

December 2019

Reclamation, Flood Control, and Government Economy

Leslie A. Miller

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarship.law.uwyo.edu/wlj>

Recommended Citation

Leslie A. Miller, *Reclamation, Flood Control, and Government Economy*, 4 Wyo. L.J. 27 (1949)
Available at: <https://scholarship.law.uwyo.edu/wlj/vol4/iss1/4>

This Special Section is brought to you for free and open access by Law Archive of Wyoming Scholarship. It has been accepted for inclusion in Wyoming Law Journal by an authorized editor of Law Archive of Wyoming Scholarship.

much affected. Rights and freedom are lost for all whenever they are lost for some.

3. The solution to our problems is to use our right as free Americans to be governed as we wish to be governed—for the good of all.

RECLAMATION, FLOOD CONTROL, AND GOVERNMENT ECONOMY

LESLIE A. MILLER*

Citizens of Wyoming, I appreciate the opportunity to come and speak briefly to a group of this type. Yet I stand up here with some degree of trepidation. I know with your analytical minds, your trained minds, trained for any occasions, far in excess of the training that was given me, you can probably find some questions I will raise, that you could combat, and I might raise some questions which, if answered, might embarrass me.

Many of you gentlemen here are fully aware of the work I have been doing, because I see a number who have sat in meetings I have addressed previously. I have been making quite a few talks in this and surrounding states, and I think it would be appropriate, at this time to make an acknowledgment, if I may, that in the work I have been undertaking, I have had the earnest cooperation of the Wyoming Tax Payers' Association, by Earle Reed and Fred Bennion. They have been very cooperative with me in all respects. Fred Bennion, executive director, has driven me around on most of my expeditions. I found him excellent company and driver, so I think I ought to make that acknowledgment at this time.

It has been very interesting work. The last three days, I have been in Colorado. I talked at Grand Junction and Kremmling and Craig, all on the western slope of Colorado, where they are called upon to consider the proposition of transmountain water diversion, which the Bureau of Reclamation is undertaking on an ever-increasing scale. A few weeks ago, I was down in the neighboring state of Nebraska. I made an address at Scottsbluff in which I undertook to discuss some of the waste I deem to be going on in Army Engineer and Bureau of Reclamation work in that state. One of the projects I directed attention to was a spillway being built alongside a dam on the Republican River. The chief executive of that state was a little bit disconcerted with what I said, and he sounded off a few days later, at a meeting in Loveland, Colorado, in which he undertook to put me in my place. Among other things he said I wouldn't know a

* Governor of Wyoming, 1933-1939. Chairman of the Natural Resources Task Force of the Hoover Commission.

spillway from a spittoon. Now, a remark of that kind assumes that he would know a spillway from a spittoon. I am rather hopeful in the not too distant future that I will have another opportunity to speak in his state, and if and when I do, I will undertake to provide some rebuttal.

But I was to talk of the Hoover Commission. You all know what the Commission was. You have read about it and you have your opinions. You possibly won't agree with probably all of the recommendations of the Commission. But the work disclosed that there is a great deal of waste. There is much inefficiency. There is great extravagance in many transactions in the conduct of governmental affairs in this country.

It discloses also that the degree of bureaucratic control which has been achieved in Washington, threatens our form of government.

I was interested this morning in listening to the report of Mr. Pence, in which he told of the apprehension of some of the attorneys that gathered in San Francisco, regarding trends which we are witnessing in government in this country, and the very fine essay by Mr. Wilkerson, who made reference to the things we need to do to protect the integrity of the free economy in this country.

If anything outstanding grew out of the research made by the people under the Hoover Commission, in my opinion it is that the people of this country are going to have to do something to regain what we have known as our representative form of government, and I want to tell you why.

This country today occupies a position in world affairs unique in its history. At no time in the past have we been in a position of world leadership such as we occupy today. It was not by reason of any ambition of ours, or any attempt of ours to achieve such a place but it was the outcome of the recent world war, at the conclusion of which America found itself the strongest, most powerful nation in all the world. The peoples all over this world look to this country for leadership.

