

headworks on the river just below Yuma, Arizona, that would connect to a 54-mile-long canal. Water would be delivered by force of gravity to its destination in what was variously called the "New River Country", or the "Imperial Settlement" and finally, the "Imperial Valley."

It was not until 1900, when George Chaffey became associated with the CDC, that work began in earnest on the canal-building project that started at Pilot Knob, extended into and out of Mexico, and eventually found its way to Cameron Lake, later to become known as Calexico, California.

Chaffey struck a deal with Rockwood and the other officers of the corporation to finish the necessary infrastructure and divert water from the Colorado River to the Imperial Valley in five years. Chaffey finished his work ahead of schedule and within two years the first water was being delivered to the fledging community of Imperial on June 20, 1901.

With the means to deliver water from the Colorado now in place on both sides of the border, the settlers of Imperial County were ready to welcome easier times. Unfortunately, the flood years of 1905-1907 created a difficult situation when the swollen Colorado River suddenly changed course, sweeping away the original headworks at Hanlon Heading and sending its entire flow not to the Gulf of Mexico, but to the Imperial Valley. A disaster for CDC resulted.

Only the intervention of the Southern Pacific Railroad, which had its own investment to protect in the Valley's continued reclamation and settlement, staved off the inevitable collapse of the CDC, and with it the hopes and dreams of several thousand new settlers. The dilemma facing the railroad was whether or not to abandon its existing lines in the Imperial and Mexicali Valleys, which were now under water, and build new ones, or to throw its considerable resources into stopping the break, saving both valleys.

Southern Pacific Railroad executives opted for the latter choice, spending a total of \$6 million over the next two years to close the break. As the company's largest stockholder, the railroad was forced to assume day-to-day management of the CDC during the midst of the flood years. To the approximately 3,000 settlers who had come to the Imperial Valley this meant that the company responsible for bringing water to their burgeoning communities and distributing it to the mutual water companies and their farms was no more.

Southern Pacific Railroad, however, was reluctant to be in the Imperial Valley irrigation and land business and made the decision to cut its losses before it acquired any new ones. A group of disgruntled local investors had the same idea and called for the dissolution of the CDC and the sale of its remaining assets.

It was against this backdrop of natural and man-made disasters that the first settlers of the Imperial Valley took a series of affirmative steps to ensure the future of their community. The first step was a vote in August, 1907, designating El Centro, with its 41 registered voters, as the county seat over Imperial, the Valley's oldest and most populous community with 500 registered voters and one-third of the total electorate. There were five towns in the Valley then: Imperial, Calexico, Brawley,

Holtville and El Centro, the first three having been developed by a syndicate of Los Angeles investors and the latter two by Mr. W.F. Holt, who underwrote much of the Valley's early growth and development.

The Imperial Valley was now its own county and El Centro its geographic and governmental center. The first Board of Supervisors was elected on that same August day in 1907, as was the very first district attorney, Mr. Phil Swing, and the county's first sheriff, Mr. Mobley Meadows. Duly constituted as an official body by the state, the young county was ready to begin addressing its most pressing concern: What to do about the water situation, so closely tied to the future of the Imperial Valley?

For a time, the federal government appeared to offer a solution. Responding to pressure from the Southern California delegation, Congress appropriated \$1 million in 1910 to construct new gates and levees near the site of the former break. An unexpected surge in the river, however, washed away eight months of work and killed one of the workers.

Despite opposition from the mutual water companies, county officials began to circulate the idea of forming an irrigation district that would be owned by the people through the California Irrigation District Act. The legal analysis was furnished by Mr. Phil Swing, the newly-elected and politically astute D.A., who would later serve in Congress. He became the motivating force behind the Boulder Canyon Project.

Swing argued that private ownership had been tried and failed, the federal government could not be counted on to fill the void left by the railroad and the mutual water companies could not be trusted to represent the people's best interests. According to Swing, what the Imperial Valley needed was an irrigation system owned by the people it was meant to serve, a public agency with municipal powers similar to a city, but one that was also autonomous from county government. The call for local control had immediate appeal in an Imperial Valley still recovering from the flood years and captured the populist mood of the voters. An election was held on July 14, 1911, and the vote in favor of establishing the Imperial Irrigation District (IID) was passed 1,304-360.

Members of the IID's first board included Mr. Porter Ferguson, a Holtville farmer; Mr. Fritz Kloke, a farmer and banker in the Calexico area; Mr. W.O. Hamilton, an El Centro farmer and merchant; Mr. H.L. Peck, an Imperial farmer and merchant; and Mr. Earl Pound of Brawley, a farmer and real estate broker. At its first meeting on July 25, 1911, Porter Ferguson was named president of the board, and members were asked to contribute \$150 toward the good of the cause, with the \$750 going to help defray ongoing expenses.

