

University of Montana

ScholarWorks at University of Montana

Mike Mansfield Speeches, Statements and Interviews

Mike Mansfield Papers

10-30-1963

Congressional Record Page 19508 - Campaign 164 U.S. Foreign Policy in the World Today

Mike Mansfield 1903-2001

Follow this and additional works at: https://scholarworks.umt.edu/mansfield_speeches

Let us know how access to this document benefits you.

Recommended Citation

Mansfield, Mike 1903-2001, "Congressional Record Page 19508 - Campaign 164 U.S. Foreign Policy in the World Today" (1963). *Mike Mansfield Speeches, Statements and Interviews*. 516.

https://scholarworks.umt.edu/mansfield_speeches/516

This Speech is brought to you for free and open access by the Mike Mansfield Papers at ScholarWorks at University of Montana. It has been accepted for inclusion in Mike Mansfield Speeches, Statements and Interviews by an authorized administrator of ScholarWorks at University of Montana. For more information, please contact scholarworks@mso.umt.edu.

File. '64.
Campaign '64.
1958

Montana Speeches, Oct. '63
Rocky Mt. College + Mont. Educ. Assoc.
CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

October 30

lenges. One impressive thing about the National Park Service to me is that it doesn't let people get into grooves. There is always something new—a new assignment, a new challenge. The very fact that you work with nature, with the out of doors, is meaningful in the sense that you work with the seasons, you work with a changing situation, with people and with policies that are dynamic. In a way the most exciting thing to me about the National Park Service, and about the national park idea, is this built-in dynamism, this built-in dilemma and contradiction of protection and use. I mean that it is there, and we never solve it. We never solve that problem. Almost each day something comes up that causes us to stop and think about it and evaluate it. There is always some argument and some controversy about it, and it makes it exciting and interesting. It makes it challenging, it seems to me, for we have to have the door open to those who work with us, and we have to have it open to any ideas and suggestions and criticisms that anyone might have.

I am glad to learn that you have had such a stimulating conference here. I heard with interest the very marvelous speech that Starker Leopold gave, and the ones of Sig Olsen and others, and I know and hope that all of you will go back strengthened and reinvigorated for the task that faces you. But it does seem to me that with the new challenges we confront—and I shall discuss many of them this evening—we must be responsive, we must be creative, we must deepen and broaden the great National Park Service tradition. I think that if we meet the new challenges successfully, it will not be because we happen to have executives at the top of the Department of the Interior who are unusually interested in the park idea or in the park movement, or not because we have a Director, an associate director, or others in the top of the bureaucracy at Washington, who are particularly good at handling people, or are especially skillful. The success or failure in the years ahead will depend, as they have in the past, on your ability to be a loyal team, on your ability to challenge one another to bring out the best that you have. And I think that the men at the top should be responsive, should try to inspire where they can, and the men below them should never be unwilling to provide the thrust of a fresh initiative or a fresh idea.

So we have many challenges, and the task of selecting our top people, as I have said, is one of the most difficult of them. It may be that we choose wisely or badly. One will never know. Only time can tell about those things, but we must select. We must choose. The only thing we can ask is that you help us make the choice a good one, because, really, the success or failure of any Director rests on you and on your loyalty, and no one knows that better or has proved it better than Connie Wirth himself.

So I express the hope that you will help make this choice a fine one, and that you will help George Hartzog take his place, as Connie has taken his place, along with Horace Albright and Steve Mather and the others, as a great conservationist and a great leader. And so I am very pleased and honored to present to you the man that we are appointing as the new Director of the National Park Service, George Hartzog.

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, it may be appropriate at this time to say that publication of the Secretary's address is done with his permission, and that previous publication of Director Wirth's letter of October 18, 1963, to the Secretary was with permission of both.

And I should like to request further unanimous consent for publication in the

RECORD at this time a self-explanatory United Press International dispatch of October 29, 1963.

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

WASHINGTON.—Interior Secretary Udall flatly denied today that top Department officials forced the retirement of Conrad L. Wirth as Director of the National Park Service.

