics, Washington, D. C.—Letter of Transmittal	469
(2) Memorandum Regarding Returns from Agriculture in the Colorado River Drainage Basin.....	470
b. Comparative Statement of Returns from United States Reclamation Service Projects in the Upper and Lower Basins of the Colorado River Area.....	474
(1) Testimony of Mr. Howard D. Sullivan, Deputy State Immigration Commissioner of Colorado.....	474
(2) Table Compiled by Mr. R. I. Meeker, Irrigation Engineer, Special Deputy State Engineer, Colorado.....	476
c. Comparative Data Submitted by Mr. McCune State Engineer of Colorado...	477
3. Products of the Coachella County Water District	478

TABLE OF CONTENTS

xvii

PAGE

4. The Effect of Additional Inches of Water upon the Number of Bushels of Wheat Produced per Acre.....478
5. The Question of the Amount of Water Debt which a Particular Area can Economically Support.....479
6. Attempts to Define "Equitable" Division..479

APPENDIX III

WHO'S WHO

IN COLORADO RIVER DEVELOPMENT

- Exhibit A—Who's Who in Colorado River Development....485

APPENDIX IV

MAPS AND PROFILES

- Exhibit B—Map of Colorado River Basin—1924.....495
- Exhibit C—Map of Colorado River Delta Region.....496
- Exhibit D—Profile of Colorado River and Grand River Showing Location of Projects for which Applications are on File with the Federal Power Commission497
- Exhibit E—Map of the All-American Canal.....498
- Exhibit F—Map of the Arizona High-Line Canal.....499
- BIBLIOGRAPHY501
- INDEX511

TABLE OF CASES

The page numbers set forth in parentheses indicate that the case is mentioned in the body of the page; cases referred to in the footnotes are indicated by the ordinary numerals.

	PAGE		PAGE
Ableman v. Booth.....	139	Boquillas Land and Cattle Co. v. Curtis	81, 110, 118, (270)
Acton v. Blundell.....	133, (135)	Boudinot v. United States.....	147
Adams v. Frothingham.....	124	Bower v. Moorman.....	134
Adams, Jones v.....	80	Bowlby, Shively v.....	126, 153
Addyston Pipe Co. v. United States.....	101	Boyer, Ex Parte.....	107
Ajax Gold Mining Co., Calhoun Gold Mining Co. v.....	113	Bradley, Fallbrook Irrigation District v.....	145
Alabama Power Co. v. Gulf Power Co.	145	Brailsford, Georgia v.....	147
Albuquerque Land Co., Gutierrez v.	110, (270)	Briggs, Lewis Blue Point Oyster Co. v.....	101
American Association, Russell et al. v.	67	Broder v. Water Co.....	(82), 140
American River Bridge Company, Cardwell v.	125	Bruening v. Dorr.....	131
Anderson v. Bassman.....	91	Bruff, Williams v.....	67
Ann Arbor, Schenk v.....	129	Buck v. "Kuykendall.....	(449)
Askura v. City of Seattle.....	148	Burley, v. United States.....	146
Atchison v. Peterson....	(82), 110, 116	Burr v. Maclay Co.....	133
Attorney General, Great Falls Mfg. Co. v.	145	Caines, Chisholm v.....	107
Bailey v. Drexel Furniture Co.....	154	Calhoun Gold Mining Co. v. Ajax Gold Mining Co.....	113
Baker v. Portland.....	147	California, McCall v.....	101
Baker, Swigart v.....	146	Calumet Canal Co., Kean v.....	153
Bank of Columbia v. Okley.....	145	Cardwell v. American River Bridge Co.	125
Barney v. Keokuk.....	126, 153	Carney, Pence v.....	129
Basey v. Gallagher.....	110	Carpenter, Farm Investment Co. v.....	80, 81
Bassett v. Salisbury Mfg. Company.....	129	Chamberlin, King v.....	131
Bassman, Anderson v.....	91	Chambers, Le Quime v.....	134
Baugh, Wheatley v.....	129	Chandler-Dunbar Co., United States v.	126, 148
Bean v. Morris.....	77, 91	Chatfield v. Wilson.....	129
Beck, Sturr v.....	81	Chicago, Escanaba Co. v.....	109
Belding v. Hebard.....	67	Chicago, etc. R. Co. v. Fuller.....	101
Bell, Hopkins v.....	148	Chirac v. Chirac.....	148
Bird, Packer v.....	153	Chisholm v. Caines.....	107
Black Bird Creek Co., Wilson v.....	109	Chisholm v. Georgia.....	73
Blaine v. Murphy.....	67	Clough v. Wing.....	80, 118
Blundell, Acton v.....	133, (135)	Coffee, Groover v.....	67
Board of Trade v. Olson.....	(151)	Coffin v. Left Hand Ditch Co.....	80, 86, (267), (270)
Bollin v. Nebraska.....	152	Cole, Griffiths v.....	146
Bond, J. B., Nampa & Meridian Irrigation District v.....	146	Collector v. Day.....	73
Booth, Ableman v.....	139		

