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Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield to the Chair?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield? I ask unanimous consent to have printed a copy of the speech entitled "U.S. Foreign Policy in the World Today," which I made before the student assembly of Rocky Mountain College, Billings, Mont., on Thursday, October 24, 1963.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

U.S. FOREIGN POLICY IN THE WORLD TODAY

(Address by Senator Mike Mansfield, Demo­crat, of Montana, Before the Student Body of the College, Billings, Mont., October 24, 1963)

Thank you very much for asking me to be with you today, the day the American Heritage Symposium was opened. I am deeply appreciated. It has provided me not only with an occasion to come home to the State but to come home to an academic setting. As a former college student and college teacher, I can say that there are times when I sorely miss the shelter of the campus. That is especially the case when the birds have gone south and the only things flying in Washington are wild political rumors and political brisket.

I speak of the campus as a shelter in the sense that it is a place in which contemplation and ideas are encouraged. I certainly do not mean it in the sense of a realm detached from the pressures of life. I know, as you know, that that is no longer a valid concept of college life, if indeed it ever was. It certainly has not been true at least since the roaring twenties gave way to the thirties, the depression-thirties which in turn were replaced by the great war of the forties and later, by the cataclysms of the post-war era and the Korean and Vietnam conflicts—the immense possibilities for human advance or regression which have become apparent in the nuclear-space age.

In this recent history—all of it within the living memory of some of us—the college campus has not been a refuge from the storms of life. Nor has it been an island, high above the surging tides of our times. On the contrary, it has been one of these storms and immersed in these tides.

It could not be otherwise and indeed it is good that it is not otherwise. The American college is indispensable from the mainstream of American life. It is now, as never before, the principal training ground for the leadership of the Nation. And more, it has come to play an integrating and leavening role in the enlightenment and progress of the community as an entity in itself and as a part of the State, the Nation and the world.

Indeed, this political education week which you have designed is very much the evidence of the contemporary role of the college. I congratulate your student leaders and your faculty not only for sponsoring this under­taking but also for the breadth of the theme which you have selected.

AMENDMENT OF FOREIGN ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1961

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, I suspect few people have observed Connie Wirth at work more closely than I have, and from personal knowledge and appreciation, I wish to say that in his retirement the Government will lose an example of public service at its finest, and the Nation forever will benefit from his constructive contributions.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, is there further discussion of the amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Pearson in the chair). Is there further business? If not, morning business is closed.

AMENDMENT OF FOREIGN ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1961

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair lays before the Senate the un­finished business, which will be stated by title.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL. A bill (H.R. 7885) to amend further the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, and for other purposes. The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute. Mr. ELLENDER obtained the floor.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the Senator from Louisiana yields to the Chair.

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.
TRIBUTE TO CONRAD L. WIRTH

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, one of the best weeks I have ever had was the week last week I took occasion to pay tribute to the great and constructive work of one of the most dedicated public officials to which this country has ever been favored. It fills me with pleasure to know. He is Conrad L. Wirth, who has announced his intention to retire as Director of the National Park Service.

The National Park Service is part of the U.S. Department of the Interior. The Honorable Stewart L. Udall, Secretary of the Interior, recently did me the honor of quoting my views with respect to the people who make the National Park Service programs what they are. Secretary Udall referred to my statement as follows when he said:

One of the finest tributes I have ever heard given a group of men or to an organization was the one that Senator Byrd paid on the afternoon we took a bike with him a little over a year ago down in the Shenandoah, when he said to me in an aside: "You know, I've been in parks and I've met Park Service people for 30 years and I've never met one that wasn't a superior man."

I did make that statement to Secretary Udall at a meeting of the National Park Service personnel held at Yosemite National Park about 2 weeks ago, on October 18, 1963.

The Secretary was speaking with reference to the forthcoming retirement of Director Wirth and made this statement about George Hartzog. And in that address he quoted in full a letter of the same date as follows:

I did make the statement I have just quoted at a conference of Park Service personnel held at Yosemite National Park about 2 weeks ago, on October 18, 1963. The Secretary was speaking with reference to the forthcoming retirement of Director Wirth and made this statement:

One of the finest tributes I have ever heard given a group of men or to an organization was the one that Senator Byrd paid on the afternoon we took a bike with him a little over a year ago down in the Shenandoah, when he said to me in an aside: "You know, I've been in parks and I've met Park Service people for 30 years and I've never met one that wasn't a superior man."