Early last spring there was an article in the Saturday Evening Post, telling of the escape by a very celebrated German scientist from the Russians, as they were approaching Berlin. I have no doubt very many of you read it. Whether the closing paragraph interested you as it did me I do not know, but I make reference to it. The article told of the manner in which this old German scientist befuddled the Russians who took over his household and with whom he lived for a certain number of days; he finally escaped and made his way into western Europe and later to the United States. He is now involved in pursuing a line of research which must be kept secret, but he was found and interviewed by a reporter for the Saturday Evening Post. At the conclusion of his story of his experiences with his

Russian captors, the reporter asked him how he passes his time when he is not working in his laboratory. "I look and I watch", he said; "I never tire of watching the American people in the streets, in the stores, at work, in the drugstores, the 5 and 10, the super markets. I try to study scientifically what has made America such a great success. I know about your constitution, your laws, your system of schools, but there is something more. It is the *unwritten* laws, ingrained in your people, that independence, more I have never seen before. That is what I think enables America to work her marvels." I like to quote this German because it is an illustration of the way in which foreign people seem to view us, the pictures they get when they see us in our daily lives. I think we ought to be proud of that. If we do have a particular pride in that, then we also have a very great responsibility to *maintain* that position. We must do something to see that our country remains sound and strong in its economic setup. We can only retain the respect of the people of other nations if we remain sound and strong.

If I had any message to give you here today, it would be to impress upon you that we are in very great danger of losing that position of soundness and strength we have occupied before, if we do not reduce some of the trends in spending of our government.

I will strengthen this premise when I tell you of a report I have from Washington, setting out that the appropriation bills pending in Congress as of today are \$6,500,000,000.00 in excess of the appropriations for the same purposes last year. Now, that is in the face of rising unemployment in many of the industrial sections of the country, in the face of falling farm and industrial prices and products. In the first few months of this year, the receipts of the Federal Government, from income taxes, decreased over a billion dollars, and at this time, we are reverting to deficit spending. I conceive that to be an unhealthy condition. At Grand Junction, the other day, I recited this same situation, and I said this: We elect our senators and our representatives to represent us, to carry out our wishes in the legislative halls, to protect our interests as taxpayers. Now, if we wish our senators and representatives to represent us, are they doing so when they propose to spend six and a half billion dollars more for the same purposes than they expended last year? I asked this question of those people over there: How many of you people—any of you, have asked your senators and your representatives to spend six and a half billion dollars more of the taxpayers money than last year? Did any of you make that request of the Wyoming congressional delegation? Well of course, there is an obvious answer. The expenditures by the Federal budgets are made on the request of the bureaus. Bureaus make budgets on which the Congress acts in the nature of things today. If you could see one of those bureau budgets as I saw a number while serving on the Hoover Commission you would understand

it is not within the realm of possibility that many of the Congress really understand those budgets and what they are called upon to approve because they are too intricate; they are too involved, too voluminous, replete with figures, replete with assertions. It is not within the realm of possibility for many Congressmen to know what they are doing, as can be proven by some of the things I have in my portfolio. Congress is making appropriations at the behest of the bureaus and the ordinary rule pursued by a bureau is to perpetuate itself, to enlarge itself and to grow, year by year. And so we have to consider this situation. In 1917, we had our first billion dollar peace time Congress. In 1917 for the first time it cost a billion dollars to run all the activities of the Federal government. Now, we are up to Forty billion dollars, and there is only one answer to a continuance of that. I stated a moment ago that the income tax receipts of the government this year are shrinking. If we have and continue to have, year by year, these huge amounts of money appropriated, then we must expect a raise in taxes, burdening all the tax payers; more people will have to pay taxes; the people now paying taxes will have to pay higher rates, or expenditures will have to be reduced. It is up to the people of this country to say, eventually which course they wish to have pursued.

