

A CATECHISM

On the Subject of the
Proposed

Columbia Valley Authority
S. B. 460

By Lars Langloe, Chairman
Projects Committee
Washington State Reclamation Association

Published by
Washington
State Reclamation Association

(Pacific Northwest Development Association,
Co-operating)

Donald Building, 203 Fifth Avenue East

P. O. Box 717

Olympia, Washington

*Officers for
1946*

George R. Thompson, Chehalis, who became acting president upon the death of the late President Thomas D. Potwin, was elected to that office for 1946. J. A. Weber, Quincy, was named vice president, and Howard Seivers, Everett, second vice president.

Directors Elected

Directors elected for two-year terms are:

J. W. Spangler and Tom D. Tyrer, Seattle, R. V. Welts, Mt. Vernon, Ed Warner, Tacoma, F. K. Jones, Spokane, Frank Maupin, Kennewick, N. G. Barlis, Oroville, John Pierce, Bellingham, and J. K. Cheadle, Spokane.

Directors for a one-year term: James P. Neal, Olympia, F. J. Barrett, Seattle, J. C. Scott, Sequim, A. L. Thiele, Wenatchee, F. M. Lowden, jr., Walla Walla, W. R. Rowe, and H. L. Coffin.

Yakima, R. L. Rutter, Ellensburg, and Maurice Windus, Longview.

Washington State Reclamation Assn.

Officers

THOMAS D. POTWIN

Yakima, President

GEORGE R. THOMPSON

Chehalis, 1st Vice President

J. A. WEBER

Quincy, 2nd Vice President

THOMAS B. HILL

Olympia, Managing Secretary

E. Y. ROBINSON

Box 8, Selah, Treasurer

Executive Committee

THOMAS D. POTWIN

GEORGE R. THOMPSON

J. A. WEBER

J. W. SPANGLER

A. L. THIELE

Directors

FRANK J. BARRETT

Seaboard Building, Seattle

FRED K. JONES

Hyde Building, Spokane

EARL JUDAY

RFD No. 1, Omak

FRANK M. LOWDEN, JR.

903 North 4th, Walla Walla

FRANK MAUPIN

Church Grape Juice Co.,
Kennewick

RODERIC OLZENDAM

Tacoma Building, Tacoma

WALTER R. ROWE

Naches

J. C. SCOTT

Sequim

J. W. SPANGLER

Seattle First National Bank,
Seattle

STANLEY STARR

221 East 4th, Olympia

A. L. THIELE

National Bank of Commerce,
Wenatchee

A. L. TIPTON

RFD No. 3, Ellensburg

TOM D. TYRER

Washington Asphalt Co.,
Seattle

ROBIN V. WELTS

Skagit National Bank Building
Mount Vernon

PROVISIONS OF THE CVA (MITCHELL) BILL

THE AUTHOR

Lars Langloe, chairman of the Projects Committee of the Washington State Reclamation Association, has followed, for the last forty years, all major legislation, both state and national, which has affected land and water resources of Washington, especially with respect to reclamation and flood control. Until recently, Mr. Langloe was for a number of years supervisor of flood control and department engineer for the Washington State Department of Conservation and Development, and also served for a period as department director.

Mr. Langloe was one of the engineers who made the original survey for the Columbia Basin project, and personally set the first stakes on the site of the present completed Grand Coulee dam. At present he is a consulting engineer, engaged in reclamation work, on his own account.

The questions and answers he has prepared, which are printed herewith, explain the powers which would be vested in a corporation which it is proposed to create by enactment of the Mitchell Bill (S. 460) now pending in Congress. He outlines the effect of such activities of such a corporation on the future reclamation projects of the State of Washington, its effect on the economic, social and recreational life of its people, and the political implications of the bill.

Washington State Reclamation Assn.

1. What is the Columbia Valley Authority?

It is a Federal regional agency and a corporation and instrumentality of the United States.

2. What territory would be covered by the Authority?

All of the states of Washington and Oregon, virtually all of the state of Idaho, that portion of Montana lying west of the Rocky mountains, and a small part of Wyoming lying within the Columbia River watershed, together with such adjacent territory as may be deemed advisable.

3. What is the stated purpose of the Authority?

To foster and protect commerce among the several states, strengthen the national defense, conserve the water, soil, mineral, and forest resources of the region and the Nation, relieve unemployment and promote the general welfare of the United States.

4. Who would direct and control the Corporation?

A board of three directors appointed by the President with the consent of the Senate. The Corporation shall maintain its principal office at a centrally located place in the Columbia Valley region.

5. What two qualifications are prescribed for a director?

He must be a citizen of the United States and must profess a belief in the feasibility and wisdom of the Valley Authority principle.

6. Are the Corporation directors subject to higher Authority?

Yes, they must conform to the general policies of the National River Basin Development Board.

7. What is the National River Basin Development Board and what are its duties?

It would be composed of the secretaries of Interior, Agriculture and War, the Chief of Engineers of the War Department and the Chairmen or executive officers of the boards of directors of all established Valley Authorities in the United States (including the Tennessee Valley Authority), with the Secretary of the Interior as its chairman. The board would coordinate the activities of each Valley Authority with each other and with National plans and programs.

8. What, if any, representation would the affected States have on the Authority?

None on the Authority itself. Provision is made for a Columbia Valley Advisory Council, with which the directors shall advise and consult, composed of seven members, one each

from Idaho, Montana, Oregon and Washington, appointed by the respective Governors, and three from the public at large who shall be residents of the region and appointed by the President with the consent of the Senate.

9. What would be the qualifications and functions of the Advisory Council?

The members shall each profess a belief in the feasibility and wisdom of the Valley Authority principle; its functions are advisory only.

10. What are some of the specific activities and resources over which the Authority would have control?

The Authority would be given specific jurisdiction over navigation, flood control and prevention, development, transmission and distribution of power, irrigation and reclamation of land, conservation and development of water and soil resources, mines and minerals, forestry and grazing, fisheries and wild life, recreation and recreational facilities.

11. What are some of the additional powers, incidental to these main purposes, which would be granted the Authority?

It would exercise authority over dams and appurtenant works, sewers, docks, wharves, piers, bridges, trestles, landing pipes, buildings, floats, and other structures, constructed, operated or maintained over, across, along or into any stream or watercourse in the Columbia Valley Region.