Wirth's decision to retire was his own and was reached long before the announcement last week, Udall said in an interview. The Secretary said he was "appalled" at reports the resignation was forced.

Informants said at the time that Wirth resigned under pressure, partly because of a National Academy of Sciences report scolding the Park Service for its attitude toward research. His resignation was announced barely 12 hours after release of the report criticizing Park Service research for an alleged lack of direction.

The report said the agency "has suffered because of a failure to recognize distinctions between research and administrative decisionmaking."

Before the report was released, Assistant Interior Secretary J. W. Carver criticized some Park Service operations in a speech.

Then a few days after Wirth's resignation, the National Republican Congressional Committee charged that Wirth was "purged by the Kennedy administration." The committee said Wirth was ousted because he "just managed the parks with efficiency, didn't try to expand bureaucracy."

Udall praised Wirth as an "outstanding public servant," who ranks "on the highest honor roll of those * * * who have done the most to preserve a rich outdoor legacy for the American people."

"Anything that indicates there was any unhappiness (with Wirth) by myself or anyone in the Department is unfair and untrue," Udall said. There was "no pressure of any kind or any dispute within the Department," he added.

Udall said Wirth began making retirement plans a year ago, and decided last February that the announcement should be made this month. It was timed for a recent meeting of Park Service officials at Yosemite National Park.

"None of us suggested the retirement, he had an entirely free hand," Udall said. It would have been "fine" if Wirth, now 64, had wanted to remain longer in his post, Udall added.

"I'm saying flatly there was no lack of confidence (in Wirth) at any time and no crisis over policy," Udall said.

Udall said Carver's speech was "the sort of thing you do within the family as indicating you can do a better job in some fields."

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 morning business?

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

AMENDMENT OF FOREIGN ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1961

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair lays before the Senate the un-

finished business, which will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. 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, will the Senator from Louisiana yield with the understanding he will not lose his right to the floor?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

U.S. FOREIGN POLICY IN THE WORLD TODAY

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD 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, Rocky Mountain College, Billings, Mont., October 24, 1963)

Thank you very much for asking me to be with you this morning. Your invitation is 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 brickbats.

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 roar of the twenties gave way to the whimper of the depression-thirties which in turn was replaced by the great war of the forties and later, by the cataclysms of the post-war era and the Himalayan uncertainties—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 here—the college campus has not been a refuge from the storms of life. Nor has it been an island-haven 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 inseparable from the mainstream of American life. It is now, as never before, the principal training ground for the leadership of the Nation. And more 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 an 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.

TRIBUTE TO CONRAD L. WIRTH

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, on Monday of this week I took occasion to pay tribute to the great and constructive work of one of the most dedicated Federal officials it has been my 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 hike 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 visiting the 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; and I want to make it again now, before the Senate of the United States. And I want to add that I have known Connie Wirth as a fine leader among these superior men.

I have reason to believe Secretary Udall shares my high esteem for Mr. Wirth. He made the statement I have just quoted at a conference of Park Service personnel held at Yosemite National Park only about 2 weeks ago, on October 18, 1963.

The Secretary was speaking with reference to the forthcoming retirement of Director Wirth and his successor, Mr. George Hartzog. And in that address he quoted in full a letter of the same date which he had just received from Mr. Wirth.

I inserted a copy of this letter in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on October 28, 1963, and it is to be found on pages 19295 and 19296 of the RECORD.

In that letter Mr. Wirth reminded the Secretary of the fact that in 1962 he had given notice of his retirement intentions, and that in February of this year he had communicated with the Secretary relative to the choice of his successor.

I cite the fact that Director Wirth's letter of October 18, 1963 has already been published in the RECORD, because Secretary Udall read it in the course of his address as Yosemite; and I now wish to request unanimous consent to insert the Secretary's address at this point in the RECORD—without repetition of the letter.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CONFERENCE OF CHALLENGES

(Address by Stewart L. Udall, Secretary of the Interior, Yosemite National Park, October 18, 1963)

This is something to which I have looked forward. Two years ago I had the wonderful experience of meeting most of you down at the Grand Canyon. I have seen a lot of you since then, and I have looked forward,

not only to the chance to meet and talk with all of you again—because I think these family reunions are one of the things that holds the Park Service together and makes it such a wonderful organization—but also to the opportunity tonight to say a few things that I have wanted to say for some time.