	PAGE		PAGE
Colorado, Kansas v....	61, 73, (75), (77), 81, (84), (85), 105, 110, 118, 140, 153, 154, (171), (427)	Duluth Lumber Co. v. St. Louis Boom & Improvement Co.....	107
Colorado, Wyoming v.....	60, 62, (75-79), (84-88), 89-92, (93), (95), 108-111, 113, 122, 146, (171), (172), (187), (282), (305), (306), (307), (331), (332)	Earhart, Drake v.....	80, 133
Colorado Springs, Strickler v.....	80	East, Houston & Texas Central R. Co. v.	129
Commonwealth v. Philadelphia & R. Coal and Iron Co.....	155	East Haven v. Hemingway.....	124
Commonwealth v. Roxbury.....	124, 125	East Orange, City of, Meeker v....	129
Conant v. Deep Creek, etc. Irriga- tion Company.....	91	East Tennessee, etc. Co., Union Branch R. R. Co. v.....	67
Cook v. Pennsylvania.....	(449)	Eaton, Hoge v.....	91
Cooley v. Port Wardens.....	101	Economy Light & Power Co. v. United States	105, 107, (108)
Coombs, United States v.....	101	Eddy v. Simpson.....	116
Coquille Mill and M. Co. v. John- son	113	Escanaba Co. v. Chicago.....	109
Coronado Coal Co., United Mine Workers of America v.....	240	Ex Parte Boyer.....	107
Coyle v. Smith.....	139	Fain, Stevenson v.....	67
Crawford v. Imperial Irrigation District	(396)	Fairfax v. Hunter.....	148
Cress, United States v.....	104, 107	Fallbrook Irrigation District v. Bradley	145
Crippen v. White.....	80	Farm Investment Co. v. Carpenter	80, 81
Crowley, Soon Hong v.....	147	Farmers' Grain Co., Lemke v....	(449)
Crowninshield, Sturges v.....	73	Fears, Williams v.....	101
Cummings v. Missouri.....	139	First Municipality, Permoli v....	139
Curtis, Boquillas Land and Cattle Co. v.	81, 110, 118, (270)	Fisher v. State.....	67
Dagenhart, Hammer v.....	101	Fite, Harrison v.....	106
Dailey, Hudson v.....	133	Foote, Twin Falls Canal Co. v..	110, 146
Daly, Josslyn v.....	134	Francis, Greenleaf v.....	129
Daniel Ball, The.....	104, 105, 107	Frothingham, Adams v.....	124
Daugherty, New York v.....	(144)	Ft. Leavenworth R. Co. v. Lowe...	147
Davis v. Spaulding.....	131	Fuller, Chicago etc. R. Co. v.....	101
Day, Collector v.....	73	Furman, Turley v.....	91
Dayton-Goose Creek Ry. Co. v. United States	101	Gallagher, Basey v.....	110
Debok v. Doak.....	129	Garrison v. New York.....	145
Decker, Willey v..	80, 86, 91, 120, (270)	Georgia v. Brailsford.....	147
Deep Creek Irrigation Co., Conant v.	91	Georgia, Chisholm v.....	73
De Geofroy v. Riggs.....	147, 148	Georgia v. Tennessee Copper Co... 77	
D. & W. Ry. Co., Hairston v.....	145	Gettysburg, etc. Co., United States v.	145
Doak, Debok v.....	129	Gibbons v. Ogden.....	73, (101), (208)
Dorr, Bruening v.....	131	Gilman v. Philadelphia.....	101, 109
Dover v. Portsmouth Bridge.....	67	Gloucester Ferry Co. v. Pennsyl- vania	101
Drake v. Earhart.....	80, 133	Glover, Huse v.....	125
Drexel Furniture Co., Bailey v....	154	Gold Dredging Co., Snyder v.....	118
		Goodtitle v. Kibbe.....	125, 153
		Graff, Perkins Co. v.....	91
		Great Falls Mfg. Co. v. Attorney General	145
		Green Bay & Mississippi Canal Co., Kaukauna Water Power Co. v..	153
		Greenleaf v. Francis.....	129