12. Would the Authority take over existing Federal Power Projects?

Yes, transfer to the Authority of the Bonneville and Grand Coulee power projects is specifically provided for, as is transfer to it of the transmission and distribution system of the Bonneville power administration.

13. Will Federal irrigation projects be transferred to the Authority?

Yes, at its option, the Authority may take over the Okanogan, Sunnyside, Teiton, Kittitas, Roza and probably, the Wapato (Indian Service) irrigation projects; also the dams and irrigation reservoirs on the Yakima River and on the Okanogan project.

14. Will the Columbia Basin Irrigation Project be taken over?

Yes, that is specifically provided for.

15. What about existing flood control and navigation projects?

The Authority is empowered to take over any Water-Control project such as Mud Mountain Flood Control Dam on White River and the Mill Creek flood control project at Walla Walla, as well as navigation projects along and at the mouths of the navigable rivers and streams.

16. What other Federal property would the Corporation be empowered to take over?

It may take over any real and personal property of the United States and its instrumentalities which the Authority may from time to time deem necessary for its purposes.

17. Do other Federal agencies have anything to say about transferring these projects and properties to the Authority?

No. The heads of the various departments and agencies would under the act, and, notwithstanding any other law or regulation, be obliged, upon request of the Authority, to turn over its projects and facilities and other properties or portions thereof.

18. What are some of the more general activities which the Authority would be empowered to engage in?

It may acquire, construct, operate, maintain, and improve dams, locks, reservoirs, levees, spillways, floodways, fishways, conduits, canals, roads, roadways, docks, wharves, terminals, sewage disposal, water-purification and other sanitation works, and recreation facilities, and structures, equipment and facilities incidental thereto.

19. What general powers would the Authority have with respect to power and water?

It may acquire, construct, operate and maintain and improve canals, conduits, powerhouses, steam generating plants, transmission lines, rural electric lines and substations, and machinery, equipment structures and facilities for storage and transportation of water or for the generation and transmission of electric energy.

20. How may the Authority acquire property?

By purchase through negotiation with the owner or by condemnation under its power of eminent domain. Property may also be acquired by lease or donation.

21. Whose property may the Authority acquire?

Anybody's property, except the electric and water systems of any municipality that objects to such acquisition.

22. How would the Authority finance its activities?

By funds appropriated by Congress, from proceeds of the sale of its revenue bonds, or, in part, with any funds furnished by cooperating governmental agencies, Federal or State.

23. From what activities and sources would the Authority receive revenues?

From two primary sources, sale of electric energy and sale of water. Probably also from sale of timber, rental of grazing privileges, mineral leases, recreational areas and facilities, etc., etc.

24. To what extent and how is the Authority em-

powered to promote sales of power and water?

By assisting and rendering services including extension of credit to public and cooperative agencies in constructing, acquiring, improving, maintaining and operating works and facilities for distributing and conveyance of electric energy, water, or both, and by assisting in organizing such public and cooperative agencies.

25. May the Authority acquire privately owned electric utilities?

Yes. It may acquire, operate, maintain, extend, and improve electric utility systems within the Columbia Valley region.

26. May the Authority acquire municipally owned electric or water systems?

Yes, with the approval of the municipality.

27. May the Authority engage in industrial and commercial enterprise?

Yes, if in its judgement the interest of economy and efficiency will be served thereby.

28. What are some of these industrial and commercial enterprises?

The Authority would be empowered to acquire, construct and operate plants and facilities for the manufacture of fertilizers and chemicals, and to sell or otherwise dispose of the output thereof; also to engage in a mineral development program, including cooperative participation with individuals, associations and corporations, public and private, in mining, quarrying and manufacturing enterprises based on minerals and mineral substances, and to sell any minerals found, purchased or acquired, or the products manufactured therefrom by the Authority.

29. What are some of the other resources over which the Authority would be granted jurisdiction?

It would assume control specifically of forestry and grazing, fish and wildlife, and recreation and recreational facilities and resources.

30. Is it indicated that the Authority may be expected to concern itself with every aspect of life in the Columbia Valley region?

Yes, through the expenditure of public funds and by guidance and control, the Authority is expected to foster and attain orderly and proper physical, economic, cultural and social development of the region.

31. Does the proposal specify how and in what direction social development shall be attained?

No.

32. What would be the Authority's first job?

To formulate and report to the President and Congress, not later than two years after the legal establishment of the Authority, its recommendations for the unified development of

the Columbia Valley region, including a complete plan for the integrated control and utilization of the waters of the region.

33. Will state and local interests share in formulating this master plan?

Yes, but only to the extent that Columbia Valley Advisory Council shall review the plans and recommendations and submit its report with that of the Authority.

34. Is the plan subject to approval by Congress?

Yes and no. The plan shall lie before Congress not to exceed four legislative months. If not affirmatively disapproved by Congress by the end of that period the plans and recommendations shall be deemed effective.

35. When does the Authority take over the Bonneville and Columbia Basin Projects and the Bonneville Power Administration?

On the first day of the third calendar month after the date of approval of the Act.

36. Would the Authority replace any existing Federal Agencies?

Yes, it undoubtedly replaces or duplicates all existing agencies dealing with the administration of natural resources and their development and utilization.

37. Which are some of these replaced agencies and functions?

- (a) The Bureau of Reclamation in charge of Federal Reclamation.
- (b) The Army Engineers in charge of rivers and harbors and flood control.
- (c) The Bonneville Power Administration, dealing with distribution and sale of electric energy.
- (d) The Bureau of Mines, dealing with mines and minerals.
- (e) The Forest Service, in charge of Federal forests.
- (f) The Grazing Service, in charge of grazing on Federal lands.
- (g) The Fish and Wild Life Service, in charge of fisheries, game and other wild life.
- (h) The National Park Service, in respect to their functions other than in National Parks and monuments.
- (i) The Soil Conservation Service.
- (j) In part, at least, The Federal Power Commission, and probably others.

38. Would the proposed legislation abolish these Federal agencies?

Apparently not. The Authority simply assumes their powers, but may utilize their services and delegate to them tasks in their respective fields.