You people reasonably can be considered as familiar with the proposals of the Hoover Commission and so I am only going to take a little of your time here to point out some of the things that have come to me in confirmation of what I have to say. As you know, I was chairman of the natural resources commission under the Hoover Commission, and in undertaking to find avenues of economy in the agencies which were in our jurisdiction for study, we found the two agencies spending the greatest amounts of money, the only agencies with which we were concerned where we could perhaps save some money, were the Army Corps of Engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation. So most of my talks have been devoted to those two agencies. In this part of the nation in which we live, we are in an irrigated country, and we depend upon irrigation of lands in our economy. I want to say at this point it has been said that my talks had the effect of setting back reclamation in this state; that my criticism of the Bureau of Reclamation will tend to encourage the enemies of reclamation in the east, and so I just want to say a word about that. What I have been contending against is the waste and extravagance of the Bureau of Reclamation and the Corps of Army Engineers, of which I have ample proof and could talk all afternoon if we wanted to take the time. I am for irrigation. I am for the production of power. I am for flood control. I think my record in office would attest to that. I am against what I conceive to be the waste going on by reason of the competition between these two agencies which has come into the picture in recent years. And if I can do anything by what I am

saying here and at other places, to eliminate that waste and extravagance, I will take whatever responsibility may be assessed to me. I believe that in the interests of the taxpayers of this country, the waste must be eliminated or the very economic security of this country is threatened.

On the 6th day of August, 1948, the Chief of Engineers of the Army was responsible for a report which was placed in the Congressional Record. In that report a copy of which I have here, the Chief of Engineers tells us that in 1927 the Congress authorized the Corps to make a survey of all the river basins of this country to determine the needs and possibilities of developing those basins for flood control, navigation, power, irrigation, all related water uses. A little further along in the report it is said: "We have now available comprehensive plans for development of essentially all the rivers of the United States." He says they made this study in 10 years. When they got out west of the Mississippi river, they were encroaching upon the territory held sacred theretofore by the Bureau of Reclamation. That stirred the Bureau to put their engineers to planning and to get the plans on paper before the Engineers. And so this race occurred out of which I contend we are now facing great waste, not only of material, men and money, but of natural resources. I contend that projects have been approved by Congress on recommendation of these agencies which are uneconomical in their inception, which cannot be expected to pay out. A few of them are to be passed by now, as witness the Moorhead dam up by Sheridan. There was objection on the part of some Wyoming people, and they took effective action. My premise that there is competition between these two agencies was set out in my article in the Saturday Evening Post.

On the 5th of August, 1948, the Commissioner of Reclamation Mr. Strauss, in a letter transmitted to the Secretary of the Interior, which I have here, gave a report on the six year program which his bureau had placed under way, with approval of Congress, and he says, substantially, appropriations will be required for the program as follows: (I give the amounts in round millions)

1949,	\$312,000,000
1950,	\$535,000,000
1951,	\$622,000,000
1952,	\$715,000,000
1953,	\$782,000,000

In other words, up and up each year, a hundred million, two hundred million until just four years from now, or five, they would reach \$800,000,000. The Army Corps of Engineers' appropriation this year is standing, as approved by the Senate in conference, at seven hundred and some odd million dollars. They have gone up year by year, too, Now, I want to read something else here. I want to preface

it by a few words from one of our outstanding statesmen. Jimmy Byrnes, whom many of you know, former Senator, former Associate Justice of the Supreme Court and Secretary of State, in a statement just a few days ago said: "When a man is intoxicated by alcohol, he can recover, but when intoxicated by power, he seldom recovers."

