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Hells Canyon, Hungry Horse Dam, and the Columbia River Power System

This is an age when energy—and today this means electric energy—is increasingly the major controlling factor in the economic development and welfare of the Nation. Under these conditions, I will never support or condone the under-development of any of the hydroelectric resources which constitute our only truly inexhaustible source of energy. Our fossil fuels may someday be depleted; even atomic power may someday be limited by the fact that the inherent reserves of the proper fuels to activate reactors; but so long as the snows melt in the mountains and the rivers flow to the sea, our hydroelectric plants will continue to pump life-giving energy into the economic bloodstream of the Nation.

Any development of such a great water resource to less than its maximum economic potential constitutes a tragic loss to our people and weakens the whole Nation. This is true not only during the 50 years of the pay-out period, but for the whole life of the project, perhaps centuries. Some may find ways to salvage their consciences for permitting such a crime against unborn generations, but I cannot, and will not, be a party to it.

This is the moral issue in the case of Hells Canyon, and the sooner the people's representatives recognize this, and stop discussing it as if it were merely a matter of faith, but I believe it is absolutely necessary to demonstrate how terribly mistaken he is, lest his statements stand unchallenged and be accepted as fact.

The Senator from Utah (Mr. WATKINS) gives $50,590,365 as the total allocation of costs to flood control in the Columbia River Basin. Imagine that—$100 million worth of damage there, twice our total investment in protection. Does the Senator from Utah really think this expenditure in the Columbia Basin is exorbitant? Obviously, it is not even adequate. Fifty-two people lost their lives in the flood of 1948. We must invest several hundred million dollars in additional flood-control projects before any repetition of such disasters can be prevented with any assurance, and I intend to continue to work to obtain such funds as
LONG AS I AM IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES, I Sincerely hope the senator from Utah will insist that the Federal Government must and support flood control, on a basis of need, in both the Northwest and Utah.

Even if Washington and Oregon did show interest in flood control, the Federal Government must undertake the study of the minimum needed. And, I would urge Senator from Montana to consider the Federal Government does not undertake navigation projects in inland Nevada, nor irrigation works in the rain forests of the Olympic Peninsula where precipitation averages over 120 inches a year. But the Federal Government does develop irrigation projects in the great Western deserts, and navigation projects alongside waterways. Likewise, the Federal Government has— in the past— provided the impetus for building of power projects in the Columbia Basin, where lurks nearly 40 percent of the water-power potential of the United States. Sound governmental policy calls for expenditure of funds for projects where the power, navigation, and irrigation potential exists. And that is the policy we are fighting today to preserve in the Pacific Northwest.

Mr. President, I wish to express my appreciation to the eminent Senator from Montana for the able and important speech he is making in the Senate. This contribution is characteristic of the Senator's continuing leadership in this whole vital realm.

Mr. President, I wish also to state to the Senator from Montana that he occupies the rather unique geographical distinction of, in part, represented in the United States Senate for many years a great and unique area that is traversed by the Continental Divide of the majestic Rocky Mountains between the Columbia River Basin and the Missouri River Basin. The entire record of the Senator from Montana shows that he has fought for full development of the Columbia River Basin, the Missouri River Basin, and also the Colorado River Basin.

I note that the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. Morse] is now present in the Chamber. If I am not mistaken, the senior Senator from Montana [Mr. Murray], the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. Morse], and I have all supported the upper basin, in which the Senator from Utah [Mr. Watkins], has so righteously supported. I support it, even though very few of the benefits will be to our own States. We are all interested in the development of that vital realm of the intermountain West, so we never thought of it on the basis of any local consideration whatsoever. Certainly for that reason I am disappointed that the distinguished senator from Utah, who has advocated pouring nearly a billion dollars of Federal funds into his own region, is so hostile to the development of the Columbia River Basin.

I know—and considering the long career of resource development of the senior Senator from Montana, I am sure he agrees with me—that the Commissioners of the Columbia River Basin has taken toward development of all the Western States and all the great river basins within the Western States.

Mr. MURRAY. I thank the Senator from Oregon for his very interesting, relevant and very valuable points he has raised. During the course of my remarks, I was touching on them, inadequately, and I am very much pleased that the Senator has brought them out so effectively.

Mr. MORSE. President, will the Senator from Montana yield?

Mr. MURRAY. I yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. President, I rise to join with my colleague in paying my respects to the chairman of the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, the distinguished Senator from Montana.

I have said on many platforms of America what I believe to say here about the Senator from Montana. I have said that the people of the United States do not make effective or fair defense of the people's heritage in their own natural resources than the senior Senator from Montana. Once again today the Senator from Montana is demonstrating that when he feels a wrong has been done, he does not hesitate to do what he can to put the record straight, according to his sights.

I speak with complete respect for the Senator from Utah [Mr. Watkins]. The Senator from Utah and I simply disagree fundamentally on the whole approach to the basic Northwest natural resources problem. The Senator from Utah and I expressed different points of view in Salt Lake City last Saturday at the conference of Western States on water resources; I shall in my own time, in due course, proceed to set the record straight, as I see the record, with respect to some statistical information which the Senator from Utah used in his Salt Lake City speech, statistics identical with information being propagated by the private utilities, to the effect that Bonneville power, for example, is being sold for less than its cost. I said in Salt Lake City—and I say here today—the facts do not bear out that contention on the part of the Senator from Utah.

But what I wish to address myself to at this moment, by way of interruption, because the Senator has reached that point in his speech, is an observation. The Senator, for example, has just said: Money is spent to develop copper in Montana because there is copper in Montana. It is spent to produce salt from the Great Salt Lake because there is salt there and not in Lake Michigan or Lake Erie. It is spent on water developments in the Northwest because our second mightiest river is there.

Where would the Senator from Utah have funds for flood control and navigation spent, if not in the river basins where flood control is needed and navigation possible? The projects now under construction in the Missouri and Columbia Rivers contain approximately 5 times the annual flow of those rivers, yet all projects now under construction or completed in the Colorado Basin will bring the total flood-control storage in that basin to less than 5 percent of 1 year's annual flow. Does this really sound as if the Northwest is getting more than its share of flood control appropriations? I refuse to believe this is what the Senator from Utah really means— storage equal to 500 percent of annual flow for the Colorado and the Missouri Rivers, but only 5 percent for the Columbia.

An absolute minimum of 27 million acre-feet of flood control storage is required for any degree of effective flood control in the Columbia River Basin. Yet the region has only about one-third of the minimum needed. And, I would like to add, little progress is now being made toward development of an adequate flood-control goal for the Columbia because of the present administration's hostility to starting construction of new multiple-purpose river projects.

Money is spent to develop copper in Montana because there is copper in Montana. It is spent to produce salt from the Great Salt Lake, because there is salt there and not in Lake Michigan or in Lake Erie. It is spent on water developments in the Northwest, because our second mightiest river is there.