39. What provision is made for the Authority's compliance with State laws?

The bill provides that the Authority shall conform to State laws relating to water and shall respect vested water rights. Likewise, it promises that public and cooperative agencies which the Authority helps to organize or which it finances shall be created and operated according to State law.

EFFECT UPON THE COLUMBIA BASIN

1. Could the establishment of the CVA affect the Columbia Basin Project?

Yes, it will take over the project, plan, build, operate and manage it.

2. How would the project be affected?

It would definitely delay start of construction, and very likely delay its progress and increase its cost.

3. Why would it delay start of construction?

Because the Authority would require much time, possibly a couple of years or more to study and modify existing plans and to "integrate" the construction and development plans with those of the entire region and nation.

4. Why wouldn't the Authority adopt the plans inherited from the Bureau of Reclamation?

That would be contrary to the theory under which it is brought into existence, namely, that the Bureau and other agencies are doing piecemeal jobs, by "dibs here and dabs there," without full understanding of the overall picture. Adopting the Bureau's plans, off the bat, would be a fatal admission of the Authority's superfluity.

5. Why might the start of Construction be delayed two years or more?

That is the length of time granted the Authority in the bill for submitting its "integrated" plan to the President and Congress. Two years would be none too long for a brand new organization to "integrate" the economy of the Pacific Northwest Region, and it would be certain to use it all.

6. But, why couldn't the Authority proceed on the Bureau plans while they are preparing the overall Basin plan?

Because the Columbia Basin Project is the key project of the whole Northwest scheme of things. If that is wrong, as the Bureau plans necessarily would be assumed to be, the overall development would be forever "unbalanced."

7. Why would the Authority be likely to delay progress of Basin Project construction?

Ideologically, and for the sake of prestige,

the Authority would favor construction by force account, that is, by its own forces rather than by contract under supervision of expert constructors. That tendency has become manifest on the T.V.A.

8. Why would the Authority likely increase costs?

Because governmental force account jobs notoriously increase costs and, besides, the Authority would lack the incentive for savings inherent in construction by contract.

9. How soon can the Bureau of Reclamation start construction?

As soon as it receives the word to go ahead. Its plans are ready now for the initial work, and the capable staff will keep the plans well ahead of construction progress.

10. In what other manner would the Authority be likely to affect the Columbia Basin Project?

The authority would be virtually certain to take advantage of this virgin project as a proving ground for all sorts of social experiments. The will and determination of the social planners to turn the project into a guinea pig for so called experimentation was very much in evidence during the Columbia Basin joint investigations, where for a time numerous visionaries held full sway.

11. Did the final recommendations of the joint investigation reflect the wishes of the social planner?

No, not to any great extent.

12. How come?

Because, in the final show down, the sane and sensible views of the representatives from the Bureau of Reclamation and other long established and experienced Federal and State agencies triumphed. The reports, which under the present set-up, will form the basis for Basin developments, are substantially the product of and written by the experienced Bureau men.

13. Under a C.V.A. then, what could we expect to happen to the Columbia Basin project?

The Columbia Basin project would be a province apart, in that it would, so to speak, be under neither true Federal nor State jurisdiction. The settlers would become solely beholden to the Authority, whence would come fortune or misfortune, depending on the degree of subservience and "cooperation" displayed by the population.

14. If this is in prospect what must now be the attitude toward the C.V.A. proposal of all true friends of the Basin project?

They must arouse themselves to the true meaning of the proposal and fight the C.V.A. propaganda with every legitimate weapon at hand, before it is too late.

EFFECT UPON FEDERAL IRRIGATION

1. Would the C.V.A. affect developed Federal Reclamation projects?

Yes, indeed. The Authority would take over all such projects. In Washington that would mean the Okanogan Project, and the Sunnyside, Tieton, Kittitas, Roza, Kennewick and, probably, the Wapato units in the Yakima Valley, together with the five major storage reservoirs serving them.

2. In what manner would the Authority affect the Yakima project?

Under pretext of economy and efficiency, and under provision of the bill for transfer to it of Federally constructed irrigation or other projects, the Authority would unquestionably take over the entire Yakima project so that its several units may be "integrated" into one overall operation.

3. What special features of the Yakima project would be subject to Authority management and operation?

The storage reservoirs. In the interest of water conservation, which would be a major objective, the Authority would be certain to re-allocate storage on the basis of its own judgment as to needs.

4. Isn't present storage water or capacity definitely allocated to each unit?

No. Present contracts simply provide for sufficient water to mature crops, irrespective of whether water comes from natural flow or from storage.

5. Has the final storage cost to each unit on the Yakima project been definitely fixed?

No. That will not be definitely fixed until the entire project has been completed, which will be some years hence.

6. Under present status who fixes the storage charge?

The Secretary of the Interior, which in reality would mean the Bureau of Reclamation.

7. Who would determine the additional storage necessary and the amount and distribution of storage charges if the C.V.A. is established?

The Authority would determine these questions.

8. Would the Authority's distribution of storage cost be based on the actual needs of a unit for stored water over and above its rights to natural stream flow?

Not necessarily. The Authority would have the right to consider the several units as interconnected by reason of the common storage works and therefore allocate costs and revenues to various units in such manner as it deems ap-

propriate—probably on the basis of ability to pay, rather than on basis of vested rights to water.

9. Would a unit or district have the right of appeal from such determination by the Authority?

No. The allocation of costs, when approved by the President, would be final.

10. Would the Authority be likely to exercise control over individual farming operations on Federal and other reclamation projects?

Yes, insofar as such operations pertain to the conservation, utilization, fertilization, cultivation and the water absorption and infiltration capacity of the soil.

11. By what means would the Authority exercise such control?

By means of regulations issued under general powers granted to it, but more particularly through money subsidies to cooperators in specific "programs."

12. Would the C.V.A. exercise any control over non-federal reclamation projects?

Yes; by bringing them under certain programs or under the pretext of water and soil conservation and by rendering financial assistance and loans for various purposes the Authority, under the general plan, would have to acquire virtually full control of such public and private enterprise.