I read that to you, in connection with another article, an Associated Press dispatch, dated August 2nd, 1949. This tells us about some remarks made by the Commissioner of Reclamation, Mr. Strauss, in Boulder City, Nevada that day. Mr. Strauss, at a conference of his area managers said: "Our appropriations for this department next year will be more than \$350,000,000 but tie on your hats, you haven't seen anything yet." He says they expect an appropriation of \$350,000,000 next year. He apparently forgot his own figures for under his own program, which I read to you a moment ago, he expects to ask for \$535,000,000 next year. He apparently forgets what he says, from time to time. I will take a moment at this point to explain what the competing objectives of Reclamation and Army Engineers means to this part of the country. You will understand that a dam, built for flood control must of necessity have a reservoir behind that dam empty when the flood comes along, as otherwise it fails to fulfill its purpose. A dam built for irrigation must have the reservoir full when the demand for irrigation water comes along. These are two diametrically opposed demands. A channel dredged out for navigation must have a steady flow of water through it in order to provide the depth of water required for the transportation placed on it. Now, the Army Engineers are proposing to dredge the Missouri River between Sioux City, Iowa and Omaha, Nebraska to a depth of nine feet, in order that the channel may be the same then from Sioux City to Kansas City. It is now nine feet from Omaha to Kansas City. When they come to Omaha upbound they have to transfer to lighter craft. To maintain the nine foot channel between Sioux City and Omaha is going to require a steady flow of water through the Missouri River of a volume of water not now required by its present uses. Where will that water come from? It must come from up here. It won't run up-hill in the river. So it must call upon the upper reaches of the stream for the required volume.

Now, in the matter of money, it would appear that the agencies feel there isn't any bottom to the barrel of the taxpayers' money upon which they can draw, and I do not believe that is quite consistent. I think there is a bottom to the barrel of the taxpayers' money, and our Task Force of the Hoover Commission went into the matter very deeply. We recommended that the civilian activities of the Corps of Engineers, which means water development, be combined with the Bureau of Reclamation in one water development service for this country. Over that service would be placed a Board of Impartial Analysis, thoroughly independent, as free from political and local

pressures as can be under our form of government, no project to be submitted to Congress for an appropriation unless and until it had the approval of this Board.

It was our sincere feeling if these recommendations were adopted by Congress and the President, it would mean the saving of billions and billions of dollars over the years ahead because competition would be eliminated and we wouldn't have some of the projects now being promoted by the two agencies. I could go through my portfolio here, keep you for a long time, and give you many projects, but I will tell you only about one or two. The other day I had a letter from a man down in Iowa, asking me if I would come down and address the Central Iowa Soil and Water Association at Knoxville. The Corps of Army Engineers is proposing to build in that country a huge flood control dam on the Des Moines river, and he quoted a statement from the District Engineer in which it was said the project was designed to protect from floods 36,000 acres of land below the site of the dam, and that they proposed to buy up 75,000 acres above the dam site, spending in all \$50,000,000 to provide that protection.

Down in North Dakota, they are building a huge structure known as the Garrison Dam. Back in the days before the Army Engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation got together to head off the proposed Missouri Valley Authority the reclamation boys *derided* this proposal. They said it could not be economically justified, and under the circumstances it would be a waste of money to build such a dam. But after they got together, the Bureau of Reclamation thought that its spokesman had better keep their mouths shut about Garrison because the Army Engineers had agreed to lay off of criticism of some of Reclamation's projects. But it isn't all quiet yet. A few weeks ago at Helena, Montana there was a meeting of the Inter Agency Committee at which time the Army Engineer member undertook to take from Mr. Sloan, of Reclamation, the Chairmanship, intimating that Sloan was still sniping at Garrison "under cover".

I here refer to the 1948 report of the Chief of Engineers. It is proposed by the Bureau of Reclamation to bring 16,200,000 new acres of land under irrigation to produce crops in this western country. The Army Engineers have a recommendation which startled me a little. I want to read this to you: "in addition to the irrigable land obtainable in the west, there are large areas in Texas, Arkansas and Louisiana where supplemental water for rice land is practical. These rich lands aggregate about 1,600,000 acres; and it appears that some 3,200,000 acres of additional rice lands could be brought into production . . ." And he so recommends. I thought this engineer must not have had the experience I had the time when Mrs. Miller was ill and out of commission and I was cooking for myself. I like rice, but she doesn't care much for it and for that reason I do not get much. I am not up on cooking, but I said, here's my chance to have myself a

mess of rice, so I took a quart of water, and an equal portion of rice, without following directions in the cook book. In due course of time I really had a mess of rice, all over the kitchen.