I did make that statement to Secretary Udall at a meeting of the National Park Service personnel held at Yosemite National Park about 2 weeks ago, on October 18, 1963. The Secretary was speaking with reference to the forthcoming retirement of Director Wirth and made this statement:
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Whether it is realized or not, foreign policy in the world today is of great importance not only to a few men and women in Washington but to every last American. This means not merely a national way of acting and reacting with respect to the rest of the world. And may I say there are many ways in which Americans would act and react for the Nation if the choice were to fall to them alone. Some Americans are eager to live in this world and of it. Some wish they might wake up in the morning and discover that the rest of the world or some part of it had disappeared during the night.

Some think we can do just about as we please in the world and some think we can do nothing. Some are anxious to do business with other countries. Others want no part of some or all of them.

Some love the peoples of the rest of the world and a few hate them and many neither hate nor love, know little about them and have few, if any, inclinations to learn about them. All of these attitudes and many others with respect to the rest of the world, are perfectly valid insofar as the individuals who hold them are concerned. Americans are free, and perhaps as they see it, they have their personalized foreign policy so to speak — and to make no bones about it.

Yet the fact remains that as a nation we are on this planet with other nations, and we are called to decide and to speak and act for the Nation as a whole. Whether we will or not is a constant action and reaction among nations which effects this Nation for better or for worse. And out of all the possible, American attitudes — all the way from outright hostility to indiscriminate love of the rest of the world, all the way from a sense of inferiority to a delusion of grandeur, all the way from doing nothing to doing everything — out of all these possible attitudes there must be distilled policies, foreign policies which, in effect, determine our approach as a nation to the rest of the world.

What are these policies at any given time will have an immense meaning for the security and welfare of every American. If they are effective policies the Nation as a whole gains by them. If they are ineffective policies the Nation as a whole suffers from them. This is not to say that individual Americans may find certain effective policies in a national sense bad, for a variety of reasons. America is not to say that individual Americans may judge for a variety of reasons ineffective national policies to be good. But, and to the extent that it is involved, the Congress are the political institution, the political mechanism, and conflicting attitudes and viewpoints, and pressures within the Nation constantly press in upon both. Popular influences cannot and must never be ignored in a representative government. And yet, somehow, a responsible course of policy must be steered through these multiple popular influences — a course which safeguards the general interests of the Nation.

Clearly, our policy must possess continuity. But this application must take account of events which in today's world can develop and happen with almost incredible speed. It is apparent that American foreign policy has the essential quality of continuity. Since World War II, the United States has sought to encourage the development of a society of independent nations in a broad sense, and has not always included among them those that might be considered underdeveloped. In pursuing this policy, the United States has always been prepared to bear the risk of further fighting in order to assure the continued independence of friendly societies and the integrity of its own basic national interests.

In addition to this the United States has provided economic and military assistance designed to strengthen independent countries and enable them thereby to evolve their own national policies which may one day suit their own highest interests.

The United States has supported international organizations, such as the United Nations, which are designed to promote peace and the integrity of nations.

The United Nations has been in existence for 17 years. Some will look back over the years and rediscover that there is much in the past that we had today to applaud. Others will do the same and convince themselves that the organization has done little of value and, indeed, has become a kind of menace to this Nation.

But there are countless Americans in this State and in the Nation who seek neither to prove that the United Nations is all good or all bad; that is a judgment which they have made. That the U.N. make a contribution to peace and to international decency. These Americans have not closed their eyes to the fact that this Nation — all nations — walk a tightrope stretched across the bottomless pit of self-interest. At a cataclysmic moment, will they have the will to act, to speak, to make no bones about it?

Some believe these events do and do not, are anxious to do business with other countries. Others want no part of some or all of them.

What these policies are at any given time may be judged for a variety of reasons. Americans may find certain policies the Nation as a whole. Whether it is desired, as it is cast in the mold of history an organization which has helped to do that in the past and which was the first small but firm first step away from the great nuclear war, by securing a treaty to limit nuclear testing. Such an agreement has now been signed, and is to be considered for adoption by the United States. But the treaty is by itself beyond parties. Indeed, it reflects the manner in which the people of our policy. It is cast in the mold of international agreement on conduct which I have shared.