Their cause was self-determination, which most people believed could only be realized through the eventual purchase of the water distribution system already in place, including the 52 miles of canals owned and operated by the Compania de Terrenos y Aguas de la Baja California, a Mexican subsidiary of the CDC. Both companies and their assets were tied up in the courts, but the ITD intended to acquire these properties out of receivership. In the

meantime, it would have to generate the capital needed to implement its ambitious acquisition plan.

By 1912, with the Mexican Revolution going on just across the border in Mexicali, an opportunity was presented for an open discussion regarding the need for an "All American Canal," the first recorded reference to the massive project that would be completed, along with Hoover Dam, some 30 years later.

At the same time, the IID was negotiating directly with the railroad and with the American and Mexican receivers in an effort to purchase the assets of the CDC, which it did in 1915 for the price of \$3 million. A bond issue for \$3.5 million was passed later that year and condemnation of the defunct company was initiated by the IID. Both actions were popular with the people, if not with the mutual water companies, but individual board members did not enjoy the same level of support among water users, mainly due to water shortages on the river.

Finally, the entire board of directors resigned as a body and the County Board of Supervisors had to appoint five new IID directors, naming Mr. Leroy Holt as president in 1916. It was this Holt-led board, serving during those first tumultuous years of 1912-1916, that skillfully pursued the acquisition of the CDC's existing waterworks and placed it in the hands of the people. The IID purchased the last of the "mutuals" in 1922. It was during this period that the East Highline was built, along with the Westside Main Canal and other important features of the canal network that are still in service today.

The IID's first four years in existence were a chronology of great accomplishments, coupled with competitive politics. Its real achievement, however, was delivering to the people of the Imperial Valley some measure of certainty in the future and, with it, a reason for optimism. With the flood years and the period of receivership behind it, the IID, on behalf of the people, picked up where the CDC left off. There was only one difference, the IID never stopped.

Thank you Imperial Irrigation District for your years of dedicated service, for saving the Imperial Valley and for all that you continue to do for the citizens of Imperial County.

TRIBUTE TO THORNTON SISTERS

HON. FRANK PALLONE, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 14, 2001

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call attention once again to a group of women who never cease to amaze me. This month marks the tenth anniversary of The Thornton Sisters Foundation, Inc. I have been following these women's struggles and accomplishments for a long time now, and after a decade of success I feel it an honor to formally salute these women a second time.

On Sunday June 10, 2001 the Thornton Sisters Foundation held an awards ceremony for the twenty-five finalists of the Donald and Itasker Thornton Memorial Scholarship and their family members. The Grand View Ballroom at the Jumping Brook Country Club in Neptune, New Jersey hosted this occasion.

The Thornton Sisters have an interesting history that led to the creation of this foundation. Their parents, Donald and Itasker, moved in 1948 from Harlem New York City to Long Branch, New Jersey. The Thornton move was so that their children would be able to receive a better education. After purchasing a lot on Ludlow Street, Mr. Thornton became the first African-American man in the area to receive a mortgage.

Mrs. Thornton having given birth to six children, all of whom are girls, became a domestic. Mr. Thornton worked three jobs at Fort Monmouth, Eatontown to provide for his children.

Mrs. Thornton was unable to attend college herself. However, she pushed all of her daughters to accomplish something that she would never be able to do. Mrs. Thornton was correct in her foreseeing that women of the future would need to be able to be financially stable on their own.

With the help of scholarships and a weekend family music group all six daughters graduated from Monmouth University in Long Branch. Their music ensemble was well known and packed the house of the Apollo Theatre in Harlem. Having learned early on the importance of an education, these six sisters now want to give the same opportunity they had to other young women.

This story has special significance to me, as I am a citizen of Long Branch. Rita Thornton and I both attended Long Branch high school at the same time and actually participated in speech and debate together. I could tell, even back then, that her and her sisters share a true commitment to education and excellence—now knowing all of them received straight A's throughout high school.

These women are truly a group that needs to be admired and praised. I want to personally thank the Thornton sisters on their ten years of providing scholarships for young minority women of the state of New Jersey.

NATIONAL YOUTH SMOKING
REDUCTION ACT OF 2001

HON. TOM DAVIS

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 14, 2001

Mr. DAVIS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to introduce the National Youth Smoking Reduction Act of 2001, which gives the Food and Drug Administration (FDA) comprehensive, effective authority to oversee the tobacco industry. As the name implies, the primary focus of this bill is to keep our children away from tobacco products—to protect them from being targeted by the tobacco industry, to keep them from becoming addicted, to keep them healthier and stronger without the detrimental effects of tobacco.

I would especially like to thank my co-sponsors, Representatives TOWNS, GILLMOR, COLLIN PETERSON, LINDER, MARK GREEN, MIKE DOYLE, COLLINS, SWEENEY, BONO, GRANGER, TERRY FERGUSON, SCHROCK, and GRUCCI, for their leadership on this important issue.