This is, I am sure you will agree—and I am sure you all know what's coming—a significant occasion. A lot of things that are unfortunate have been said and written in the last day or so that misrepresent the situation, but that will become plain, I hope, before I finish. I think that the opportunity we have here these days to discuss in a family way where we are going, and where we have been, and what we think of one another, is and should be a solemn occasion and one we will finally remember with satisfaction.

I have a letter which Connie wrote and delivered to me. I would like to read it to you because I think it is a document that will deserve an important place in our records.

I am going to save some of the things I want to say about Connie, some humorous and some serious, until this evening. But I do have one story about this man, whom most of you know better than I—although I have come to know him very well, I was joking with him while coming up here, telling him that the only public criticism I ever made of him in nearly 3 years was when I wrote an article saying that maybe Tiogo Road was a mistake. The next morning he was down in my office to tell me it wasn't. And I admitted to him that I had never seen it. I had uttered my opinion on the basis of the opinions of others who I thought had pretty good judgment. I had planned perhaps to take Marshal Tito up to see it, and finally to form a personal opinion of my own. But now I'll have to wait on that, Connie. But I do want to say to all of you here tonight that from my knowledge of the National Park Service, as a Congressman, as a citizen, and as a Secretary, I do not think there has been a time when its esprit has been higher, and when its prestige, not only in this country, but in the world, has been stronger than it is today.

During the past 6 weeks I have been to an international conference in Africa. I have worked with African park people, and I have come as a result of this experience, and as a result of the First International Conference on National Parks a year ago in Seattle, to have an even higher regard than I had had previously of what the National Park Service means to conservation in the world at large. I think that this is the result, of course, of the work that all of the dedicated Park Service people have contributed ever since Steve Mather, and even before him. And let us also admit the accomplishments of those on the outside who have helped us to raise and keep the standards high in the National Park Service.

The esteem and warm personal friendship that we have for Connie and Helen makes this an emotional occasion for all of us. This is a time to look backward, as well as forward, and I shall do some of both later this evening. But this is a time, too, when we must select a successor, and I want you to know that the process of selecting him—the man who will become the seventh Director of the national park system, is something that has not been taken lightly by the Director or by myself or my associates. It has consumed a period of nearly 9 months since Connie came in to see me, and we first talked about it. One of the most difficult things that any Secretary has to do is select his personnel, make his appointments, pick his associates. It requires a lot of soulsearching. It requires one to do the best and fairest

job one can do in estimating the abilities of men. All of us, each of us here—as is true of all mankind and womankind—has his strengths and his weaknesses. We all have our abilities and our talents. Some of us do one thing better than someone else, and some of us are fitted to particular jobs and have particular capacities. We never know whether we should select a younger man or an older man, and it often depends upon what the particular job is that needs to be done in the future.

It was this type of thinking that went through our minds in the weeks and months when we thought over this problem. But certainly, and this is the thing that I want to stress above all—for I am acutely conscious of it and said this to Connie and George while driving down—the great thing about the National Park Service, which I think that one can say of few other governmental or nongovernmental organizations, is that an esprit and a tradition and a loyalty have been developed over the years that is to me one of the finest things that I have ever encountered in my governmental service. It is a tribute that I want to pay to all of you here.