In the past several years, the United States has tried to curb the hazard of nuclear war, by securing a treaty to limit nuclear testing. Such an agreement has now been signed, and is to be considered for adoption by the United States. But the treaty is by itself beyond parties. Indeed, it reflects the manner in which the people of our policy. It is cast in the mold of international agreement on conduct which I have shared.
perfect concept or inadequate administration.

What, we may well ask ourselves, would be the completion of world politics today if the United States had not made the great effort in the past and its continuance?

History seldom reveals its alternatives and it is evident that the whole Western Europe which may have been spared collapse and that the countries which may have been spared collapse because they have received American assistance. We do not know what the political complexion of Western Europe would be today if its war-ravaged societies had not received aid. We do know, however, that the Marshall plan was a brilliant success in preserving the opportunity for freedom to re-store itself in that region after the war. We do not know what would have happened to Greece and Turkey in the absence of the Initiative taken by President Truman when he decided to assist these countries in 1947; but we do know that each has maintained its independence; each has progressed, remarkably so in the case of Greece whose national integrity was seriously threatened scarcely more than a decade ago.

We do not know what would have happened to India if we had failed to provide support to that country. We do know that strong centrifugal forces in India have always existed. The reason for the rather coherent cohesion of Asia's largest Republic. And it is important to remember that India's history of that without aid from abroad there would have been a series of mass famines, with even greater upheaval in the 1970s.

In Vietnam, where the problems have for many reasons been especially difficult, I think there is no question about American support of the Republic of South Vietnam. The evidence is overwhelming that if America had not supported South Vietnam, it probably would have been propelled into the Chinese Communist orbit. In consequence, the possibility for satisfactory relations with Asia, already sharply curtailed by events in China, more than a decade ago, would have suffered, we have not.

To say that there are no quick and easy solutions to our problems is a commonplace. Yet even so fundamental and obvious a truth as this is not readily accepted by many of the people of a far flung, rich and vibrant democracy. There is ever present the tendency to see world problems in a simple black and white pattern, and solutions in the same way. This is due in large part to the influence of the struggle with the Soviet Union. But it is perhaps a political bipolar look, if not a bipolar character.

The role of the United States in this struggle is to maintain the freedom of the United States. And in this day and age, performance, aligned with the maintenance of an international environment in which the countries of the free world may develop, is a vital and powerful factor. This is a continuing undertaking and, at times, a highly expensive and tedious one. Some aspects of this undertaking appear irrelevant to the central struggle against totalitarianism. And the absence of discernible results at particular points of tension tends to dis­tract us all. Berlin, Laos, Vietnam, nuclear rivalry, Cuba and others which will occur to you are questions that have taxed our patience and our resources for years and the end is not yet in sight at any of them. But, there is, however, that this continuity of our basic policy has a cumulative effect. It builds pressures, which every so often gives the development of both the strengthens and dramatizes our basic policy, that of the free world which is our own citizens and to the rest of the world.

The Cuban crisis last year, and the Berlin crisis, just to name a few, are perhaps the most important of our own developments. The Soviet Union chose to test us by two major events: Berlin and Cuba. As a result there was a series of hard-hitting gestures at Berlin during the summer and fall of 1961. These failure, however, to move the United States from its policy of no change in that city and no German solution have been a direct blow to the Marshall plan was a brilliant success in preserving the opportunity for freedom to re-store itself in that region after the war. We do not know what would have happened to Greece and Turkey in the absence of the Initiative taken by President Truman when he decided to assist these countries in 1947; but we do know that each has maintained its independence; each has progressed, remarkably so in the case of Greece whose national integrity was seriously threatened scarcely more than a decade ago.

We do not know what would have happened to India if we had failed to provide support to that country. We do know that strong centrifugal forces in India have always existed. The reason for the rather coherent cohesion of Asia's largest Republic. And it is important to remember that India's history of that without aid from abroad there would have been a series of mass famines, with even greater upheaval in the 1970s.

