

# Second Bacon Siphon needed project

Readers are invited to express opinions in letters to the Chronicle. They must be signed, with addresses given. The limit is 150 words, with some exceptions. The Chronicle retains the right to trim letters to conform with the word limitation. Because of volume all cannot be used, but representative letters will be published. None will be returned.

Editor, the Chronicle:

I feel that I must respond to congressional candidate Mel Tonasket's remarks about the Second Bacon Siphon and Tunnel and the proposed completion of the Columbia Basin Project. I don't know where Mr. Tonasket is getting his information, but it is not entirely correct.

The East Columbia Basin Irrigation District is presently negotiating a contract with the Water and Power Resource Service for construction of facilities to irrigate approximately 300,000 acres of land in the East High Area of the Columbia Basin Project. This contract must be voted on and approved by the landowners included in the district before any work can begin on construction.

This is no different than a school bond issue; it is democratic and the majority rules. The East District has held landowner meetings to inform the farmers and get their input concerning development. The last meetings were held in March and April of this year and the response is always in favor of development.

All 300,000 acres in the East High Area are presently being farmed, 175,000 acres dry farmed and 125,000 acres irrigated from deep wells. The underground water is being depleted. With the cost of energy increasing, it is estimated that in 15-20 years these wells will no longer be economically feasible to operate.

Completion of the irrigation system for this area is planned over a 40-year period, so time is of the essence to keep those farmers with investments in irrigation equipment from suffering large economic losses.

No one will deny the fact that there is some opposition to the proposed development. However, it is not correct to say that the project is "forcing people from their land," "shoving the project down peoples' throats," "not economically feasible," "amounts to the government condemning their land" and other such statements. The directors of the East Columbia Basin Irrigation District are five farmers elected by landowners in the district. The last thing they want to do is to create a

"boondoggle," as Mr. Tonasket suggests.

In any public endeavor there is opposition. If Mr. Tonasket wishes to oppose completion of the Columbia Basin Project, that is his business. All I ask is that he get his facts straight.

C. D. BAILEY,  
Secretary-Manager,  
East Columbia Basin Irrigation  
District,  
Othello, Wash.

FILE: Tonasket  
Clipping

# Second Bacon Siphon needed project

Readers are invited to express opinions in letters to the Chronicle. They must be signed, with addresses given. The limit is 150 words, with some exceptions. The Chronicle retains the right to trim letters to conform with the word limitation. Because of volume all cannot be used, but representative letters will be published. None will be returned.

Editor, the Chronicle:

I feel that I must respond to congressional candidate Mel Tonasket's remarks about the Second Bacon Siphon and Tunnel and the proposed completion of the Columbia Basin Project. I don't know where Mr. Tonasket is getting his information, but it is not entirely correct.

The East Columbia Basin Irrigation District is presently negotiating a contract with the Water and Power Resource Service for construction of facilities to irrigate approximately 300,000 acres of land in the East High Area of the Columbia Basin Project. This contract must be voted on and approved by the landowners included in the district before any work can begin on construction.

This is no different than a school bond issue; it is democratic and the majority rules. The East District has held landowner meetings to inform the farmers and get their input concerning development. The last meetings were held in March and April of this year and the response is always in favor of development.

All 300,000 acres in the East High Area are presently being farmed, 175,000 acres dry farmed and 125,000 acres irrigated from deep wells. The underground water is being depleted. With the cost of energy increasing, it is estimated that in 15-20 years these wells will no longer be economically feasible to operate.

Completion of the irrigation system for this area is planned over a 40-year period, so time is of the essence to keep those farmers with investments in irrigation equipment from suffering large economic losses.

No one will deny the fact that there is some opposition to the proposed development. However, it is not correct to say that the project is "forcing people from their land," "shoving the project down peoples' throats," "not economically feasible," "amounts to the government condemning their land" and other such statements. The directors of the East Columbia Basin Irrigation District are five farmers elected by landowners in the district. The last thing they want to do is to create a

"boondoggle," as Mr. Tonasket suggests.

In any public endeavor there is opposition. If Mr. Tonasket wishes to oppose completion of the Columbia Basin Project, that is his business. All I ask is that he get his facts straight.

C. D. BAILEY,  
Secretary-Manager,  
East Columbia Basin Irrigation  
District,  
Othello, Wash.

FILE: Tonasket  
Clipping