I wish to enlarge upon that point, if I may, and point out the whole spirit of the Senator's speech, that when expenditures are related to the proportion of water resources in an area, it is doubtful that the Northwest has had its fair share of the appropriations.
I become a little tired of hearing the charges which are always made by selfish groups in some parts of the country to the effect that we, in the Pacific Northwest, are getting more than our fair share of appropriations. In the first place, we are not. In the second place, whatever appropriations go to the development of the power resources of the Pacific Northwest, are in combination with other natural resources in the Pacific Northwest, help every citizen of the country, no matter where he or she lives, whether it be in Maine, Florida, Pennsylvania, Ohio, California, or any other State, because only to the extent that we conserve our natural resources, and carry out the doctrine of stewardship preached by Pinchot and Teddy Roosevelt, and leave our natural resources in better condition than that in which we found them, will we keep faith with future generations of American boys and girls. I stress that point as I now place in the Record some certain figures.

For the information of the Senator from Utah and other like-minded Senators, I should like to have printed in the RECORD, certain figures. For Montana, available water power which are located in the Pacific Northwest, encompassed by the Columbia Basin, and I will have no part in fighting against full development of the water resources of the Columbia Basin, and I will have no part in it.

Mr. MURRAY. I thank the able Senator from Oregon. He has made a very valuable contribution to this discussion. His statements cannot be disputed. They are on the record, and no one can dispute them.

On April 20, 1955, during the upper Colorado debate, the Senator from Utah [Mr. Warrack] knew that expenditures of the Colorado project would be developed. The Senator from Oregon [Mr. Morse] has discussed that in some detail, and has made it very clear. The Senator from Utah told the Senate then:

Nothing, flood control, and hydroelectric generation are similarly located where there is water—not in the desert.

Having listed the allegedly tremendous expenditures for flood control and navigation projects in the Northwest, the Senator from Utah says:

These expenditures, furthermore, were first cost only. No estimate was provided on the planning and operation and maintenance costs for those projects. This continuing overestimates, later on, the Federal Government under these two programs, could amount to hundreds of millions of dollars during the lifetime of these projects.

Mr. MORSE. The figures given show the percentages of the national potential water power resources in the four States of the Northwest. The figures are as follows: For Washington, available 50 percent of the time, 20.33 percent; available 90 percent of the time, 19.44 percent. For Oregon, available 50 percent of the time, 10.51 percent; available 90 percent of the time, 10.33 percent.

For Idaho, available 50 percent of the time, 6.85 percent; available 90 percent of the time, 6.93 percent.

For Montana, available 50 percent of the time, 3.92 percent; available 90 percent of the time, 4.24 percent.

The figures show that, for the total Pacific Northwest, encompassed by the States which were being given such excessive appropriation, available 50 percent of the time, 41.61 percent; available 90 percent of the time, 40.94 percent.

What do these figures mean? If the Senator from Utah and others will examine the figures, they will notice Oregon and Washington, the two States which the Senator says have more than their fair share of appropriations, have an available 50 percent of the time, 20.33 percent of such expenditures, actually have within their boundaries 30 percent of the Nation’s total potential water power, the one investment which pays its way in cash, and which serves the consumers of the United States many times its cost to the taxpayers.

So far as the dams are concerned, the dams of the Columbia River system are ahead of their payout schedule today. Could it be that we are really not giving the Northwest its fair share of the appropriations, rather than giving it more than its fair share, as has been charged? If the Senator from Montana will permit me, I should like to buttress his speech by stressing again what the Senator has heard me stress so many times, but which cannot be repeated too often.

What is our problem in regard to natural resource conservation? Fundamentally, it is a problem of conserving water. If I was asked to name what I think is the greatest need of the American people today, my answer would be that the American people should wake up, before it is too late, to the claims of the Senator from Montana, as chair­man of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, is warning the American people to remember those fallen civilizations in the history of mankind happen to be the civilizations in which there are always one common element, namely, the failure of the people to conserve their natural resources, and particularly their water supply.

In the Middle East today, there is under vegetation a little less than one-fourth the land area which was under vegetation when that area was the home of great civilizations.

In China there are thousands of square miles of eroded topsoil and deforested mountains, and a falling water table. There are physical facts. I plead with the Senator from Utah and others to give those facts as the Senator from Montana leads the Senate, as he has done for so many years, in the great fight for the conservation and protection of our natural resources, in the tradition of Gifford Pinchot and Teddy Roosevelt, and of George Norris, Hiram Johnson, Clarence Dill, and other great Senators who preceded the Senator from Montana in this body.

The Senator from Montana, as chairman of the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, is warning the American people once again, in answer to the claims of the Senator from Utah, that now is the time to protect the natural resources of the United States. As I said in Salt Lake City last Saturday, and repeat here today—and my colleague has made reference to it—I believe it or not, the fallen civilizations in the history of mankind happen to be the civilizations in which there are always one common element, namely, the failure of the people to conserve their natural resources, and particularly their water supply.

In the Middle East today, there is under vegetation a little less than one-fourth the land area which was under vegetation when that area was the home of great civilizations.

In China there are thousands of square miles of eroded topsoil and deforested mountains, and a falling water table. There are physical facts. I plead with the Senator from Utah and others to give those facts as the Senator from Montana leads the Senate, as he has done for so many years, in the great fight for the conservation and protection of our natural resources, in the tradition of Gifford Pinchot and Teddy Roosevelt, and of George Norris, Hiram Johnson, Clarence Dill, and other great Senators who preceded the Senator from Montana in this body.

The Senator from Montana, as chairman of the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, is warning the American people once again, in answer to the claims of the Senator from Utah, that now is the time to protect the natural resources of the United States. As I said in Salt Lake City last Saturday, and repeat here today—and my colleague has made reference to it—I believe it or not, the fallen civilizations in the history of mankind happen to be the civilizations in which there are always one common element, namely, the failure of the people to conserve their natural resources, and particularly their water supply.

In the Middle East today, there is under vegetation a little less than one-fourth the land area which was under vegetation when that area was the home of great civilizations.

In China there are thousands of square miles of eroded topsoil and deforested mountains, and a falling water table. There are physical facts. I plead with the Senator from Utah and others to give those facts as the Senator from Montana leads the Senate, as he has done for so many years, in the great fight for the conservation and protection of our natural resources, in the tradition of Gifford Pinchot and Teddy Roosevelt, and of George Norris, Hiram Johnson, Clarence Dill, and other great Senators who preceded the Senator from Montana in this body.

The Senator from Montana, as chairman of the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, is warning the American people once again, in answer to the claims of the Senator from Utah, that now is the time to protect the natural resources of the United States. As I said in Salt Lake City last Saturday, and repeat here today—and my colleague has made reference to it—I believe it or not, the fallen civilizations in the history of mankind happen to be the civilizations in which there are always one common element, namely, the failure of the people to conserve their natural resources, and particularly their water supply.

In the Middle East today, there is under vegetation a little less than one-fourth the land area which was under vegetation when that area was the home of great civilizations.