I am probably talking too much about water. However, I tell you these facts, because I think we are witnessing a trend which has grown out of the competition between these two agencies. There must be an end to it if our economic strength is to be properly conserved, if the interests of the taxpayers are to be properly protected. Now the engineers, and that refers to the engineers of both agencies, apparently go on the theory you can't overbuild irrigation or water development projects of any kind; you can't overdo it. That is their theory and accordingly they recommend all these projects. I want to read you a few of them. In the concluding paragraph of the Chief of Engineers report he says: "Prosecution of a sound program of river-basin development may be essential to our survival as a Nation. Ancient civilizations, such as the Incas of the Andes found it necessary to build great aqueducts and terraces to conserve meager amounts of mountain soil and water in order to maintain themselves." Gentlemen, they did *not* maintain themselves; they disappeared. Why the Incas of the Andes disappeared is one of the great mysteries of this western hemisphere. I wondered when I read that if perhaps the rulers of the Incas of that day spent so much of the substance of the people on these great public works that they ruined the economy. If there is anything to be done about putting this nation on a more co-ordinated level as to saner water development it is up to the people to order the Hoover recommendations written into law and brought into being. You can't leave it to Mr. Hoover alone or to Les Miller. It is only to be expected if demanded by the people of the nation.

I want to say something further about another matter that has come to my ears several times. It has been said by many, "Les Miller is making a good Republican speech". You have heard that. It grows out of some wishful thinking on the part of the people who say this, Republicans who believe that if they won a national election they would take care of these things. They would put the bureaus in their place. That is what they mean.

The record is against such a thought. The Republicans controlled 80th Congress gave record appropriations to the Bureau of Reclamation and Army Engineers. Then an issue came into the 1948 campaign. The Democrats came out into the West and said "That niggardly, penny-pinching bunch of Republicans that controlled the 80th Congress didn't do right by our gal Reclamation; they cut her down, they are agin reclamation." The Republicans retored: "Tain't so. We gave her record appropriations, more than she ever had before." The Democrats had to fall back on: "Yes, but you didn't give her as much as asked for."

If anything is going to be done about these things, it won't be

done by Republican politicians, as attested by the record; it won't be done by the Democratic politicians, as attested by the record of the current administration. It will be done only as a result of Republicans and Democrats working together as Americans.

When people say Les Miller is expounding a Republican doctrine such is not the case. I might read you something that was said 150 years ago by one of the great statesmen of all time in American life, Thomas Jefferson, founder of the Democratic party, who, in one of his state papers said: "I place economy among the first and most important virtues, and public debt as the greatest of dangers to be feared. To preserve our independence we must not let our leaders load us with perpetual debt. We must make our choice between economy and liberty, or profusion and servitude. If we run into such debts, we must be taxed in our meat and drink, in our necessities and in our comforts, in our labors and in our amusements. If we can prevent the government from wasting the labors of the people under the pretence of caring for them, they will be happy. The same prudence which in private life would forbid our paying our money for unexplained projects, forbids it in the disposition of public money. We are endeavoring to reduce the government to the practice of rigid economy to avoid burdening the people and arming the Magistrate with a patronage of money which might be used to corrupt the principles of government." Those are words of Thomas Jefferson to which I ascribe, words which guide me in my thinking as to what constitutes proper handling of public affairs today.

You have trained minds. What is your responsibility in this matter? If we have delegated too much power to the bureaus in our government, is it not the responsibility of trained minds like yours to do something to reassert your Americanism? I leave that responsibility with you.

THE STATE LAW LIBRARY

ELLEN CROWLEY*

It is rather presumptuous of me to appear before this auspicious gathering and say "put me to work." I am well aware of the adage involving fools and angels. I recall also, however, a statement that sounds like a Chinese proverb: "Observe the turtle. He makes progress only when he sticks his neck out."

My real purpose in being here is to try to attain a meeting of the minds, namely, what do the members of the Wyoming Bar expect of the State Law Library? In lieu of a better approach, I shall tell you what the State Law library has to offer. Then it will be your turn.

* Wyoming State Librarian.