THE C.V.A. AND STATE WATER LAW

1. Would the acts of the C.V.A. be governed by Federal or by State laws and procedure?

By Federal laws, with the sole exception that the bill provides that the laws of any state relating to the control, appropriation, use, or distribution of water shall not be affected or interfered with, nor shall vested rights to water be annulled or limited.

2. What do the laws of Washington and the Northwest States provide with respect to control of waters?

In general, the States assert full authority and control over their respective public waters, subject only to Federal jurisdiction over navigation.

3. What are public waters?

Public waters are such as have not been legally appropriated for beneficial purposes.

4. Do the several federal agencies now generally

comply with state law in appropriating water for their respective uses?

Yes; the Bureau of Reclamation, the Forest Service, Army Engineers, National Park Service, and the Bureau of Indian Affairs, except on treaty reservations, always have complied.

5. Is there any disposition on part of certain federal agencies to disregard state rights to control water?

Yes. A section of opinion within certain federal agencies hold that the Federal government has the power and should control both navigable and interstate streams and their tributaries.

6. On what theories have these recent federal claims to jurisdiction over water been based?

On the commerce clause of the Federal Constitution, and claim of United States ownership of unappropriated waters and of water appropriated for federal reclamation projects.

7. Why not take the declaration of compliance with State water law at face value?

Because, the Mitchell bill, for instance, explicitly provides for Authority ownership and control of waters. It specifically provides for the sale of water by the Authority, while under state law, the rights and ownership in water can only be obtained by the actual user.

8. As a matter of fact isn't complete Authority control and jurisdiction over water resources essential to the operation of any Valley Authority?

Definitely yes! Every provision relating to water development in any authority proposal assumes that the Authority has the unquestioned right to do whatever it wishes to do with any public waters in the region.

9. If the powers of the Valley Authority are incompatible with State water laws, what is likely to happen?

Inevitably, state water laws will give way to the Authority.

10. Why is that inevitable?

By reason of its vast powers over all of the resources of the region and over the advancement or retardation of their development and utilization, the Authority would be able to secure the amendment of existing, or the enactment of new State laws to suit its own purpose. For that reason a Valley Authority may well undertake to always comply with state laws respecting water and any other matters and things.

11. What about vested water rights?

Vested rights would not be disturbed without compensation. The Authority would have ample powers and funds to acquire any vested rights that were in its way, or that might in-

terfere with "overall and integrated" development and control of a stream or stream basin.

12. How extensively may the Authority be expected to assume control over water in the State of Washington?

Authority control would most certainly be applied to the Columbia River and all its tributaries; also to all streams in Western Washington that are classified as navigable for any distance above their mouths, and very probably also to streams that originate in the National forests or in a National Park, or other federally owned area or reservation as well as international streams.

13. Wouldn't that mean virtually all waters in Washington?

Yes, ultimately only a very few minor streams and creeks would remain under state control.

14. Under what pretext might the Authority be expected to assume control and ownership of water?

As a matter of policy the Authority might be expected to undertake at the earliest possible time on most streams some form of water regulation and control, either by the construction of major or minor storage dams or other structures or simply by a program of storage by "retardation of water run-off and the restoration and improvement of the absorption and infiltration capacity of the soil." In any such case the necessity for "integrated overall control" would furnish the excuse for assumption of full authority and ownership of waters of the stream.

15. What would be the difference between obtaining water rights from the State and acquiring such rights from the Valley Authority?

The State grants rights to water for beneficial purposes free of cost, except small fees to help defray cost of administration; the Authority would sell water in order to obtain revenue. As a matter of fact, all so-called reimbursable costs of the Authority's projects are intended to be repaid by revenues from sale of water and electricity.

16. May any citizen who feels aggrieved by the Acts of the Authority seek redress in State courts?

No. Only Federal Courts have jurisdiction in any case involving the Valley Authority.

THE C.V.A. AND PRIVATE ENTERPRISE

1. Would the C.V.A. be authorized to participate or engage in industry?

Yes. The corporation may request heads of various federal departments and agencies to turn over to it, besides water control and electric generating and transmitting facilities, any other real and personal property of the United States and its instrumentalities, and the pertinent departments and agencies would be directed to comply, notwithstanding the restrictions or limitations of any other laws or regulations.

2. Would the Authority be authorized to operate such property?

Yes, the Authority may maintain, repair, alter, use and operate such real and personal property of the United States whether or not for the purpose of this act.

3. What are some of the real and personal properties the Authorities would be almost certain to take over under the above provisions?

Probably, and almost certainly, all federally financed and owned war production plants, such as those for extraction and processing of aluminum, magnesium and other metals; also ship building and aircraft plants, the mysterious and secret Hanford plant and many others.

4. Is it not the understanding that many war production plants financed by the United States are optioned to their private operators who may then elect to take them over and operate them once the war is over?

Yes, but it is doubtful if the Authority once it obtains possession is bound by any prior commitment of the United States, since the act would provide that such transfer to the Authority shall be made "—notwithstanding the restrictions and limitations of any other laws and regulations—."

5. But even though these war plants and other real and personal properties are transferred to the Corporation, may they not in due course be sold to private interests?

No, the act would provide for virtual perpetual ownership by the Authority, by a clause reading as follows:

"Except as provided in section 15 (e) of the act" (pertaining to sale of electric utility systems) "the Corporation shall not dispose of any real property on which is located a permanent dam, hydraulic power plant, or munitions plant heretofore or hereafter constructed by or on behalf of the United States or the Corporation, or which has a value in excess of \$1,000,000."

6. Would this clause prevent ultimate sale if a

"munitions plant" was by the Authority transformed into other production?

By a recent court decision almost any plant or enterprise may be deemed to be a munitions or defense plant. Also almost any of these plants "has a value in excess of \$1,000,000" and therefore could not be disposed of.

7. Then it looks as though the Mitchell bill, if passed could settle the problem of reconversion of war plants in the Pacific Northwest?

Yes it could, indeed.

8. Also the acquisition, reconversion, and operation of all the war enterprises and plants by the C.V.A. might come very close to once and for all establishing public ownership and operation of industry in the Pacific Northwest, would it not?

Indeed it could.

9. Would the C.V.A. be authorized to engage in the fertilizer business?

Yes. It may acquire or construct and operate plants for the manufacture of and may engage in the purchase, sale or other disposal of fertilizers and chemicals.