I think there were two men who as heads of bureaus in this century did more in a way to start it, but they had associates who worked with them, too. They were Gifford Pinchot and Stephen Mather. They had different convictions on some things. Their assignments were different, really—they worked in different areas—but the one thing that both of these men did was to create a service, a spirit, a tradition, a devotion, that have permeated the entire organization. Not only that, but they selected devoted and dedicated people. The result has been that the National Park Service has never been, and never should be, one man or even one group of men. Each of you, in my opinion, is as important as another when we get right down to what makes the National Park Service a great organization. You are a great organization because of this dedication and esprit. You are a great organization because you are a team and because you work together. I would like to say to George, here, as I have said to Connie in the past, the only thing a Director can ask of you as that you carry out this great and high tradition of devotion and dedication, that you continue to work as a team, and that you give the very best that you have in loyalty and in achievement to your Director and to the Service and to whoever is the Secretary of the Interior. And the only thing, George, that I think that your people have a right to expect of you, as they had a right to expect it of Connie—and as he gave it to them—is the right to encourage each of them to make the finest and highest contribution that they can make, to do the most creative work, to feel free to do the best job they can in strengthening their part of the job in this great Service. One of the finest tributes I have ever heard given to a group of men or to an organization, Connie, was the one that Senator BYRD paid on the afternoon we took a hike 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 visiting the parks and I've met Park Service people for 30 years and I've never met one that wasn't a superior man." I thought that that was one of the finest tributes that I had ever heard.

Let me say one other thing, too, and I will dwell on some of this at a little greater length this evening. There has been perhaps a little bit too much constructive criticism. We can sometimes overstate what we mean, or have our words misconstrued. But certainly there is always room in any organization for a challenge—indeed, that's the purpose of this Conference of New Chal-

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 inhabitant of Billings, of Montana and of the United States.

For foreign policy is 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 as individuals 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 not the time nor inclination to learn.

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 properly so, to react as they see fit—to 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 someone has got to decide and to speak and act for the Nation as a whole. Whether we will it or not there is a constant action and reaction among nations which affects this Nation for better or for worse. And out of the myriad of 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 and govern our approach as a nation to the rest of the world.

What these policies are 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. Nor, indeed, is it to say that individual Americans may judge for a variety of reasons ineffective national policies to be good.

The Presidency and, to the extent that it is involved, the Congress, are the political institutions which delineate, by word and action, the overall foreign policy of the Nation. The Presidency and the Congress are popularly responsive political mechanisms, 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 its application must take account of events which in today's world can develop and change course with remarkable speed. It is apparent that American foreign policy has the essential quality of continuity. Since the end of World War II, the United States has sought to encourage the development of a society of independent nations in a world free from aggression, hence warfare. In pursuing this policy, the United States has fought, as in Korea, and has often entertained 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, the United States has provided economic and military assistance designed to strengthen independent countries and enable their peoples gradually to evolve societies that 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 as an organization for 17 years. Some will look back over the years and rediscover that there is much in its record 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. The only concern which they have is 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 a catastrophic nuclear war. These Americans recognize that the tightrope sways violently with every wind of conflict—whether it blows in Asia, in Africa, in the Middle East, or elsewhere.

These Americans will not dismiss as useless or worse, any rational attempt to temper these winds of conflict. They will not consign to the waste heap of history an organization which has helped to do that in the deserts of the Middle East, and in the high mountains of Kashmir between India and Pakistan. These Americans will not make light of the sacrifice of the life of Dag Hammarskjöld, a great and decent human being who raised the barrier of the U.N. against the hurricane of hate in the Congo.

Nor will these Americans dismiss as useless or dangerous to this Nation the work which the United Nations has done in marshalling an international effort to feed and clothe and otherwise help children in need wherever they may be, the work to eradicate the scourge of diseases such as malaria in forgotten corners of the world, to teach the unenlightened how to farm better and to develop community skills and habits which may lead them out of the morass of a crushing poverty and a superstitious ignorance.

These Americans will not condemn an organization whose purpose is to build bridges of peace and understanding among nations where too few exist, whose purpose is to promote a less cruel and more decent life for men, women, and children throughout the world.

We may deplore the inadequacies of the U.N. We may criticize what are sometimes meddling tendencies on the part of immature member-governments. We may denounce the irresponsibility which leads some nations to vote grandiose United Nations action in some situation or other and then leave by the nearest exit when the price of the action is announced in the Assembly. We may be dismayed by the moral preachments of certain nations which do not accord with their national practices.