TABLE OF CASES

xxi

	PAGE		PAGE
Griffiths v. Cole.....	146	Ide, United States v.....	146
Groover v. Coffee.....	67	Illinois Central Railway v. People of the State of Illinois.....	125, 139
Guiraud, Thomas v.....	80, 86	Illinois, Missouri v.....	77, 91
Gulf Power Co., Alabama Power Co. v.	145	Illinois, Munn v.....	151
Gutierrez v. Albuquerque Land Co.	110, (270)	Illinois, People of the State of, Illi- nois Central Railway v.....	125, 139
Haga, United States v.....	146	Imperial Irrigation District, Craw- ford v.	(396)
Hagan, Pollard's Lessees v.....	105, 125, 139, 153	International Paper Co. v. Massa- chusetts	154
Haggin, Lux v.....	120, 132, 198	Jacobs, Wheelock v.....	129
Hairston v. D. & W. Ry. Co.....	145	James, St. Louis & San Francisco Railway Co. v.....	67, 203
Hallowell v. United States.....	139	Jennison v. Kirk.....	110
Hammer v. Dagenhart.....	101	Johnson, Coquille Mill & M. Co. v.....	113
Hammond v. Rose.....	86	Johnson, Howell v.....	91, 113
Hanson, United States v.....	146, 154	Johnson, Stowell v.....	81
Harbor Commissioners, Weber v.....	125	Johnston v. Little Horse Creek Irri- gating Co.	80
Hardin v. Jordan....	118, 125, 140, 153	Joint Traffic Association, United States v.	140
Hardin v. Shedd.....	126	Jones v. Adams.....	80
Harrison v. Fite.....	106	Jordan, Hardin v.....	118, 125, 140, 153
Hatch, Willamette Iron Bridge Co. v.	109	Josslyn v. Daly.....	134
Hathorn v. Natural Carbonic Gas Co.	129	Kansas v. Colorado... 61, 73, (75), (77), 81, (84), (85), 105, 110, 118, 140, 153, 154, (171), (427)	
Hebard, Belding v.....	67	Kansas Natural Gas Cases.....	157
Heisler v. Thomas Colliery Co....	240	Kansas Natural Gas Co., West v....	240
Hemingway, East Haven v.....	124	Katz v. Walkinshaw.....	(129), 130
Henderson v. City of Lexington....	145	Kaukauna Water Power Co. v. Green Bay & Mississippi Canal Co.	153
Henderson v. New York.....	101	Kean v. Calumet Canal Co.....	153
Herkert & Neisel Co., United Lea- ther Workers International v....	240	Kelly, United States v.....	107
Hicks, Palmer v.....	125	Keokuk, Barney v.....	126, 153
Holland, Missouri v.....	148	Kibbe, Goodtitle v.....	125, 153
Hoge v. Eaton.....	91	Kibbe, Pollard's Lessee v.....	147
Hopkins v. Bell.....	148	Kidd v. Pearson.....	154, 240
Horne v. Utah Oil Refining Co..	130, 133	Kimball, County of Mobile v.....	101
Hough v. Porter.....	(113), 114	King v. Chamberlin.....	131
Houston & Texas Central R. Co. v. East	129	Kirk, Jennison v.....	110
Howell v. Johnson.....	91, 113	Krall v. United States.....	81
Huber v. Merkel.....	129	Kuykendall, Buck v.....	(449)
Hudson v. Dailey.....	133	Larimer & Weld Irrigation Co., Wyatt v.	80
Hudson Water Co. v. McCarter...	(94), 240	Lattig, Scott v.....	126, (127)
Hulett, Taylor v.....	91	Leddy, Stockman v.....	91
Hunter, Fairfax v.....	148		
Huse v. Glover.....	125		
Hutchinson v. Watson Slough Ditch Co.	133		