In China there are thousands of square miles of eroded topsoil and deforested mountains, and a falling water table. There are physical facts. I plead with the Senator from Utah and others to give those facts as the Senator from Montana leads the Senate, as he has done for so many years, in the great fight for the conservation and protection of our natural resources, in the tradition of Gifford Pinchot and Teddy Roosevelt, and of George Norris, Hiram Johnson, Clarence Dill, and other great Senators who preceded the Senator from Montana in this body.

The Senator from Montana, as chairman of the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, is warning the American people once again, in answer to the claims of the Senator from Utah, that now is the time to protect the natural resources of the United States. As I said in Salt Lake City last Saturday, and repeat here today—and my colleague has made reference to it—I believe it or not, the fallen civilizations in the history of mankind happen to be the civilizations in which there are always one common element, namely, the failure of the people to conserve their natural resources, and particularly their water supply.
I am almost embarrassed to have to answer such statements. My good friend from Utah knows better if he will only consider the circumstances. I am sure he is really aware that planning costs of these projects are included in what he calls first costs—the initial investment in the projects.

He must be aware that the cost of operation and maintenance of the great power projects he is talking about—Bonneville, The Dalles, McNary, Chief Joseph, and the rest—are not an additional expense to the Government. The distinguished Senator’s own statement says at one point:

A total additional payment of $170 million has gone into the Treasury, but it has gone toward payment of operation and maintenance and interest.

The Senator from Utah would be more accurate if he told how well our projects are paying their own way, instead of accusing them of being a load on the Federal Treasury. All flood control and navigation projects anywhere in the Nation, like Power projects repay their costs. They are not a cost to the taxpayers. Besides returning the investment in their construction with interest, and stimulating the economy of the area, stimulate industry, and tremendously increase tax collections from the corporations and newly employed workers.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MURRAY. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I believe a quotation from the works on the Senator from Utah should be inserted at this point. He was speaking of the Colorado River storage project on the Senate floor on August 19, 1954, when he said:

‘The resulting productivity of the area served by the project, besides providing the money to repay all the reimbursable project costs, also will furnish tax revenue estimated to be far in excess of the total cost of the project every 50 years.’

Let me say that that is likewise true of such great projects as we are fighting for in the Pacific Northwest, like the Hells Canyon project.

Mr. MURRAY. I thank the Senator for his statement.

People who oppose Federal investment in resources development preach a philosophy that would keep America perpetually in the pre-McKinley, horse-and-buggy days. If we are going to accept the philosophy behind criticism of the great projects that have stimulated the economy of the Pacific Northwest, then we ought to rescind authorization of the upper Colorado project right away. And if we cannot afford to invest in self-sustaining public works, we ought to stop building highways and ride bareback as of old, for we cannot afford non-reimbursable public works either!

**No Federal Gratuities Involved**

It is impossible to stand idly by while the Senator from the upper Colorado refers to Federal gratuities involved in Northwest projects and the size of the outstanding indebtedness. An investment with a payback with interest, including the full amounts required for operation and maintenance, is surely not a gratuity.

The Senator from Utah [Mr. Watkins] says ‘during the first 18 years of operation the Columbia Basin has paid off only $170,409,916 on its total net capital investment.’ He fails to point out that even before the end of the period he mentions, at the end of fiscal 1953, there were in operation in that entire basin only 2 projects which could pay anything back to the Government. The money to be repaid came from the Bonneville and Hells Canyon Dams. How can projects begin to pay for themselves when they are not even completed?

**Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?**

Mr. MURRAY. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I should like to place in the Record at this point another quotation from the Senator from Utah:

‘I quote from the hearings on the Colorado River storage project of Wednesday, June 30, 1954, page 312. He said:

‘If the income from the project overall is enough to operate reservoirs to the United States and leave something for the people themselves, then it ought to be built.’

He is right. I think that is equally applicable to some of the Pacific Northwest projects such as Hells Canyon, which he is now opposing.

Mr. MURRAY. I thank the Senator for his valuable interposition at this point.

‘Why were not up-to-date figures used by the Senator from Utah? Total capital repayment at the end of fiscal 1956, as shown in schedule 3 of the 1956 report of the Bonneville Power Administration, was $202,178,224, which places the entire program some $77.1 million ahead of schedule on repayments. Imagine that—a Government spending program which not only pays for itself, but is actually over 60 percent ahead of its repayment schedule, in addition to paying, as the Senator from Utah points out, the full costs of both maintenance and of interest charges on the unpaid balance. Before this $202 million was credited to repayment, the Bonneville Power Administration had turned over $247 million to the Federal Government for operation, maintenance, and interest.

I should like to say to the Senator from Utah that if the upper Colorado project ever gets 60 percent ahead of its repayment schedule and matches the record of the Northwest projects, he will be justified in feeling proud of his part in bringing the upper Colorado into being, just as we who have had the Columbia River System development feel proud when we view its achievements.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, I wish to commend the distinguished Senator from Montana, our esteemed Chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, for the address he is now making. I may say, in this connection, that I think it is a public service to point out that these dams are not impositions upon the taxpayers, as they are so often made out to be by their critics, but, in fact, they are investments in the country and in the future; investments which represent a borrowing from the Treasury, and which will be repaid, with interest, by the dams themselves.

In that respect, I think it noteworthy that the Senator from Utah [Mr. Watkins] himself made the following statement as recently as April 29, 1955, in the course of the Senate debate on the upper Colorado project:

‘So, Mr. President, by means of this project, we shall accomplish two purposes. First, we shall be able to develop the necessary water; second, from the same program we shall be able to develop power at no extra cost to the people of the United States, who will keep us the money for a period of 50 years, for each of the projects.

So it is with the Hells Canyon project: It will be an investment of the public money in the future of the country, and will be repaid, with interest, to the Treasury.

In pointing this out, and in pointing out the fiscal validity of the Bonneville Power System, I say to the distinguished Senator from Montana that, in my opinion, he has rendered worthy public service.

Mr. MURRAY. I thank the able Senator from Idaho. I welcome these interjections. I think if we were to search the records, we could fill the Record for many days with quotations from the Senator from Utah which would support the position we have been taking with reference to these projects in the West.

The benefits of the Columbia Basin Power System and the Tennessee Valley Authority to the people of this Nation cannot be measured entirely in dollars and cents, as we have been discussing them.

Without elaborating on the subject, let me remind the Senator from Utah that these two areas made outstanding contributions to winning the last great war. Availability of abundant power in those areas saves tens and hundreds of thousands of young men’s lives today.

It is not impossible that this Nation may again have to defend itself and the free world. If that day comes and we find ourselves in a country bereft with little, private-power-company dams, wasting half the energy potential of our great rivers, as at Hells Canyon, those who today are battling for such under-development of our potential power will inevitably have a heavy load upon their consciences.

We should never forget that it is energy—abundant energy—which wins wars with a minimum of human sacrifice. We must not waste our power resources.