Where does my interest in curbing tobacco use come from? My father died of emphy-

sema, and my wife is a doctor. I have three children of my own, and it would break my heart to see them fall prey to the marketing tactics that ensnare children and get them started on tobacco and down the road to disease and suffering. Moreover, I can see with my own eyes the dangers presented by tobacco use, and I believe there is a need to do something about the situation.

I should note that this is not the first time I have acted against tobacco. Back in the mid-1980s, as a member of the Fairfax County Board of Supervisors, I introduced the first ordinance in the Commonwealth of Virginia to designate non-smoking areas in restaurants.

I have tried to take a sensible approach to what is clearly a sensitive and polarizing issue. Some believe FDA has no role in regulating tobacco. Many would prefer FDA to have complete authority over tobacco, up to and including banning the use of tobacco products outright. I am promoting an approach that will allow FDA to take important steps in protecting our citizens, especially children, from the dangers of tobacco. However, I stop short of an abolitionist stance, because I believe that if an adult chooses to use tobacco products, he or she should legally be able to do so. If we ban tobacco use, or leave room for tobacco products to be altered in a way that makes them unacceptable to adult consumers, an illegal market to obtain such products will surely arise. This, ultimately, will be more harmful to the public health than if we never did anything at all. My bill leaves the authority to ban the use of tobacco products, or to eliminate nicotine completely from them, where that authority belongs: the Congress.

In addition, my bill allows for "reduced-risk" tobacco products. This is an area I believe could be very important in weaning existing tobacco users from more dangerous products—making it easier for them to quit, or at least giving them options that are less dangerous than the ones they are currently using.

I have sought to improve upon S. 190, which has been introduced in the other body. Like that bill, mine allows FDA to remove harmful substances from tobacco products, whether or not they are already on the market. It improves upon S. 190 by codifying the marketing and access restrictions found in the Master Settlement Agreement and the 1996 FDA regulation. These restrictions will go into effect shortly after enactment of the bill, and will subject them to federal enforcement. Furthermore, my bill directs FDA to regulate descriptors, such as "light" and "ultralight", and allows FDA to ban their use if they determine them to be misleading. I have also extended my bill to cover "bidis" and other tobacco products specifically directed towards children.

Mr. Speaker there are other important additions included in my bill, which are described in the attached section-by-section analysis. I urge your careful consideration of this extremely important legislation.

THE NATIONAL YOUTH SMOKING REDUCTION
ACT

Section-by-Section Summary: The "National Youth Smoking Reduction Act of 2001," among other things, creates a new chapter IX of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetics Act (FDCA) to provide explicit au-

thority to FDA to regulate tobacco products. The bill creates a separate chapter in the FDCA for tobacco products and thus expressly directs FDA to maintain a distinct regulatory program for tobacco products. The new FDCA chapter IX for tobacco products provides for comprehensive regulation of tobacco products.

The provisions of this new FDCA tobacco products chapter are based on the FDCA's device provisions, but some changes were made to make the provisions more appropriate for tobacco products. The most significant change is that the current statutory standard of "reasonable assurance of safety and effectiveness," which is relied on when FDA makes a range of decisions for devices, was changed to "appropriate for the protection of the public health," a standard which is more appropriate for tobacco products.

FDCA CHAPTER IX—TOBACCO PRODUCTS

Section 901—FDA authority over tobacco products

Clarifies that nothing in chapter IX shall be construed to affect the regulation of drugs and devices under chapter V that are not tobacco products under the FDCA.

Also clarifies that chapter IX does not apply to tobacco leaf that is not in the possession of the manufacturer, or to producers of tobacco leaf, including tobacco growers, tobacco warehouses, and tobacco grower cooperatives.

Also clarifies that FDA employees may not enter onto a farm owned by a producer of tobacco leaf without the producer's written consent.

Section 902—Adulterated tobacco products, and Section 903—Misbranding tobacco products

Defines the conditions under which a tobacco product will be adulterated or misbranded under the FDCA, and subject to enforcement action. These provisions are similar to device law provisions, but are tailored to tobacco product regulation.

Section 903(b) authorizes the Secretary to require by regulation the prior approval of statements made on the label of a tobacco product, and explicitly states that no regulation issued under this subsection may require the prior approval by the Secretary of the content of any advertisement. This is similar to a device law provision.

Section 904—Submission of health information to the secretary

Within 6 months of enactment (and annually thereafter), each tobacco product manufacturer or importer must, among other document requirements, submit to FDA:

All documents relating to research activities, research findings, conducted, supported, or possessed by the manufacturer on tobacco or tobacco-related products;

All documents relating to research concerning the use of technology to reduce health risks associated with the use of tobacco; and

All documents relating to marketing research on tobacco products.

Section 905—Annual registration

Tobacco manufacturers are required to register each year with FDA in order to provide name and place of business information, as well as to provide lists of tobacco products manufactured by the establishment, and other information. Entities registered with FDA are subject to inspection every two years.

Section 906—General provisions respecting control of tobacco products

Provides authorities relating to the general regulation of tobacco products. This section includes protections for trade secret information similar to those for devices.