PAGE	PAGE
Left Hand Ditch Co., Coffin v.....	Missouri v. Holland.....148
.....80, 86, (267), (270)	Missouri v. Illinois.....77, 91
Left Hand Ditch Co., Oppenlander	Missouri, Welton v.....(449)
v.80, 86	Mobile, County of, v. Kimball....101
Lemke v. Farmers' Grain Co.....(449)	Moffat Tunnel Improvement Dis-
Leovy v. United States.....107, 153	trict, Milheim v.....(251), 270
Le Quime v. Chambers.....134	Montello, The104, 105, 107
Lewis Blue Point Oyster Co. v.	Moorman, Bower v.....134
Briggs101	Morris, Bean v.....77, 91
Lexington, City of, Henderson v...145	Moyer v. Preston.....80, 86, 121
Little Horse Creek Irrigating Co.,	Munn v. Illinois.....151
Johnston v.80	Murphy, Blaine v.....67
Lord, Oliver Mining Co. v....162, 240	Myers, St. Louis v.....153
Lord v. Ship Co.....101	
Los Angeles, City of, Los Angeles	Nampa & Meridian Irrigation Dis-
F. & M. Co. v.....118	trict v. J. B. Bond.....146
Los Angeles F. & M. Co. v. City of	Natatorium Co., Public Utilities
Los Angeles118	Commission v.
Lottery Cases101	(128), 129-132, 134, (135)
Louisiana, United States v.....73	National Bank v. Yankton County.165
Lovington, County of St. Clair v...126	Natural Carbonic Gas Co., Hathorn
Lowe, Ft. Leavenworth R. Co. v....147	v.129
Luterman, Trombley v.....81	Nebraska, Bollin v.....152
Lux v. Haggin.....120, 132, 198	Nelson, Metcalf v.....131
	New Haven, Society, etc. v.....147
Mackay et al v. New York, etc.	New York v. Daugherty.....(144)
R. R. Co. et al.....67, 203	New York, Garrison v.....145
Maclay Co., Burr v.....133	New York, Henderson v.....101
Martin et al v. Waddell.....125, 153	N. Y. C. R. R. Co. v. Winfield..(449)
Maryland, McCulloch v.....	New York, etc. R. R. Co. et al,
.....73, 140, 153, 162	Mackay et al v.....67, 203
Massachusetts, International Paper	Nichols, Yunker v.....80
Co. v.154	North Carolina v. Tennessee.....67
McBride, Whitaker v.....118	
McCall v. California.....101	Ogden, Gibbons v....73, (101), (208)
McCarter, Hudson Water Co. v.	Oklahoma v. Texas. (104), 105, 125, 153
.....(94), 240	Okley, Bank of Columbia v.....145
McCulloch, v. Maryland.....	Oliver Mining Co. v. Lord....162, 240
.....73, 140, 153, 162	Olson, Board of Trade v.....(151)
McGilvra v. Ross.....126	Oppenlander v. Left Hand Ditch
McKinney v. Saviego.....139	Co.80, 86
Meeker v. City of East Orange....129	Packer v. Bird.....153
Merkel, Huber v.....129	Palmer v. Hicks.....125
Metcalf v. Nelson.....131	Pearson, Kidd v.....154, 240
Middletown v. Sage.....124	Pence v. Carney.....129
Milheim v. Moffat Tunnel Im-	Pennsylvania, Cook v.....(449)
provement District(251), 270	Pennsylvania Gas Co. v. Public
Miller & Lux, Rickey Land and	Service Commission155, (157)
Cattle Co. v.....77, 91	Pennsylvania, Gloucester Ferry Co.
Minnesota Rate Cases.....155	v.101
Minnesota, Searns v.....166	Pennsylvania v. West Virginia....
Missouri, Cummings v.....139	(162), (239), 240, (428)