In Vietnam, where the problems have for many reasons been especially difficult, I think there is no question about American support of the Republic of South Vietnam. The evidence is overwhelming that if America had not supported South Vietnam, it probably would have been propelled into the Chinese Communist orbit. In consequence, the possibility for satisfactory relations with Asia, already sharply curtailed by events in China, more than a decade ago, would have suffered, we have not.

To say that there are no quick and easy solutions to our problems is a commonplace. Yet even so fundamental and obvious a truth as this is not readily accepted by many of the people of a far flung, rich and vibrant democracy. There is ever present the tendency to see world problems in a simple black and white pattern, and solutions in the same way. This is due in large part to the influence of the struggle with the Soviet Union. But it is perhaps a political bipolar look, if not a bipolar character.

The role of the United States in this struggle is to maintain the freedom of the United States. And in this day and age, performance, aligned with the maintenance of an international environment in which the countries of the free world may develop, is a vital and powerful factor. This is a continuing undertaking and, at times, a highly expensive and tedious one. Some aspects of this undertaking appear irrelevant to the central struggle against totalitarianism. And the absence of discernible results at particular points of tension tends to dis­tract us all. Berlin, Laos, Vietnam, nuclear rivalry, Cuba and others which will occur to you are questions that have taxed our patience and our resources for years and the end is not yet in sight at any of them. But, there is, however, that this continuity of our basic policy has a cumulative effect. It builds pressures, which every so often gives the development of both the strengthens and dramatizes our basic policy, that of the free world which is our own citizens and to the rest of the world.

The Cuban crisis last year, and the Berlin crisis, just to name a few, are perhaps the most important of our own developments. The Soviet Union chose to test us by two major events: Berlin and Cuba. As a result there was a series of hard-hitting gestures at Berlin during the summer and
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In the North African Magrib there is the great conflict between Al-Fida and Morocco. In Africa, there is the Congo and Angola, which, unfortunately, are not the only two regions of the world in which the patience of the United Nations is being stretched to the limit. In other parts of the world, there are civil wars in which the United Nations is not directly involved, but in which it is playing a supporting role. In these cases, the United States is taking an active part, not only through its own participation in the United Nations, but through its influence in other countries. In the case of the Congo, for example, the United States has been providing economic assistance to the Government of that country in an effort to help it maintain its independence. In the case of Angola, the United States has been providing military assistance to the Angolan Government in an effort to help it secure its borders and to prevent the spread of communism.

There are other conflicts in which the United States is not directly involved, but in which it is playing a supporting role. In the case of the Middle East, for example, the United States is providing economic assistance to the countries of that region in an effort to help them maintain their independence and to prevent the spread of communism. In the case of Indochina, the United States is providing military assistance to the governments of those countries in an effort to help them secure their borders and to prevent the spread of communism.

In the case of the United States, the United States is providing military assistance to the governments of those countries in an effort to help them secure their borders and to prevent the spread of communism.

The United States is also providing economic assistance to the countries of that region in an effort to help them maintain their independence and to prevent the spread of communism. In the case of the United States, the United States is providing economic assistance to the countries of that region in an effort to help them maintain their independence and to prevent the spread of communism. In the case of the United States, the United States is providing economic assistance to the countries of that region in an effort to help them maintain their independence and to prevent the spread of communism.