It is proper that we deplore, criticize, and denounce when these expressions are required. Spades are spades and should so called, in the U.N. or anywhere else. But in calling them—and I have done my share along with Arthur Lamey of Billings, as a U.S. delegate on two occasions to the U.N. General Assembly and in the Congress—I do not believe our purpose ought to be to destroy but rather to improve. Mature Americans can recognize the significant contribution of the organization to the world, and to this Nation as a part of it, while at

the same time we recognize that the contribution is far from enough.

Every day, so far as most of us are concerned, is United States Day. Each of us in our own way might very well by our actions and words, 365 days a year, rededicate ourselves to the preservation and enhancement of all that this Nation means to us and all that it stands for in the history of mankind. And, may I say that I can see nothing inconsistent with the respect and love which we have for our country in giving recognition and careful attention once a year to a principal institution through which this Nation and all nations, if they have the will as well as the words, may find the difficult way to a decent understanding and mutual respect among the world's peoples and to a durable peace.

In seeking its national objectives in the world, the United States has turned away from the path of territorial conquest or domination of others. Nor has the United States sought to intimidate with nuclear superiority. On the contrary, we have tried consistently since the end of World War II to develop some form of international control over this new and immense source of power.

Over the past several years, the United States has tried to curb the hazard of nuclear fallout, to say nothing of the danger of nuclear war, by securing a treaty to limit nuclear testing. Such an agreement has now been reached under a Democratic President and a Democratic Congress. But the treaty itself is beyond parties. Indeed, it reflects the continuity of our policy. It is cast in the mold of international agreement on control which was the first concept of nuclear policy designed at a time when there was a Democratic President and a Republican Congress. And, in specific elements, the treaty adheres to a pattern first set forth under the Republican administration of President Eisenhower in 1958 at a time when the Democratic Party was in control of the Congress.

The test ban treaty reflects the continuity of policy, and its history also illustrates some of the difficulties which beset the President—any President—in seeking to maintain this continuity. In a society as dynamic as our own, there is an understandable impatience with the static quality that sometimes characterizes critical areas of our foreign policy. May I say in all frankness that I have on occasion shared that impatience. Years of continuous and repetitious effort to reach agreement on the test ban discouraged a great many Americans and fostered a sense of frustration. Yet because the President was persistent and because, in the end, the Senate by a preponderant majority of both parties saw value in the treaty for the Nation we now have an agreement which, hopefully, will put an end to one type of unnecessary contamination of the earth's environment in which we must all live. At the same time by this treaty we may well have taken a small but firm first step away from the great peril of nuclear war.

A similar sense of frustration and impatience shapes the attitude of many Americans toward foreign aid programs, and, again, I must say that it is an impatience which I have shared. If one has some firsthand experience of these programs, it is almost impossible to escape the conviction that there is a great deal of waste motion and aimlessness and presumptuousness in the administration of this element of policy. These characteristics have been there for many years and despite vigorous efforts at the present time to curb them, it is not at all unlikely that these faults persist to some degree. But may I suggest that if you would evaluate this program properly it must be placed in a broader context than that of im-

perfect concept or inadequate administration. What, we may well ask ourselves, would be the complexion of world politics today without this great effort in the past and its continuance?

History seldom reveals its alternatives and it is not possible to state with precision the countries which may have been spared collapse and a loss of their independence 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 restore 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 in India if we had failed to provide support to that country. We do know that strong centrifugal forces in India have always posed a serious threat to the continued cohesion of Asia's largest Republic. And it is reasonable to assume, too, on the basis of history that without aid from abroad there would have been a series of mass famines, with great political upheavals in their wake.

In Vietnam, where the problems have for many reasons been especially difficult, I think there is little question that without American support of the Republic of South Vietnam the entire Indochina peninsula 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 another major blow.

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 major part to the influence of the struggle with the Soviet Union, a struggle that has given world politics a 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 which in this day and age is, perforce, aligned with the maintenance of an international environment in which the concept of human freedom remains 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 disturb 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.