*Allocation of At-Site Power from Hungry Horse to Montana*

The Senator from Utah has tried to cause dissension among States by alluding to the reservation of at-site power generated at the Hungry Horse project for the State of Montana. The Hells Canyon Dam bill reserves 500,000 kilowatts if the power is needed by Idaho and the Senator bemoans the fate of the poor citizens of Idaho who are thus discriminated against.

At pages 274 and 275 of the hearings held last year by the Interior Commit-
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Mr. MORSE. Is it not true that when we speak of full development, as compared with partial development of the river basin, we have in mind the benefits which will accrue from building dams such as Hungry Horse or Grand Coulee Dam or Hells Canyon Dam? This is not discrimination against Idaho, and no inflammatory use of half the facts is going to turn the people of the two States against each other.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, will the Senator from Montana yield to me?

Mr. MURRAY. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I note that when the Senator from Utah referred to the Hungry Horse Dam, he used only at-site figures in calculating the cost of Hungry Horse power. I am sure the Senator from Montana agrees with me that we must consider the problem of basin-wide integration in connection with these dams and the control of river flow.

It is interesting to note that, in past, the Senator from Utah (Mr. Watkins) himself has recognized that; and in that connection I should like to quote from what he said in debate on the floor of the Senate on August 19, 1954. The Senator from Utah at that time asked this question:

Is it not true that the large dams have to be integrated so that the maximum amount of firm power can be produced and the best job be done in regulating the river and saving water when the water comes down during floods?

Does not the Senator from Montana agree with me on that occasion the Senator from Utah was correct?

Mr. MURRAY. Yes; that is correct.

Mr. MORSE. But when it comes to calculating the cost of the Hungry Horse Dam, the Senator from Utah does not take into account anything except the at-site power, and he falls to take into account the integrated power; is that true?

Mr. MURRAY. That is true. In the course of my remarks I shall dwell on that point to some extent; but I very much appreciate the remarks of the Senator from Oregon, who has stated the matter in so clear a fashion.

Mr. President, I regret very much that the Senator from Utah (Mr. Watkins) is not present at this time to hear these remarks. This morning his office was advised of my intention to allude this afternoon to his April 4 statement. I advised of my intention to allude this afternoon to his April 4 statement. I advised of my intention to allude this afternoon to his April 4 statement. I advised of my intention to allude this afternoon to his April 4 statement. I advised of my intention to allude this afternoon to his April 4 statement.

Mr. President, it is an old technique to try to get people divided among themselves. The only way to make sense in dealing with a river basin is to treat the entire basin as a single entity and develop it accordingly with comprehensive planning. This benefits the whole area, and also the Nation, as well. The people know this, and they are not going to fall for the flight-each-other technique.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Montana yield again to me?

Mr. MURRAY. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I am glad the Senator from Montana has brought out the single-entity theory. It is true, is it not, that the Hungry Horse Dam is only one segment of a particularly comprehensive river-development program? It is not at all an entity, of course, of Idaho. His reargument applies to the Columbia River system, as the Columbia River system, as the Columbia River system, as the Columbia River system, as the Columbia River system, as the Columbia River system.

Mr. President, let me say to the Senator from Montana that I completely agree with Mr. Linford's observation. I am glad that at that time the Senator from Utah agreed with it, although the discussion on that occasion was in connection with the upper Colorado River project, of which the Senator from Utah was the author.

Let me say, for the benefit of the Senator from Utah, that exactly the same observation applies to the Columbia River Basin; and the Hungry Horse Dam, which the Senator from Montana has been discussing, is a very vital link in the whole development of the basin of this river in the Pacific Northwest.

I would say to the Senator from Utah that the same observation applies to the Hells Canyon Dam. The Hells Canyon Dam is a vital link in the full development of the Columbia River Basin. That is why I am taking such an admiring position in opposition to the Hells Canyon Dam.
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I have never seen the Senator from Montana distinguish one river basin from another on the basis of the resources which a generous Creator put in a certain place. If those resources were there, not through any act of some human being but by the almighty power of the Almighty, and they could be developed for the benefit of America and of mankind, the senior Senator from Montana has favored their development. I have never tried to "Balkanize" our country by pitting one region against another, as has possibly been done by the senior Senator from Utah, as pointed out in the outstanding speech being delivered today by the senior Senator from Montana.

I wish to say to the able Senator from Idaho (Mr. Dworshak), speaking for myself as one of the Members of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, that it is a privilege for me to serve as a member of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs under the chairmanship of the senior Senator from Montana (Mr. Murray). I go to him with problems from the State of Oregon, and the Senator from Idaho goes to him with problems from the State of Idaho. Just as the Senator's junior colleague goes to him with problems from the State of Idaho, and other Senators go to him with problems affecting the States of Washington, California, Wyoming, Colorado, or whatever the States may be. I have never seen the Senator from Montana (Mr. Murray) in his consideration of those problems distinguish as to whether or not they affected or benefited his State. He has taken the attitude, without discrimination, and with complete fairness, pertaining to the entire West. I think this is one reason that all of us, regardless of political partisanship, regard the Senator from Montana as a great chairman of the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Mr. MURRAY. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MURRAY. I yield.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Is it not a fact that the two distinguished Senators from the State of Montana (Mr. Mansfield and Mr. Murray), the two distinguished Senators from the State of Washington (Mr. Magnuson and Mr. Jackson), the Senators from the State of Oregon (Mr. Morse and Mr. Neuberger), and the Senator from the State of Idaho (Mr. Curtis), in their approach to river basin development, have not looked to see how many particular acres in their State or somebody else's State were within the confines of some certain river valley? In stead, the Senators whom I have enumerated have felt that all the great river basins of the West and of the Nation should be wisely developed and prudently conserved.

For example, the 2 Senators from Montana, the 2 Senators from Washington, the 2 Senators from Oregon, and the junior Senator from Idaho come from river basins which are either completely outside the Colorado River Basin, or only inside of it fragmentally, yet they all have supported wholeheartedly, either as Members of the Senate or as citizens, if they were not in the Senate, the full development, at a very high cost and very great expense, of the Colorado River Basin.

They have not taken the position of the senior Senator from Utah (Mr. Watkins), for example, that he favors nearly $1 billion worth of development in his own basin, but is leading the fight against any new Federal authorizations or starts in the Columbia River Basin. No. His is the broad gauge view, as distinguished from Oregon, based, I believe, by the position of the senior Senator from Montana.

To put it differently, in the slightly less than 2½ years I have been a Member of the Senate, and in the considerably longer period of time in which I have observed developments as a writer and journalist in the Pacific Northwest, engineers and published in House Document 851, 81st Congress.

The senior Senator from Montana has made his judgment on the management of the resources which a generous Creator put in a certain place. If those resources were there, not through any act of some human being but by the almighty power of the Almighty, and they could be developed for the benefit of America and of mankind, the senior Senator from Montana has favored their development. I have never tried to "Balkanize" our country by pitting one region against another, as has possibly been done by the senior Senator from Utah, as pointed out in the outstanding speech being delivered today by the senior Senator from Montana.