TABLE OF CASES

xxiii

	PAGE		PAGE
Perkins Co. v. Graff.....	91	Schurmeir, Railroad Co. v.....	126
Permoli v. First Municipality.....	139	Scott v. Lattig.....	126, (127)
Peterson, Atchison v.....	(82), 110, 116	Scott v. Sanford.....	139
Philadelphia, Gilman v.....	101, 109	Searns v. Minnesota.....	166
Philadelphia & R. Coal & Iron Co., Commonwealth v.	155	Seattle, City of, Askura v.....	148
Philadelphia Co. v. Stimson.....	101	Shedd, Hardin v.....	126
Pioneer Irrigation Co., Weiland v..	92	Shelby County Taxing District, Robbin v.	(449)
Pollard's Lessees v. Hagan.....	105, 125, 139, 153	Ship Company, Lord v.....	101
Pollard's Lessee v. Kibbe.....	147	Shively v. Bowlby.....	126, 153
Port Wardens, Cooley v.....	101	Shoemaker v. United States.....	145
Porter, Hough v.....	(113), 114	Simms v. Simms.....	165
Portland, Baker v.....	147	Simpson, Eddy v.....	116
Portsmouth Bridge, Dover v.....	67	Smith, Coyle v.....	139
Preston, Moyer v.....	80, 86, 121	Smith v. Turney.....	101
Public Service Commission, Penn- sylvania Gas Co. v.....	155, (157)	Snyder v. Gold Dredging Co.....	118
Public Utilities Commission v. Na- tatorium Co.	(128), 129-132, 134, (135)	Society, etc. v. New Haven.....	147
Race Horse, Ward v.....	139	Soon Hong v. Crowley.....	147
Railroad Co. v. Schurmeir.....	126	South Carolina v. United States....	73
Ramshorn Ditch Co., United States v.	146	Spaulding, Davis v.....	131
Rickey Land & Cattle Co. v. Miller and Lux	77, 91	St. Anthony Falls Co. v. St. Paul Commissioners	107, 155
Riggs, De Geofroy v.....	147, 148	St. Clair, County of, v. Lovington.	126
Rio Grande Dam & Irrigation Co., United States v.....	(83), 100, 104, 105, 109-111, 113, 117, 119, 153	St. Louis v. Myers.....	153
Robbin v. Shelby County Taxing District	(449)	St. Louis & San Francisco Railway Co. v. James.....	67, 203
Robinson, Walbridge v.....	91	St. Louis Boom & Improvement Co., Duluth Lumber Co. v.....	107
Rominger, Schilling v.....	80	St. Paul Commissioners, St. Anthony Falls Co. v.....	107, 155
Rose, Hammond v.....	86	Stafford v. Wallace.....	151
Ross, McGilvra v.....	126	Stanfield v. Umatilla River Water Users Assn.	110
Roxbury, Commonwealth v....	124, 125	State, Fisher v.....	67
Russell et al v. American Assn....	67	State Board of Dental Examiners, Thiedemann v.....	67
Sage, Middletown v.....	124	Stevenson v. Fain.....	67
Salisbury Mfg. Co., Bassett v.....	129	Stimson, Philadelphia Co. v.....	101
Sandoval, United States v.....	139	Stockman v. Leddy.....	91
Sanford, Scott v.....	139	Stowell v. Johnson.....	81
Sanitary District of Chicago v. United States	(151)	Strickler v. Colorado Springs.....	80
Saviego, McKinney v.....	139	Sturges v. Crowninshield.....	73
Schenk v. Ann Arbor.....	129	Sturr v. Beck.....	81
Schilling v. Rominger.....	80	Swigart v. Baker.....	146
Schodde v. Twin Falls Land & Water Co.	133	Taylor v. Hulett.....	91
		Tennessee, North Carolina v.....	67
		Tennessee, Van Brocklin v.....	139
		Tennessee, Virginia v.....	67
		Tennessee Copper Co., Georgia v..	77
		Texas, Oklahoma v..	(104), 105, 125, 153