10. May the C.V.A. enter the mining and extracting and processing business, and what Authority does it assume in connection therewith?

Yes. "Cooperatively" it may engage in the mining, extracting and processing of minerals and in the sale or other disposal of mineral products purchased or manufactured by the Corporation. In connection with mines, mining and minerals the Authority is vested with "the same powers as are vested in the Secretary of the Interior and the Director of the Bureau of Mines."

11. Does this latter provision mean a duplication of Authority?

Apparently it does. Private enterprise would thenceforth have to deal with a dual federal authority in respect to mining and allied matters.

12. Would the Authority be given control of the federal forests and of grazing?

Yes, the Authority would "—exercise within the Columbia Valley region — the same powers as are vested in the Secretary of the Interior and the Director of Grazing and the Secretary of Agriculture and the Chief Forester."

13. Does this mean transfer to the Authority of all federal powers over forests and grazing?

Apparently not. It simply is granted "the same powers" as are now vested in existing agencies—simply a duplication of authority.

14. Does this mean simplification or complications for private enterprise that depends on the public domain for timber, grazing and other privileges?

Obviously, complications instead of the simplifications in dealing with federal agencies promised by the proponents of the bill.

15. Is there a possibility that the C.V.A. might itself undertake the logging, milling, manufacture and sale of timber and timber products from the federal forests?

Definitely yes. Such would be perfectly in line with the provisions of the Mitchell bill and its underlying ideology.

16. Might the Authority conclude that, in line with the underlying ideology, logging, grazing and other privileges on the public domain should be reserved for "cooperatives and other organizations organized and operating not for profit" who are accorded preferential rights throughout the bill?

That could well become the Authority's policy.

17. Since most of the remaining commercial timber in the Pacific Northwest is on federal reserves, what would such policy mean to the lumber industry?

It would mean its complete socialization.

18. What powers would the Authority have with respect to recreation and recreational facilities?

It would have power "to establish, maintain, and operate in conjunction with any of the programs and activities authorized under this act, recreational areas and facilities."

19. Would these recreational activities be in competition with private enterprise?

They most certainly would. Being under no obligations to make ends meet, the Authority could, in the interest of the public health and welfare, soon put our private recreation business out of existence. The Authority would have coextensive powers with the Secretary of the Interior and the National Park Service, outside of National parks and monuments.

20. What, if any, other facilities commonly owned and operated by private enterprise would the Authority be specifically empowered to acquire, construct and operate?

Any and all electric generating, transmission and distribution systems, and docks, wharves, terminals, etc.

21. What about the heavy construction industry? Is the Authority likely to supplant that industry by building its own projects by force account?

The Mitchell bill says nothing about how Authority projects shall be constructed—by contract or by force account. This is contrary to common practice in measures providing for construction of public works. Consequently, one has the right to assume that Authority projects will be constructed by the corporation's own forces on a force account basis.

22. Inasmuch as the Authority, in that event, would

become virtually the sole heavy construction agency in the Pacific Northwest, the construction contractor would become a thing of the past?

Yes, he would have to get on the pay roll of the C.V.A.

23. Is there any private enterprise which the C.V.A. might not conceivably supplant?

We can not think of any.

THE "LOCAL" CHARACTER OF THE PROPOSED C.V.A.

1. Great stress is laid by the proponents on the "local" character of the Authority. How "local" will it be?

The Mitchell bill provides that "The corporation shall maintain its principal office at a convenient place centrally located in the territory in which its activities are conducted."

2. Must the three directors of the Authority, or any of them, be local men?

No. Any citizen of the United States may be appointed providing he is otherwise qualified.

3. Are familiarity with the region or any part of it, technical knowledge and experience pertaining to the important job assigned to them part of the qualifications?

No, not at all.

4. What, then, must be their qualifications, aside from United States citizenship?

They must be ideologically qualified, that is to say, each must under oath, "profess a belief in the feasibility and wisdom of the Act—".

5. Must the three directors establish and maintain their residence in the Columbia Valley region?

No, as far as the proposed act is concerned they can live wherever they please.

6. But surely they must hold their meetings at the corporation's principal office in the region, and during part of the time, at least, make themselves locally available to the public for conferences, discussions of problems, etc?

No such requirements are imposed on them by the proposed act.

7. Then their meetings, conferences, etc., might be held in Washington, D.C., New York, or any place most convenient to the directors?

Apparently so.

8. But assuming, now, that the directors will con-

scientifically establish and maintain their residence among us in the Pacific Northwest, does that insure a sympathetic understanding and treatment of our problems equal or superior to what we have been accustomed to from the existing well qualified and experienced agencies?

It does not. If our problems are as complicated and far-flung as the Authority proponents claim them to be, it would certainly require more than one term in office to acquire the necessary knowledge of and familiarity with our resources and conditions to deal with them with the degree of super-intelligence anticipated from the Authority.

9. But, what about the Columbia Valley Advisory Council of seven members; will not that body give the Authority local coloring?

Theoretically, yes. But after all that body is not likely to be important except as window dressing. They act in an advisory capacity only, and would have no decisive voice in final discussions and actions.

10. Assuming, for argument's sake, that we had a capable and conscientious board of directors and an equally qualified advisory council, the two working harmoniously and wisely to our entire satisfaction, would that insure that local wishes and view points as expressed by the board of directors would prevail?

It would not. Any "overall integrated plans" for the Columbia Valley region, be they ever so acceptable locally, would be subject to approval or disapproval by the National River Basin Development Board composed of the Secretaries of Interior and Agriculture, the Chief of Engineers of the War Department and the chairman of each of such regional authorities as may have been created including the Tennessee Valley Authority.

11. What would be the function and authority of the National River Basin Development Board with respect to the C.V.A.?

"—To review the recommendations of the Corporation—and coordinate such recommendations with national plans and programs and with the plans and programs of other authorities and establishments of the government."

12. Is it true, then, as the proponents claim, that the C.V.A. would be a regional autonomous body?

Certainly not. Its every act would be subject to approval or rejection by a superior authority in Washington, D.C., the National River Basin Development Board.