I wish to say to the able Senator from Idaho (Mr. Dworshak), speaking for myself as one of the Members of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, that it is a privilege for me to serve as a member of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs under the chairmanship of the senior Senator from Montana (Mr. Murray). I go to him with problems from the State of Oregon, and the Senator from Idaho goes to him with problems from the State of Idaho. Just as the Senator's junior colleague goes to him with problems from the State of Idaho, and other Senators go to him with problems affecting the States of Washington, California, Wyoming, Colorado, or whatever the States may be. I have never seen the Senator from Montana (Mr. Murray) in his consideration of those problems distinguish as to whether or not they affected or benefited his State. He has taken the attitude, without discrimination, and with complete fairness, pertaining to the entire West. I think this is one reason that all of us, regardless of political partisanship, regard the Senator from Montana as a great chairman of the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Mr. MURRAY. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MURRAY. I yield.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Is it not a fact that the two distinguished Senators from the State of Montana (Mr. Mansfield and Mr. Murray), the two distinguished Senators from the State of Washington (Mr. Magnuson and Mr. Jackson), the Senators from the State of Oregon (Mr. Morse and Mr. Neuberger), and the Senator from the State of Idaho (Mr. Curtis), in their approach to river basin development, have not looked to see how many particular acres in their State or somebody else's State were within the confines of some certain river valley? Instead, the Senators whom I have enumerated have felt that all the great river basins of the West and of the Nation should be wisely developed and prudently conserved.

For example, the 2 Senators from Montana, the 2 Senators from Washington, the 2 Senators from Oregon, and the junior Senator from Idaho come from river basins which are either completely outside the Colorado River Basin, or only inside of it fragmentally, yet they all have supported wholeheartedly, either as Members of the Senate or as citizens, if they were not in the Senate, the full development, at a very high cost and very great expense, of the Colorado River Basin.

They have not taken the position of the senior Senator from Utah (Mr. Watkins), for example, that he favors nearly $1 billion worth of development in his own basin, but is leading the fight against any new Federal authorizations or starts in the Columbia River Basin. No. His is the broad gauge view, as distinguished from Oregon, based, I believe, by the position of the senior Senator from Montana.

To put it differently, in the slightly less than 2½ years I have been a Member of the Senate, and in the considerably longer period of time in which I have observed developments as a writer and journalist in the Pacific Northwest,
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Mr. DWORSHAK. A few years ago, when the late Senator Hugh Butler of Nebraska served as chairman of that committee, he had the cooperation of the Democratic members of that group in trying to promote some of the programs and solve some of the problems affecting the great Northern.

Mr. MURRAY. He certainly did.

Mr. DWORSHAK. The junior Senator from Oregon has just stated that we should encourage resource development, not on a regional or State basis, but rather, on an overall basin basis. He referred to the support which was forthcoming at the time the Hungry Horse project was authorized, and during the years when appropriations were made available to complete that fine water resource development.

At this point the Senator from Idaho would like to emphasize the desirability of continuing that spirit of cooperation. The Senator from Oregon refers to the Hungry Horse project as having been of unusual wisdom, and I believe it was to the advantage of the people of Montana. I am sure that if the Senator from Oregon were to be consistent he would agree to support the Bruces Eddy project on the North fork of the Clearwater River, which is also a very vital project, and important to the State of Idaho. It certainly fits into the same category as does the Hungry Horse project. I am sure that the junior Senator from Oregon, if he applies the formula which he has just outlined, will find himself in complete accord with the efforts to have the Bruces Eddy project authorized.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MURRAY. I yield.

Mr. NEUBERGER. I should like to comment on the statement of the Senator from Idaho, inasmuch as he has discussed my statement.

I will say to the distinguished senior Senator from Idaho, because he has brought up the question of the Bruces Eddy project and supported the Hells Canyon project. The Hells Canyon project is infinitely greater in scope, far greater in the flood-control storage which would be provided, and infinitely more productive in the amount of hydroelectricity which would be generated, than is the Bruces Eddy project.

In addition, the Hells Canyon project would not have an adverse effect on fisheries, wildlife, or wilderness areas that encompass and safeguard scenic grandeur. Virtually every outdoor and wildlife organization in the United States has gone on record as opposed the Bruces Eddy project and supported the Hells Canyon project.

I myself do not understand the position of the distinguished senior Senator from Idaho. In his own State he has consistently advocated the Bruces Eddy project, and yet has opposed the far more productive, far more valuable Hells Canyon project. It may be entirely mistaken in my understanding of his position, but I do not comprehend it.

Let me conclude by adding one further observation in connection with the very able address of the junior Senator from Montana. I am pleased that he has emphasized the full development of our great rivers, like the Snake River and the Columbia River. Today, as we stand on the shore of one of our potential foes in the Soviet Union are building some of the largest river development projects ever undertaken. These projects involve the Yenesei, the Ob, the Lena, and the Volga Rivers. It is my information that there is a greater quantity of potential hydroelectric power within the borders of the Soviet Union than within the borders of the United States.

Today we are far ahead of the Soviet Union in production of energy, but they are going forward with projects which I understand, in some instances, will be even bigger than Grand Coulee, which now stands as the largest hydroelectric undertaking ever built in any country. These projects are not only the country, sacrifice our rivers, which are a God-given resource, to anything less than full development, if our potential enemies in Russia are using still mightier rivers, such as the Yenesei, the Ob, the Lena, and the Volga to the utmost of their capacity in kilowatts?

It seems to me that it is folly, from the standpoint of national defense, for us not to obtain every single kilowatt lurking in rivers like the Columbia and its tributaries, when this power can be tapped without imperiling wildlife.

Mr. MURRAY. I thank the Senator from Oregon [Mr. Neuberger] for his very clear explanation of the situation. I am sure that the people of this country are aware of the importance of this problem of developing our American resources to their highest potential.

I thank the Senator from Idaho [Mr. Dworshak] for his remarks. I assure him that Montana and the Senate and the Congress want to see Idaho prosper. That is why the two Senators from Montana, as well as the Senator from Oregon, are fighting for Hells Canyon. We think it will be a great benefit to Idaho.

The Senator from Utah [Mr. Watkins] also expresses a belief that the reservation of power and Idaho is subordinate to the general preference clause of the Bonneville Project Act, so that Idaho could lose all its rights to this power reserved. Counsel advises me to the contrary. The statutory reservation to Idaho comes first. Within Idaho, public and cooperative distribution systems will have first call on the 500,000 kilowatts of power. But preference outside Idaho cannot defeat the express reservation of the 500,000 kilowatts for use in Idaho and other small parts of the Snake River Basin lying outside Idaho.