	PAGE		PAGE
Texas, United States v.....	73	United States, Utah Power etc. Co.	
Texas v. White.....	73	v.	139
Thiedemann v. State Board of		United States, Weeds v.....	154
Dental Examiners	67	United States, Winters v.....	81, 118
Thomas Colliery Co., Heisler v....	240	Utah Oil Refining Co., Horne v.	
Thomas v. Guiraud.....	80, 86		130, 133
Trombley v. Lutermau.....	81	Utah Power etc. Co. v. United	
Turley v. Furman.....	91	States	139
Turney, Smith v.....	101	Van Brocklin v. Tennessee.....	139
Twin Falls Canal Co. v. Foote.....	110, 146	Virginia v. Tennessee.....	67
Twin Falls Land & Water Co.,		Waddell, Martin et al v.....	125, 153
Schodde v.	133	Walbridge v. Robinson.....	91
Umatilla River Water Users Assn.,		Walkinshaw, Katz v.....	(129), 130
Stanfield v.	110	Wallace, Stafford v.....	151
Union Branch R. R. Co. v. East		Ward v. Race Horse.....	139
Tennessee, etc. Co.....	67	Water Commissioners, St. Anthony	
United Leather Workers Interna-		Falls Water Power Co. v....	107, 155
tional v. Herkert & Neisel Co....	240	Water Commissioners, Water	
United Mine Workers of America		Power Co. v.....	153
v. Coronado Coal Co.....	240	Water Co., Broder v.....	(82), 110
United States, Addyston Pipe Co.		Water Power Co. v. Water Com-	
v.	101	missioners	153
United States, Boudinot v.....	147	Watson Slough Ditch Co., Hutch-	
United States, Burley v.....	146	inson v.	133
United States v. Chandler-Dunbar		Weber v. Harbor Commissioners...125	
Co.	126, 148	Weeds v. United States.....	154
United States v. Coombs.....	101	Weiland v. Pioneer Irrigation Co... 92	
United States v. Cress.....	104, 107	Welton v. Missouri.....	(449)
United States, Dayton-Goose Creek		West v. Kansas Natural Gas Co....240	
Ry. Co. v.....	101	West Virginia, Pennsylvania v....	
United States, Economy Light &			(162), (239), 240, (428)
Power Co. v.....	105, 107, (108)	Wheatley v. Baugh.....	129
United States v. Gettysburg, etc.		Wheelock v. Jacobs.....	129
Co.	145	Whitaker v. McBride.....	118
United States v. Haga.....	146	White, Crippen v.....	80
United States, Hallowell v.....	139	White, Texas v.....	73
United States v. Hanson.....	146, 154	Willamette Iron Bridge Co. v.	
United States v. Ide.....	146	Hatch	109
United States v. Joint Traffic Asso-		Willey v. Decker.. 80, 86, 91, 120, (270)	
ciation	140	Williams v. Bruff.....	67
United States v. Kelly.....	107	Williams v. Fears.....	101
United States, Krall v.....	81	Wilson v. Black Bird Creek Co....109	
United States, Leovy v.....	107, 153	Wilson, Chatfield v.....	129
United States v. Louisiana.....	73	Winfield, N. Y. C. R. R. v.....	(449)
United States v. Ramshorn Ditch		Wing, Clough v.....	80, 118
Co.	146	Winters v. United States.....	81, 118
United States v. Rio Grande Dam		Wyatt v. Larimer & Weld Irriga-	
& Irrigation Co.....	(83), 100,	tion Co.	80
104, 105, 109-111, 113, 117, 119, 153		Wyoming, Colorado v.....	60, 62,
United States v. Sandoval.....	139	(75-79), (84-88), 89-92, (93),	
United States, Sanitary District of		(95), 108-111, 113, 122, 146,	
Chicago v.....	(151)	(171), (172), (187), (282),	
United States, Shoemaker v.....	145	(305), (306), (307), (331), (332)	
United States, South Carolina v....	73	Yankton County, National Bank v.165	
United States v. Texas.....	73	Yunker v. Nichols.....	80