13. Then the C.V.A. would not be, as its sponsors claim, an autonomous local organization designed to bring to the Pacific Northwest the responsibility for the operation of Federal agencies affecting our natural resources?

No, in the final analysis the C.V.A. would

only be the errand-boy of an extra-constitutional Authoritarian political body of men in Washington, D.C., whose majority hold office solely on the basis of their sworn allegiance to and belief in the un-American ideology underlying the Valley Authority principle.

14. Then, also, the Pacific Northwest would still depend upon Washington, D.C. for the direction of Federal enterprise?

Yes; and the National Capitol would still be "3,000 miles away" and it would still remain fully as "impossible for officials located there to know in detail the day to day needs, or even the year to year needs, of a part of the country so far away" as Senator Mitchell, in a published statement, claims it to be now.

15. In the final analysis, then, who would ultimately exercise full and complete control over the economic and social destinies of the Pacific Northwest region?

The chairmen of the 7 or 9, or what have you, regional valley authorities of the United States.

16. Do these chairmen receive their mandate to rule over our destinies directly, or nearly directly, from the electorate?

No; they would be as far removed from the electorate and as irresponsible to its will and desires as public officials could possibly be.

17. Then the word "Authority" is fully descriptive of the regional set-up?

Yes, indeed!

18. Who exercises control over Federal projects and activities in the Pacific Northwest and elsewhere under present set-up?

Congress.

19. Is Congress close to and responsive to wishes and aspirations of the electorate?

Yes.

20. Has Congress in the past dealt fairly and sufficiently expeditiously with the Pacific Northwest in regard to federal land, water and other resource developments?

Yes it has.

21. To preserve local control then, hadn't we better leave things as they are?

That is our only safe course.

POLITICAL ASPECT OF A VALLEY AUTHORITY

1. What would be the political status of the C.V.A?

It would be an extra-constitutional political authority imposed by Congress upon the Pacific Northwest region.

2. Why would it be extra-constitutional?

Because neither Federal nor State constitutions anticipate or provide for any such governmental authority.

3. Would Valley Authorities affect Federal-State relationship to such a degree that their establishment should be made contingent upon constitutional provisions?

Definitely yes. A Valley Authority could and undoubtedly would directly or indirectly establish virtually complete control over the economy of the region over which it rules. The states have never granted any such powers to the Federal government; nor has there, until comparatively recently, been any thought or desire on the part of the United States to acquire any such control by constitutional amendments or otherwise.

4. Then why don't the proponents attempt to secure a constitutional amendment authorizing creation of Valley Authorities?

Because they know well enough that neither Congress nor the states would approve such amendment. Furthermore, the proponents have discovered, or think they have discovered, an easy plan for gaining their objectives by way of the back door.

5. And what is the essence of this back door plan?

Since their various Valley Authority bills solemnly provide or imply that the Authorities shall in all respects comply with state laws; that they shall not enter into local affairs or enterprise except with the voluntary cooperation of local governments and agencies, no conflict, they claim, can possibly arise with the states, and nobody's rights will be taken away except by consent.

6. Under what theory do the proponents justify Valley Authorities?

They contend that private enterprise and governmental agencies below the "Federal level" are utterly incompetent to conserve, develop, utilize and manage natural resources in a manner that will insure sustained employment and economic welfare of the people. That being so, they contend, it is the duty of the Federal government in the interest of the public welfare to take over all natural resources and guide and integrate their utilization and the entire economy to insure sustained public economic well-being. Furthermore they contend that this can

not be accomplished by dealing with the individual states since their respective territories cannot be integrated into adequate economic units. But such units can be created by dividing the nation into regions substantially on the basis of the principal water sheds or river valleys, each governed by an autonomous Authority which will supercede or replace the old, obsolete and inefficient established federal agencies. The framers of the State and Federal constitutions, cramped as they were by their concept of state sovereignty, could not have been expected to anticipate the discovery of the great regional principle. But now that it has been discovered we should apply it. And since there is no intention to interfere with states' rights, constitutions or laws, and the whole program is to be carried out purely on a co-operative, voluntary and benevolent basis, there is no danger of upsetting or encroaching upon the American system of government. A Valley Authority will only proceed to do in an integrated and overall fashion that which numerous Federal agencies and the states are already attempting to do by "dibs and dabs" in an ineffectual and piecemeal manner. Such is the theory.

7. That theory sounds plausible, doesn't it?

Yes, on the face of it, and for many people, the plan has appeal.

8. Then, what is wrong with it?

No better answer can be given than the following quotation from the statement of Congressman A. J. May of Kentucky, Chairman of the Military Affairs Committee of the House of Representatives, before the subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Commerce in opposition to the Missouri Valley Authority bill on April 27, 1945. He said:

"*** the Authority type of Federal agency is a misbegotten offspring of collectivist thinking by which our constitutional system is bypassed and set aside by an authority with economic and political power beyond, above, and different from that of the individual states and the federal departments, as envisaged in the Constitution. The path of authoritarianism leads to totalitarianism. * * *

9. Did Congressman May substantiate his charge about the collectivist origin of the Authority plan?

Yes. He did so by quoting from the book "Socialism in our Times" (1929) by H. S. Raushenbush, in charge of research and plans in the Power Division in the Department of the Interior, in which the author introduced the phrase "power authority" and the word "yardstick," as follows:

"The very subject transitional state implies that we have accepted the alternative of encroaching control in place of the dream of cataclysmic socialism which has engrossed

people dissatisfied with the world for so many years * * *

"Our long-time aim is the abolition of the profit system for private use. Our strategy is to make and take every opportunity to prove that it works. We must force our experts on agriculture, trusts, coal, power, subways, housing, milk, etc., to tell us correctly which the next steps are, and then take them and identify ourselves with their success. The students coming from our colleges today can do something more than be filled with wholesome and cleansing indignation. They can be of enormous use to the movement as government officials, starting in small and definitely working on the reasonable hope that in the course of another 10 years we shall have government control of a much more definite kind over our trusts, banks and general industries; that there will be government corporations operating and managing, not only the Port of New York and Muscle Shoals, but many other developments. There is a chance here for young men not only to keep the liberal groups informed about the dirty work going on and times and ways to prevent it, but also to look forward to careers of usefulness in executive positions, making the government control over industry more adequate, pioneering in a field of essential importance. * * *".