Mr. MURRAY. I thank the Senator from Utah [Mr. Watkins] for his clarification. I assure him that the Senator from Idaho, and I am sure the people of this country, are aware of the importance of this problem of developing our American resources to their highest potential.

How will Idaho's interests be best served?

Another effort to stir dissension between Idaho and Montana is the charge that Idaho suffered great injury when the Victor Chemical Works built its new plant in Butte, Mont., instead of in Idaho.
Idaho lost this plant because it did not not have the necessary low-cost power to offer Victor, Montana. If I could ask Utah to the people of Idaho, the logical way to do it is to help them develop their low-cost power. I invite the Senator from Utah, earnestly and sincerely, to join me in helping Idaho get the real solution for its development problems by backing Hells Canyon Dam. It is the only project which can provide for Idaho the large block of low-cost power it needs for its industrial development. And it will do the job. There are industries lined up waiting for low-cost energy—aluminum and light metals, chemical and others. Low-cost power would unlock a tremendous phosphate fertilizer development in Idaho, lowering costs of this vital material to farmers from California to Ohio.

This is Idaho’s great chance. Even the Federal Power Commission examiner who found against the high dam at Hells Canyon admitted that it could produce power at 2.7 mills. This is in contrast to the 7.6-mill power he found would be presently used in the entire State of Idaho. There is a depression in Idaho. That big business is being subsidized by tears about her fate and then vote to the 7.6-mill power he found would be.

It should be remembered also that the tax base has been broadened considerably because of these projects. Further, more, the credit which should be given at-site costs for these downstream benefits from Hungry Horse Dam has not been calculated, but it is obviously great. The downstream benefits are three times the power from Hungry Horse and the salable prime at-site power sales.

In this case the facts again indicate that the salable prime at-site power from Hungry Horse Dam is only one-fourth of the total attributable to it when the downstream benefits at the 10 existing dams between Hungry Horse and the sea are included. The Senator from Utah made mention of these downstream benefits but unfortunately passed lightly over them in his discussion.

The credit which should be given at-site costs for these downstream benefits from Hungry Horse Dam has not been calculated, but it is obviously great. The downstream benefits are three times the power from Hungry Horse and the salable prime at-site power sales.

In this case the facts again indicate that the salable prime at-site power from Hungry Horse Dam is only one-fourth of the total attributable to it when the downstream benefits at the 10 existing dams between Hungry Horse and the sea are included. The Senator from Utah made mention of these downstream benefits but unfortunately passed lightly over them in his discussion.

The credit which should be given at-site costs for these downstream benefits from Hungry Horse Dam has not been calculated, but it is obviously great. The downstream benefits are three times the power from Hungry Horse and the salable prime at-site power sales.

In this case the facts again indicate that the salable prime at-site power from Hungry Horse Dam is only one-fourth of the total attributable to it when the downstream benefits at the 10 existing dams between Hungry Horse and the sea are included. The Senator from Utah made mention of these downstream benefits but unfortunately passed lightly over them in his discussion.

The credit which should be given at-site costs for these downstream benefits from Hungry Horse Dam has not been calculated, but it is obviously great. The downstream benefits are three times the power from Hungry Horse and the salable prime at-site power sales.

In this case the facts again indicate that the salable prime at-site power from Hungry Horse Dam is only one-fourth of the total attributable to it when the downstream benefits at the 10 existing dams between Hungry Horse and the sea are included. The Senator from Utah made mention of these downstream benefits but unfortunately passed lightly over them in his discussion.

The credit which should be given at-site costs for these downstream benefits from Hungry Horse Dam has not been calculated, but it is obviously great. The downstream benefits are three times the power from Hungry Horse and the salable prime at-site power sales.

In this case the facts again indicate that the salable prime at-site power from Hungry Horse Dam is only one-fourth of the total attributable to it when the downstream benefits at the 10 existing dams between Hungry Horse and the sea are included. The Senator from Utah made mention of these downstream benefits but unfortunately passed lightly over them in his discussion.

The credit which should be given at-site costs for these downstream benefits from Hungry Horse Dam has not been calculated, but it is obviously great. The downstream benefits are three times the power from Hungry Horse and the salable prime at-site power sales.

In this case the facts again indicate that the salable prime at-site power from Hungry Horse Dam is only one-fourth of the total attributable to it when the downstream benefits at the 10 existing dams between Hungry Horse and the sea are included. The Senator from Utah made mention of these downstream benefits but unfortunately passed lightly over them in his discussion.

The credit which should be given at-site costs for these downstream benefits from Hungry Horse Dam has not been calculated, but it is obviously great. The downstream benefits are three times the power from Hungry Horse and the salable prime at-site power sales.

In this case the facts again indicate that the salable prime at-site power from Hungry Horse Dam is only one-fourth of the total attributable to it when the downstream benefits at the 10 existing dams between Hungry Horse and the sea are included. The Senator from Utah made mention of these downstream benefits but unfortunately passed lightly over them in his discussion.

The credit which should be given at-site costs for these downstream benefits from Hungry Horse Dam has not been calculated, but it is obviously great. The downstream benefits are three times the power from Hungry Horse and the salable prime at-site power sales.

In this case the facts again indicate that the salable prime at-site power from Hungry Horse Dam is only one-fourth of the total attributable to it when the downstream benefits at the 10 existing dams between Hungry Horse and the sea are included. The Senator from Utah made mention of these downstream benefits but unfortunately passed lightly over them in his discussion.

The credit which should be given at-site costs for these downstream benefits from Hungry Horse Dam has not been calculated, but it is obviously great. The downstream benefits are three times the power from Hungry Horse and the salable prime at-site power sales.

In this case the facts again indicate that the salable prime at-site power from Hungry Horse Dam is only one-fourth of the total attributable to it when the downstream benefits at the 10 existing dams between Hungry Horse and the sea are included. The Senator from Utah made mention of these downstream benefits but unfortunately passed lightly over them in his discussion.

The credit which should be given at-site costs for these downstream benefits from Hungry Horse Dam has not been calculated, but it is obviously great. The downstream benefits are three times the power from Hungry Horse and the salable prime at-site power sales.

In this case the facts again indicate that the salable prime at-site power from Hungry Horse Dam is only one-fourth of the total attributable to it when the downstream benefits at the 10 existing dams between Hungry Horse and the sea are included. The Senator from Utah made mention of these downstream benefits but unfortunately passed lightly over them in his discussion.

The credit which should be given at-site costs for these downstream benefits from Hungry Horse Dam has not been calculated, but it is obviously great. The downstream benefits are three times the power from Hungry Horse and the salable prime at-site power sales.

In this case the facts again indicate that the salable prime at-site power from Hungry Horse Dam is only one-fourth of the total attributable to it when the downstream benefits at the 10 existing dams between Hungry Horse and the sea are included. The Senator from Utah made mention of these downstream benefits but unfortunately passed lightly over them in his discussion.

The credit which should be given at-site costs for these downstream benefits from Hungry Horse Dam has not been calculated, but it is obviously great. The downstream benefits are three times the power from Hungry Horse and the salable prime at-site power sales.