It occurs to me, however, that the continuity of our basic policy has a cumulative effect. It builds pressures, which every so often leads to some development that both strengthens and dramatizes our basic policy, thus making it more understandable to our own citizens and to the rest of the world.

The Cuban crisis last year, and the Berlin crisis the year before, for example, were such developments. The Soviet Union chose to test American policy on Berlin and Cuba. As a result there was a series of harassing gestures at Berlin during the summer and

fall of 1961. These failed, however, to move the United States from its policy of no change in that city and no German solution under duress.

In Cuba last year, the Soviet Union introduced offensive missiles, then withdrew them in the face of U.S. countermeasures. This was one of those events which sometimes alters sharply the pattern of the main current of international relations. Both the Soviet Union and the United States stood on the edge of the bottomless pit of nuclear war in the Cuban crisis of 1962. And the rest of the world swayed with them on the rim of the abyss. That rendezvous with mass extinction which was not kept may well have altered the basic nature of the tensions which had led to it.

This is not to suggest that the adversary is now less committed to its expansionist policies than before the Cuban crisis. What is suggested is that the world knows now—with a new and grim intimacy what it has always known from a distance—the overwhelming cost which nuclear war would represent to civilization and the folly of not considering it fully in the calculations of the policies of any nation. What is suggested, too, is that American policy, often misunderstood by friend and foe alike, is now more comprehensible to both. These are dividends of very great importance.

A question frequently asked in Washington during the past summer concerned the shift in the Soviet Union's position on a limited nuclear test ban. In short, why did the Soviet Union abruptly decide to accept the U.S. position, which for years it had rejected? As with any analysis of Soviet motives, the explanation in this case is necessarily speculative. However, it is generally believed that a number of related factors produced the shift in Soviet policy. The Cuban missile crisis, as I have noted, had a most sobering effect.

The Sino-Soviet rift, about which so much has been written, certainly played a role in the Soviet decision. I have long felt that this quarrel in major part was inevitable in the light of the historic conflict of interests between China and Russia along the inner borders of the Asian mainland. The rift also arises from a difference between communism's two great powers over the means to be reached in attaining their ends. The Soviet Union seeks to avoid a general war and to consolidate its position at home and in Eastern Europe. China is still in a revolutionary thralldom compounded of militant nationalism, racism and ideological arrogance. It has been estranged from a great part of the world by the policies of both the United States and the Soviet Union. The leadership of the Soviet Union clearly has felt the need of some tangible expression of its policy of coexistence which would arouse popular support in Russia and Eastern Europe and lead to a further dampening of the Chinese thralldom.

Furthermore, there is no reason to doubt that the Soviet Union shares our concern with the problem of nuclear fallout. This insidious phenomenon has already done noticeable health and genetic damage to people of the two countries and others and could do a great deal more if international anarchy were to persist in nuclear testing. There is, too, a common interest with the Soviet Union in solving the problem of proliferation of nuclear weapons. The test ban treaty does not guarantee that other nations will forego development of these weapons. However, leaving aside France (already a nuclear power) and China, the treaty has been signed by about 100 nations including every country which appears to have the human and material resources that would permit development of these weapons over the next several years.

The struggle goes on with the Soviet Union, but as I have already indicated, the

tone may well be changing to some degree. The sale of American grain to the Soviet Union is one of those measures which by serving the interests of both parties in a very direct way may contribute, in a general way to the objective of a durable peace. The Soviet Union needs grain because of crop failures. It had the choice of buying directly from the United States or arranging to obtain American grain, or the flour therefrom, from third countries. The fact is that they could have obtained it. The fact is that U.S. grain has gone to eastern Europe in the past and continued to go either as grain or in the form of flour by way of middleman countries such as West Germany and others who from time to time take it upon themselves to preach to us against the evils of trade with Communist countries. Indeed, West Germany does an annual trade with the Soviet Union alone which is equal to or greater than our trade with all of the Communist countries in the world.