10. Are we then justified in assuming that the Valley Authority proposals are manifestations of carefully made plans toward State Socialization of industry and enterprise?

Unquestionably. As Congressman May said in his testimony:

"Obviously the Tennessee Valley Authority was the first step toward total control of industry by government, not only regulation but ownership and operation."

11. Would the C.V.A. be likely to enter into state and local politics?

It is difficult to see how that could be avoided. In order to get under way with and carry on its program, it would either be forced to break its pledge to abide by state laws, or it would have to enter into and stay in politics in order to secure legislation and public officials that would provide the necessary cooperation. The C.V.A. would be the one definite issue in all state and local elections.

12. Would the Authority be politically potent?

Once in the saddle with all the powers over resources and enterprise proposed to be granted to it, the Authority would be the most potent political force in the region.

13. Why would the Authority be politically persuasive?

Because it would have the power to dole out or withhold Federal funds for all sorts of projects and developments. Not only would the

Authority be in a position to play one section of a state against another, but it could, if need be, play one state against another within the region. Political subservience to the Authority would be inevitable.

14. Has the Tennessee Valley Authority influenced local politics?

Answering that question, Congressman May, in his testimony before the Senate sub-committee, states:

"Already its impact has been felt in the politics of the State of Tennessee. As years go on, it is inevitable that its political power shall never grow less. The time will come when Members of Congress who hope to be elected from the area, must bow to its will. Such a situation is dangerous in a democracy."

15. Have existing Federal development agencies been factors in local politics?

Never. The Bureau of Reclamation and the Army Engineers, for example, have rarely, if ever, even expressed opinions on pending measures before the Washington State Legislature unless specifically invited to do so. One of these rare instances occurred during the 1945 Session, when a Bureau representative supported a measure facilitating transfer of the operation and management of a unit in Yakima Valley from the Bureau to the irrigation districts served by the unit. That is the type of "meddling" no one objects to.

NO NECESSITY FOR A C.V.A.

1. What are the proponents principal arguments for a C.V.A.?

They claim an Authority is necessary to take over all the separate functions of the separate federal agencies in order to (1) prepare a master plan for integrated and overall development of the region and its resources; (2) perfect an organization to apply the plan; (3) do away with disagreements and clashes between overlapping agencies; (4) do away with piecemeal planning; (5) provide employment for returned service people and for displaced war workers and (6) to avoid postwar economic disaster.

2. Has planning for the Pacific Northwest States been neglected?

No. Planning for the best uses of the water resources of the Columbia River and its tributaries have been actively and ably carried on by the Bureau of Reclamation and the Geological Survey for more than 40 years and by the Army Engineers for nearly 20 years.

3. Has this planning been comprehensive and fruitful in results?

Yes. The Bureau of Reclamation's planning has resulted in the reclamation, settlement and development of vast areas of desert lands. The initial comprehensive planning of the Army Engineers brought forth the first comprehensive reports on the multiple purpose development of the Columbia River and its tributaries—the so-called 308 reports—which formed the basis for the construction of Bonneville and Coulee Dams and power developments, the Willamette Valley and other projects under construction. Other results are the Mud Mountain Dam, the Walla Walla Flood Control project, reclamation and flood control projects on the lower Columbia river in Washington and Oregon, and several other projects.

4. Is this planning continuing?

Yes, by both the Army Engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation; the Bonneville Administration which has planned and built an extensive transmission system for its power is continuing to plan and extend and to study and plan industrial processes which will use electric energy. By mandate of Congress the Army is now reviewing its 308 reports on the Columbia River and its tributaries; the Bureau of Reclamation is simultaneously studying the reclamation projects in the Columbia river drainage basin.

5. Has there ever been any public or private claims of lack of or of faulty planning in the Columbia River Basin?

No. The first and only implied criticism comes from proponents of the C.V.A.

6. Has there ever been any claim from responsible sources that the Bonneville, Grand Coulee or any reclamation project was faulty in design or execution?

No, except that the sponsor of the Mitchell C.V.A. bill refers to the accomplishments in the Columbia River Basin as "dibs here and dabs there."

7. Has there ever been any intimation from responsible sources that any water control or power and reclamation works in the Basin have been so conceived and constructed that they preclude or interfere with an integrated development?

No.

8. Has it ever been claimed that construction carried on by the Army Engineers or the Bureau of Reclamation was performed in a faulty or inefficient manner?

No. On the contrary such works have received general public acclaim for efficient and expeditious performance.

9. Have there been disagreements and clashes be-

tween the Army Engineers and the Bureau or any other federal agencies over who should plan or execute any of the numerous federal projects in the Basin?

No. Each agency has performed the tasks assigned to it by Congress. Thus at Coulee Dam the general plans were prepared by the Army during the "308 investigations." The task of construction was assigned to and performed by the Bureau of Reclamation. No clashes or hair pulling resulted from this arrangement as far as anyone knows.

10. Does that mean that in all probability no differences of opinion ever arose, or are likely to rise, between federal planning and construction agencies?

It means no such things. Differences of opinion are not only bound to arise, but are in themselves healthy and a guarantee that no enterprise will be rushed into execution at public expense without bringing to bear many opinions and view points. No one, except those of an autocratic and totalitarian frame of mind takes exception to that type of friendly controversy.

11. Do the federal planning and construction agencies each pursue their own independent course in respect to their projects?

No. By both law and agreement they consult and confer with one another and harmonize their various plans into the best possible utilization of land and water resources.

12. What must be concluded, then, regarding the claims of the C.V.A. proponents?

That their arguments are put forth purely for propaganda purposes and that their purposes are ideological rather than practical and constructive.

13. What about post war unemployment? Would establishment of a C.V.A. further that worthy objective?

On the contrary it would unquestionably and unavoidably delay both commencement of construction and prosecution of postwar projects and thus fail to create employment when most needed.

14. Why would the C.V.A. delay postwar projects?

Because, with the best of intentions, there would occur an inevitable delay while the Authority takes over, while it prepares its integrated plan and perfects its organization. In fact, these inevitable delays are from a postwar employment point of view the strongest possible argument against now turning our Northwest enterprises and projects over to an untried, unorganized and inexperienced organization.