In this case the facts again indicate that the salable prime at-site power from Hungry Horse Dam is only one-fourth of the total attributable to it when the downstream benefits at the 10 existing dams between Hungry Horse and the sea are included. The Senator from Utah made mention of these downstream benefits but unfortunately passed lightly over them in his discussion.

The credit which should be given at-site costs for these downstream benefits from Hungry Horse Dam has not been calculated, but it is obviously great. The downstream benefits are three times the power from Hungry Horse and the salable prime at-site power sales.

In this case the facts again indicate that the salable prime at-site power from Hungry Horse Dam is only one-fourth of the total attributable to it when the downstream benefits at the 10 existing dams between Hungry Horse and the sea are included. The Senator from Utah made mention of these downstream benefits but unfortunately passed lightly over them in his discussion.

The credit which should be given at-site costs for these downstream benefits from Hungry Horse Dam has not been calculated, but it is obviously great. The downstream benefits are three times the power from Hungry Horse and the salable prime at-site power sales.

In this case the facts again indicate that the salable prime at-site power from Hungry Horse Dam is only one-fourth of the total attributable to it when the downstream benefits at the 10 existing dams between Hungry Horse and the sea are included. The Senator from Utah made mention of these downstream benefits but unfortunately passed lightly over them in his discussion.

The credit which should be given at-site costs for these downstream benefits from Hungry Horse Dam has not been calculated, but it is obviously great. The downstream benefits are three times the power from Hungry Horse and the salable prime at-site power sales.

In this case the facts again indicate that the salable prime at-site power from Hungry Horse Dam is only one-fourth of the total attributable to it when the downstream benefits at the 10 existing dams between Hungry Horse and the sea are included. The Senator from Utah made mention of these downstream benefits but unfortunately passed lightly over them in his discussion.

The credit which should be given at-site costs for these downstream benefits from Hungry Horse Dam has not been calculated, but it is obviously great. The downstream benefits are three times the power from Hungry Horse and the salable prime at-site power sales.

In this case the facts again indicate that the salable prime at-site power from Hungry Horse Dam is only one-fourth of the total attributable to it when the downstream benefits at the 10 existing dams between Hungry Horse and the sea are included. The Senator from Utah made mention of these downstream benefits but unfortunately passed lightly over them in his discussion.

The credit which should be given at-site costs for these downstream benefits from Hungry Horse Dam has not been calculated, but it is obviously great. The downstream benefits are three times the power from Hungry Horse and the salable prime at-site power sales.

In this case the facts again indicate that the salable prime at-site power from Hungry Horse Dam is only one-fourth of the total attributable to it when the downstream benefits at the 10 existing dams between Hungry Horse and the sea are included. The Senator from Utah made mention of these downstream benefits but unfortunately passed lightly over them in his discussion.

The credit which should be given at-site costs for these downstream benefits from Hungry Horse Dam has not been calculated, but it is obviously great. The downstream benefits are three times the power from Hungry Horse and the salable prime at-site power sales.

In this case the facts again indicate that the salable prime at-site power from Hungry Horse Dam is only one-fourth of the total attributable to it when the downstream benefits at the 10 existing dams between Hungry Horse and the sea are included. The Senator from Utah made mention of these downstream benefits but unfortunately passed lightly over them in his discussion.

The credit which should be given at-site costs for these downstream benefits from Hungry Horse Dam has not been calculated, but it is obviously great. The downstream benefits are three times the power from Hungry Horse and the salable prime at-site power sales.

In this case the facts again indicate that the salable prime at-site power from Hungry Horse Dam is only one-fourth of the total attributable to it when the downstream benefits at the 10 existing dams between Hungry Horse and the sea are included. The Senator from Utah made mention of these downstream benefits but unfortunately passed lightly over them in his discussion.

The credit which should be given at-site costs for these downstream benefits from Hungry Horse Dam has not been calculated, but it is obviously great. The downstream benefits are three times the power from Hungry Horse and the salable prime at-site power sales.
This dam, situated in the upper region, is accorded to the report of the engineers, capable of becoming part of this general Federal improvement of navigation, which is a diversity of utilite into a series of dams which may all become eventually a part of a single improvement directed at the nation’s good, in my opinion, be highly objectionable.

These are principles which have been honored and acted upon for the last half-century, and we betray future generations when we fail to abide by them.

It is even more difficult for me to understand why the Senator from Utah was unable to grasp the fallacy of separating projects in his statement about the Northwest projects when, during the upper Colorado hearings in 1955, he knew that it is the overall picture which is important.

At page 459 of the Senate hearings on the upper Colorado, held in 1955, I find the Senator from Utah told a witness, criticizing pooling of income:

"This is sound economics if the overall income is sufficient to do the job."

"The people who have paid for them should own them."

"Mr. WATKINS.

There is no sound basis for any charge of subsidy in the Pacific Northwest power rates. By the time they do bring—tremendous benefits both to the people and the industries involved. Hungry Horse Dam is a great project in a great system which is paying for itself while bringing tremendous benefits to the Northwest and to the whole Nation. Why should we try to besmirch such a proud picture with vague charges of subsidy which cannot withstand the test of facts?

At one point in this statement, the Senator from Utah indicated that Bonneville Power Administration, overall, is charging less than cost for its power.

This is what the statement said:

"The BPA could come up with an estimated cost per kilowatt-hour of only 0.5 mills for the entire system. However, in spite of these cost estimates, the Bonneville system sells the bulk of its power for 0.75-0.90 a kilowatt-year, which averages out roughly 2.1 mills per kilowatt-hour."

That statement would have been technically correct if the Senator had added on the end of the phrase "at 100 percent load factor."

Unfortunately, he did not, so it is not even technically an accurate representation of the facts. But even if the statement had been technically complete, it would have left a misleading impression in the public mind that Bonneville does not even get cost for its power.

The fact is that few customers of Bonneville Power Administration, or any other, take their power 24 hours a day, 365 days a year, which is 100 percent load factor. At Bonneville, the average load factor is 75 percent. The custom-ers’ average use is 18 hours a day—not 24 hours a day.

"This means that for every 100 kilowatts of firm, 24-hour power Bonneville can generate, it can contract to deliver 133 kilowatts to different customers.

When the load goes off in one area, or one plant, it shifts its power to another area or customer who needs it. This is the tremendous advantage of having a large, integrated system. It is neither dishonest nor tricky. It occurs in every major power network in the country. It explains why a $17.50 million industrial loan is assumed by the government in the Bonneville situation.

Because 4 kilowatts can be sold on an annual basis for every 3 of firm capacity, a 2.1-mill rate is adequate.

I am saddened that the distinguished Senator from Utah has taken an attitude toward the Northwest which he has so often discussed, and I have been victimized with so much misinformation.

Today it is the Senator from Utah who wants to call the game. He has had his time at bat, so the Senator from Utah wants to see the development of the Pacific Northwest.