There are other conflicts in which the United States is not directly involved, but in which it is playing a supporting role. In the case of the Middle East, for example, the United States is providing economic assistance to the countries of that region in an effort to help them maintain their independence and to prevent the spread of communism. In the case of Indochina, the United States is providing military assistance to the governments of those countries in an effort to help them secure their borders and to prevent the spread of communism.
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Anyone who has had the opportunity to travel the length and breadth of this great land, has been impressed by the tremendous vitality in its diversity. This quality contributed much to our birth and our greatness. At the same time it is a major source of the need for compromise. All of the diverse future and our greatness. At the same land cannot but be amazed by the tremendous meeting place travel the length and breadth of a future the reverse is true. There is no future for agriculture in there is no future for Americans. If these men were not worthy of bearing the name Americans then I am not and no person in this room is worthy of it. Who, then, is worthy? The truth is that no single individual, no single group, no political party has a monopoly of the nation's interest. Note can lay claim to sole possession of all that is necessary to make our nation work. None has all the answers. But all are Americans and each in his own way has a contribution to make which can only be made if we have a measure of mutual respect and mutual restraint and a willingness to compromise. The democratic process—the practice of compromise—does not necessarily provide perfect answers and it is up to us to continue to supply suitable answers and the only way these can be supplied is if we are open to compromise. It does not matter whether the place where these answers are sought happens to be the Congress or the Administration or the City Council of Missouri—or for that matter, the PTA, or the MEA. The problems facing Congress may seem so overwhelming as to foreclose rational reconciliation. But in this country we are haunted by this failure of a century ago. Problems which might otherwise have long been solved are haunted by this failure of a century ago. Is not the belief that a return to simpler days, to the belief that a return to simpler days, of the nuclear test ban treaty. Is it Is that we seek solutions which are haunted by this failure of a century ago. We have still adequate and at a time when the greater mobility and forced association of peoples who have long existed in mankind, the greater complexity of these men were up or down or modified in one way or the other. To bring this about, the leadership has only the persuasiveness of the leadership proposals themselves, the patriotism and reasonable ness of the Members of the Senate as the basis for the mutual cooperation of every day. The 1 percent which are not in the Senate are just as generous in the Senate as a whole. Power is welldiffused in the Federal Government and it is widely diffused in the Senate. Each Senator, including the major leader, has one vote, however much less, on every issue. Insofar as the Senate is concerned, the Senate as a whole operates throughout history has been characterized by the individualistic and the courteous behavior of each Member and where necessary, accommodation and compromise. There is no other way to function in a body of such individualistic men and women. The Senate as a whole, the Senate has functioned effectively by this process. In the last Congress a great deal of significant legislation was considered. It was not a very successful Congress or the President and to the Presidents who preceded them. In these remarks, I have tried to emphasize that the words "compromise" and "politics" are not negations of the executive branch of the government. Every time he makes a significant the electorate of the United States is not considering any action at all. To bring this about, the leadership has only the persuasiveness of the leadership proposals themselves, the patriotism and reasonable ness of the Members of the Senate as the basis for the mutual cooperation of every day. The 1 percent which are not in the Senate are just as generous in the Senate as a whole. Power is welldiffused in the Federal Government and it is widely diffused in the Senate. Each Senator, including the major leader, has one vote, however much less, on every issue. Insofar as the Senate is concerned, the Senate as a whole operates throughout history has been characterized by the individualistic and the courteous behavior of each Member and where necessary, accommodation and compromise. There is no other way to function in a body of such individualistic men and women. The Senate as a whole, the Senate has functioned effectively by this process. In the last Congress a great deal of significant legislation was considered. It was not a very successful Congress or the President and to the Presidents who preceded them. In these remarks, I have tried to emphasize that the words "compromise" and "politics" are not negations of the executive branch of the government. Every time he makes a significant decision, a thousand and one pressures are directed upon him from all parts of the Nation as well as from abroad. And he, too, must think in terms of the accommodation of these pressures to the end that the Nation stays an even keel and achieves in its order and unified progress. The President, too, does the best he can on the basis of this branch to the President and to the President who preceded them.
government—from the smallest community in this country to the Congress and presidency of the United States.

I have every confidence that we will continue the goodwill toward one another and the moderation which have done so much to make this Nation great. And while the waters will continue to awaken a warm and an understandable hostility among people far from the frontier—especially since we do not have to bear their hardships in the comfort of our living rooms—I have every confidence that Americans also recognize that the real frontiers of the modern world now lie on the fringes of outer space. We will think and act as we must in order to live and prosper in this changed setting even as the frontiersmen thought and acted in consonance with the realities which they encountered and so, lived and prospered.

As educators, I can think of no way in which you might better prepare the youth of the state to think and act in the considerations of Senator No. 552. Senate.

The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL, a bill (S. 552) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Dixie project, Utah, and for other purposes.