15. Why wouldn't the Authority almost immediately build an efficient organization by taking over the services and personnel of the Army Engineers, the Bureau of Reclamation and

other agencies, as is contemplated in the C.V.A. plan?

These agencies are not the kind that are so readily taken over or utilized. In the first place the civilian personnel in the agencies would immediately lose its organizational identity and much of its best talent. In the second place, the military personnel is probably neither for let nor hire. The plan for using existing agencies sounds well, but is in the final analysis, pure window dressing.

16. Why all this skepticism about the C.V.A. taking over or employing existing agencies and personnel?

Because, for one thing, personnel of the C.V.A. must possess special qualifications, prescribed by the plan or would-be law.

17. What are these qualifications?

The Mitchell C.V.A. bill stipulates that the Authority may require that its officers and employees express a belief in the feasibility and wisdom of the C.V.A. act.

18. Does this provision augur well for a factual, unbiased consideration of the multitude of questions the Authority is empowered to deal with?

It does not.

19. Does that mean that an experienced and dependable staff and organization can be set up in a hurry?

It does not.

20. What about the claim that failure to establish the C.V.A. will mean postwar economic disaster?

It is extravagant and ridiculous. Experience and common sense should convince us that a hastily created organization, as the Authority's setup necessarily would be would prove utterly incapable of taking hold of, and safely guiding the economy of the entire Pacific Northwest through the difficult postwar period. And it is equally certain that the establishment of the Authority would create a degree of uncertainty and apprehension that could more effectively retard private enterprise and bring out stagnation and economic disaster than any other thing that could happen. Therein lies one of the chief threats of the C.V.A.

OUR PROGRAM

1. As opponents of the Columbia Valley Authority, what do we stand for?

We advocate the continued orderly and timely development and use of all the natural resources of the Pacific Northwest under a program participated in by our citizens, and by local, state and established federal agencies.

2. What do we mean by "continued development?"

We simply emphasize the fact that the program we advocate is nothing radically new. It has been operating successfully for many long years.

3. What do we mean by "orderly and timely?"

By that we mean a development in step with our needs, each enterprise and project to be undertaken and expanded as fast as we need or can foresee the need for it.

4. When is a project needed?

A project is needed whenever we determine with reasonable certainty that an increasing population or expanding industry and enterprise can make use of it.

5. Who do we think should use or enjoy the benefits of public development projects?

The citizens acting as individuals, partnerships, associations, corporations, cooperatives or governmental units, with special favors or preference to none.

6. Upon whom rests the primary responsibility for development and use of the natural resources?

On private enterprise as represented by the citizen acting by himself or in association with others.

7. Upon whom rests the secondary responsibility?

On the state and its political subdivisions who must undertake essential projects and enterprise which by reason of their nature or magnitude can not be undertaken by private enterprise.

8. How do we advocate handling of projects and resource enterprise that transcend state lines?

By interstate compacts according to law.

9. Do we recognize any federal responsibility for resource development?

Yes, we not only recognize it; we advocate and work for a vigorous exercise of that responsibility within the legitimate spheres of federal activity.

10. What do we consider legitimate spheres of federal activity toward resource development?

Programs and projects involving conservation,

control and use of water for navigation, flood control, reclamation of arid and semi-arid lands, the development, transmission and marketing of hydroelectric power, incidental to the foregoing purposes, soil erosion control, and conservation and management of federal forests, national parks, grazing lands and other resources of the public domain.

11. Do we now have adequate federal policies and competent agencies to discharge these federal responsibilities?

Yes.

12. What federal agency is responsible for navigation and flood control projects?

The Army Corps of Engineers which, under the direction of the Secretary of War, has been in charge of and capably and efficiently handled that type of work in accordance with congressional mandate for 120 years.

13. What federal agency is in charge of reclamation projects?

The Bureau of Reclamation which under the direction of the Secretary of the Interior and pursuant to programs laid down by Congress has capably handled federal reclamation for 43 years.

14. What federal agencies handle federal power development and distribution?

The Army Engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation each build and operate the generating plants that are incidental to their respective projects. The energy generated in excess of the needs of the constructing and operating agency is at the Columbia River plants turned over to the Bonneville Power Administration for transmission and sale.

15. In their respective activities on the Columbia River, or elsewhere, have these federal agencies engaged in undue controversies and clashes that have prevented proper planning or delayed or otherwise interfered with programs handed to them by Congress?

No. Whatever differences there may have been, have had the virtue of opening controversial opinions to searching and fruitful discussions, not only among the agencies themselves but with and among the public as well.

16. Would controversial opinions and discussions be obviated by a Valley Authority?

Yes. And that is one of the principal virtues claimed for it by the proponents. Naturally within an Authority there would be little or no room for controversies or differences of opinion within its own organization or with the public. If such things were permitted it wouldn't be an "Authority."

17. Is each federal agency now planning its own

share of river development irrespective of the others?

No. Under provisions of the 1944 Flood Control Act and the 1945 Rivers and Harbors Act the federal agencies, that is the Army Engineers, the Bureau of Reclamation, the Soil Conservation Service, the Federal Power Commission and the Power Division of the Department of the Interior, and others shall cooperate in investigations and plans and shall coordinate their recommendations for any river basin development into one comprehensive multiple purpose plan for submission to Congress.

18. Are the states involved now given a voice in determining the development?

Yes. The new statutes provide that the affected states shall be furnished with information developed during investigations and given opportunity for consultation and participation in investigations.

19. What provisions are made by law in case of disagreements?

In case of disagreement on plans, as between federal agencies, or between federal agencies and the states, the reporting agency must submit the view of those disagreeing to Congress, with their own recommendations.

20. Is the set-up, as now provided by law, workable and practical?

Yes. It gives each established, experienced, well-staffed agency an opportunity to study those development phases for which it is trained and responsible, and at the same time provides for the several agencies to get together and coordinate their plans, not only among themselves, but with plans and wishes of the states involved—and Congress has the final say—as it should have.

21. And what is the most important part of this present method?

The plan adheres to the American, Democratic way of doing things. It may not be perfect, but at least it contains no provision for an "Authority," a word and concept that is—and should remain—abhorrent to all Americans.