The Senate of the United States is going to be deluged with growing quantities of misinformation about the Columbia Basin power system in the next few weeks.

A vote on the Hells Canyon Dam bill is approaching.

Mr. MORS.

"Mr. WATKINS.

"Mr. MORS. I again express my appreciation for the Senator from Montana, as I did earlier this afternoon, for the excellent analysis he is presenting in the field of the power problems in the Pacific Northwest. There are two questions that I am sure the Senator from Montana will answer, to which I shall be glad to have his observations.

The Senator has just finished pointing out that the proposed Hells Canyon Dam raises the question whether or not the power resources of the Snake River at Hells Canyon will be developed, or whether we are to go along with the underdevelopment of the power resources of the Idaho Power Co. through its half-mill subsidy. I think that the question needs to be pointed out, because the Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS, in Salt Lake City, last Saturday, created the impression that the Idaho Power Co. program would produce as much power as would the Hells Canyon Dam program.

Does not the Senator from Montana agree with me that it is unanswerably clear from the official reports of the examiner of the Federal Power Commission himself that the Hells Canyon Dam program, taking into account the benefits of downstream dams, would produce approximately 50 percent more from direct performance by Government of one of its utility responsibilities instead of turning the job over to affiliates of the Electric Bond & Share Co., headquartered in Wall Street, who exploit the West through high power rates which cover the added operating expenses including unnecessary management fees, propaganda and lobbying charges.
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power than would the Idaho Power Co.'s program?

Mr. MURRAY. The Senator from Oregon is absolutely correct; I do not think there can be any question about it.

Mr. MORSE. I think that point needs to be stressed. I have discovered that when the people realize what an astounding giveaway this program of the Eisenhower administration is, in opposition to the Hells Canyon Dam, they are as shocked as I am. But the people have been fed the private utility propaganda line for so long, and they have read the high-priced advertisements in the national magazines, which are paid for by the electric-power users in their electric-power rates, that it is not surprising to learn the number of persons who are of the opinion that about the same amount of power would be produced by either project. So I build up to the question again: Is it not true that the Hells Canyon Dam project, considering the downstream benefits, would produce, in round numbers, about 50 per cent more power than the Idaho Power Co.'s program would produce?

Mr. MURRAY. The Senator is absolutely correct; there can be no question about it. I do not think that fact can be disputed by anyone who wants to be guided by the record.

Mr. MORSE. One other point. The Senator earlier in his speech spoke about the claims which are being made by some persons that the Hells Canyon Dam project will discriminate against the State of Idaho. The Senator well knows that in speech after speech over the years, as I have spoken on this subject, I have brought out, time and time again, the benefits from Hells Canyon Dam which will accrue to the people of Idaho themselves. I am pleased to note that increasing numbers of people in the State of Idaho—and I am happy to say this when the new Senator from Idaho [Mr. COWEN] is occupying the chair of the Presiding Officer—are beginning to see the soundness of the position taken by the Senator from Montana, the Senator from Oregon and others who have been joining with us in this fight, over the years, for Hells Canyon Dam.

But I want the Senator from Montana to comment on this one point, because we find it in the speeches of the Senator from Utah and in the propaganda of the private utilities, namely, that the Hells Canyon Dam will in some way, somehow, injure the farmers of the State of Idaho, in that it will take away their water rights. The Senator from Montana has been the chairman of the committee and has heard the testimony. He has heard the Senator from Oregon speak on the subject. He knows that I have insisted upon placing in the bill language which will make it perfectly clear that the people of Idaho who have existing water rights, or who may in the future legitimately acquire such rights, will not have their water rights affected one iota by the building of Hells Canyon Dam, but their priority water rights, whether existing now or acquired in the future, will be continued in effect by the Hells Canyon Dam. The Hells Canyon bill could not be clearer or more explicit on this point than it is. I would be the first to insist upon it. Does the Senator from Montana agree with me about that?

Mr. MURRAY. I absolutely agree. I do not think there can be any question about the correctness of the observation the Senator from Oregon has made.

Mr. MORSE. Does the Senator from Montana also agree that my insistence that the bill provide for the reservation of 500,000 kilowatts for the use of the people of that area, which includes some eastern counties of Oregon, as well as all the counties in Idaho, is rather clear proof of our honest intention to see to it that the people of Idaho and of eastern Oregon are not discriminated against as the result of the building of the dam, but, to the contrary, that they will be greatly benefited by the reservation of this tremendous large block of power, amounting to 500,000 kilowatts—more than is presently used in the entire State of Idaho?

Mr. MURRAY. The Senator from Oregon is absolutely correct. I do not think anyone can question that; I do not think there can be any argument about it, when the actual facts are considered.

Mr. MORSE. The able Senator from Montana has already presented the matter very well, but I thought it might be well for me to submit these additional points. I thank the Senator from Montana very much for permitting me to make the numerous interruptions I have made in the course of his speech.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I have been glad to yield, because I think the Senator from Oregon has contributed to the understanding of the people regarding this matter.

Mr. President, some of us are battling to get Idaho the low-cost power supply she needs and deserves.

The road runners for the power companies will be delivering misinformation by the truckloads—just as they do in their deceitful advertising programs—in an effort to block Hells Canyon Dam. They will dress it up in all kinds of plausible garb and will try to foist it off on busy Senators. We must be on guard.

The fact is that, if Hells Canyon Dam is not built, we shall have wasted for all time a half million kilowatts of low-cost energy. We shall have committed a criminal act—the waste of resources which belong to the people of the United States, whom we represent. We are their trustees. Congress alone can prevent the proposed waste of resources. The Secretary of the Interior has come too late with his half hearted plan for a high Pleasant Valley Dam. We shall betray our trust if we in Congress permit the administration to throw away such an enormous public asset.

Over and above a betrayal of our trust over physical resources of the people of the United States, we would betray democracy itself.

The charge is made by our enemies abroad that powerful private interests control our supposedly democratic government; that it is not in reality democratic. The proposed waste of resources at Hells Canyon has been cited as an example and a measure of the power of these vested interests over our Government.

In the approaching Hells Canyon vote we shall have an opportunity to disprove that charge. We shall have an opportunity to show the world that multimillion-dollar advertising campaigns, distortion of truth, half truths, and all the other tricks in the Power Trust arsenal were unable in the final showdown to cause the people's representatives in the Senate to betray the people's interest.
CONFRONTATIONAL ISSUES

The U.S. and China are facing a number of crucial issues that need to be addressed.

Firstly, the trade war between the two countries has escalated significantly in recent years.

Secondly, the ongoing territorial disputes in the South China Sea have raised tensions in the region.

Thirdly, the political differences between the two nations continue to cause friction.

Lastly, issues related to technology and cyber security have become increasingly important.

Addressing these issues will require a collaborative approach and a willingness to compromise.

Together, the U.S. and China can work towards a more stable and prosperous relationship.