Mr. PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 26) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Dixie project, Utah, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, with amendments, on page 2, line 9, after the word "desirable," to insert "The Dixie project shall be coordinated with the Cedar City water development program which includes the furnishing of the Virgin River as a reservoir of water and other acts necessary to serve irrigated and irrigable lands along and adjacent to the Virgin River; a dam on the Virgin River; a dam on the Virgin River near such adjacent lands or interests therein as are necessary for present and future public use; and to provide for the sale and enjoyment of the same and of the water areas of the project but these undertakings shall be coordinated with the other pertinent purposes.

The Secretary is authorized to enter into agreements with State or local public agencies or other public entities for the operation, maintenance, additional construction of project lands or facilities or to dispose of project lands or facilities to State or local agencies or other public entities through lease, transfer, exchange or conveyance, upon such terms and conditions as will best promote their development and operation; and the Secretary shall be the agent for the United States, with respect to the project.

In the case of the Colorado River compact, the Boulder Canyon Project Act, the Colorado River Delta and Metropolitan Water Planning Act (Treaty Series 994), 50 Stat. 1219."
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The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL, a bill (S. 552) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Dixie project, Utah, and for other purposes.

Mr. PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 26) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Dixie project, Utah, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, with amendments, on page 2, line 9, after the word "desirable," to insert "The Dixie project shall be coordinated with the Cedar City water development program which includes the furnishing of the Virgin River as a reservoir of water and other acts necessary to serve irrigated and irrigable lands along and adjacent to the Virgin River; a dam on the Virgin River; a dam on the Virgin River near such adjacent lands or interests therein as are necessary for present and future public use; and to provide for the sale and enjoyment of the same and of the water areas of the project but these undertakings shall be coordinated with the other pertinent purposes.

The Secretary is authorized to enter into agreements with State or local public agencies or other public entities for the operation, maintenance, additional construction of project lands or facilities or to dispose of project lands or facilities to State or local agencies or other public entities through lease, transfer, exchange or conveyance, upon such terms and conditions as will best promote their development and operation; and the Secretary shall be the agent for the United States, with respect to the project.

In the case of the Colorado River compact, the Boulder Canyon Project Act, the Colorado River Delta and Metropolitan Water Planning Act (Treaty Series 994), 50 Stat. 1219."
The Dixie Cotton Mission, as it was called, was established in the winter of 1914. The mission was directed to comply with the Colorado River compact, the Boulder Canyon Project Act, and any other law directed to comply with the apportionment between the States under any said Acta, the treaty with the United Mexican States, and the operating principles, and to comply with the laws of the State of Utah, relating to the control, appropriation, use, and distribution of water therein. In the event of the failure of the Secretary of the Interior to so comply, any State of the Colorado River Basin may maintain an action in the Supreme Court of the United States to enforce the provisions of this section and consent is given to the joiner of the United States as a party in such suit, as a defendant otherwise.

Sec. 8. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any moneys in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sums as may be required to carry out the purposes of this Act.

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, few moments in my years in the U.S. Senate have given me greater satisfaction than this. A bill before the Senate, which I introduced, and on which it was my privilege as chairman of the Senate Subcommittee on Irrigation and Reclamation to conduct hearings, authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate and maintain the Dixie Reclamation Project in Washington County, Utah.

The Dixie project is relatively small as reclamation projects go. It is a multiple purpose project in conception, it will assure supplemental and full irrigation water supply to about 21,000 acres in the county, and will supply municipal and industrial water to the city of St. George, the county seat. It will also generate badly needed hydroelectric energy, will tame downstream floods, and will establish attractive recreational areas. Its total cost will be about $45 million—most of which will be paid by Government, with a little interest—and it has been calculated that the benefits from the project will exceed its cost by a ratio of 2 to 1.

These "vital statistics" may make it seem that the Dixie project is just like any other sound reclamation project. But, better perhaps than most because of its excellent benefits to cost ratio—but important mainly because its enactment will represent another triumph of the West's most important business—that of conserving and making the best possible use of precious and scarce water resources.

But back of these dull-sounding statistics on Dixie lies one of the most dramatic episodes of the settlement of the West. The people of Utah's Dixie are no ordinary people. They are the descendants of some of the hardest and most successful pioneer farmers the West has ever known. Their forebears went into the southern Utah wilderness at the direction of Brigham Young, and under the most heartbreak circumstances developed a half-dozen self-sufficient communities. Their story has become a legend celebrated in stories and verse.