By dealing directly with the Soviet Union instead of through the middlemen of Western Europe, the United States will realize exchange earnings from a large sale of grain. This will benefit our deficit balance of payments by precisely that much. It will, of course, greatly help our wheat-producing areas and at the same time affect beneficially all taxpayers who now bear the burden of storage costs for wheat stocks far in excess of any reasonable need for our own consumption.

I have spoken of our tendency to become impatient and insistent on solutions to problems that can only be settled over the space of many years. I should also take note of the tendency of some to exaggerate the significance of any easing of cold war tensions and to sense the tantalizing image of a stable peace just around the next bend.

Between these two tendencies, a more realistic approach I think would be to observe that the nature of present world tension is not static and immutable. Rather it changes as events cause the powers—including this Nation—to adjust their policies to changed conditions and new requirements. At present, it is the Soviet Union whose policies are undergoing most significant shifts. It was the Soviet Union, for example, which accepted the American position on the limited test ban question, not the other way around. It was the Soviet Union which approached the United States for the sale of wheat.

These changes reflect credit on the strength and continuity of the fundamental policy we have pursued since the early post World War II days under administrations of both parties. As such, they should encourage Americans to support efforts by the Government to bring about still greater progress toward our national objectives. This will mean resisting the tendencies to self-defeating impatience and frustrations on the one hand, and illusory optimism on the other.

The direct antipathies between the Soviet Union and the United States constitute only one aspect of the problem of U.S. policy in the world today. Difficulties are arising in connection with the key Atlantic Alliance. The United States assists India and Pakistan and the effect of this assistance is neutralized by the inability of these countries to compromise the differences particularly over Kashmir that so embitter their relations.

There are other outstanding international disputes which serve to destabilize some parts of the world and to frustrate programs of economic and social development. The Arab-Israeli conflict is one of these, and like the Kashmir issue, is one that the United States has been deeply concerned with for many years. Such problems exist in virtually all parts of the world. In the Middle East, there is the civil war in Yemen.

In the North African Magreb there is the grave border conflict between Algeria and Morocco. In Africa, there is the Congo and Angola, with problems in South Africa and possibly the Rhodesias lying ahead. In southeast Asia, there is the complex struggle surrounding the birth of the new state of Malaysia. And, of course, there are Laos and Vietnam. In Latin America, it is becoming clear that the Alliance for Progress will absorb energies from both North and South America for many years and even then the ultimate outcome is by no means clear.

There are few rational alternatives for American policy. The overriding objective of promoting the security and well-being of the United States amounts to a continuing effort involving just about every part of the world.

The thought that I should like to leave with you during this political education week is one of a hope for continued progress toward a world of stable peace and freedom in which our own peace and freedom will be unassailable. Yet this hope must be tempered by an awareness that the future is always uncertain and difficult. Of this, there is no doubt.

I should also like to suggest that time is on our side, provided we use it wisely. The years ahead will present a wide range of opportunities together with a normal complement of setbacks and mistakes. Our greatness as a nation in this period will be measured by our ability to catch some of the fresh breezes that history will offer and thus give greater momentum to our purposes. This ability will derive largely from the President but its exercise will depend primarily on the understanding support of an informed citizenry. It is with this in mind that I heartily applaud your political education week and express once again my great satisfaction that it is taking place in this city and in this State and my gratitude for your kindness in inviting me to participate.

COMPROMISE IN A DEMOCRACY

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a speech entitled "Compromise in a Democracy," which I made before the Montana Education Association in Missoula, Mont., October 25, 1963.

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

COMPROMISE IN A DEMOCRACY

(Speech by Senator MIKE MANSFIELD, Democrat, of Montana, before the convention of the Montana Education Association, Missoula, Mont., October 25, 1963)

It is with great personal pleasure that I meet with you today. I have enjoyed a long affinity with the Montana Education Association, as a teacher in fact, and in retrospect over the years.

When I was asked to speak, today, several topics were suggested. The one entitled "Compromise in a Democracy," caught my attention at once. That is not strange, since the word "compromise" is very frequently associated with the word "politics."

An overworked, but nevertheless accurate phrase states that politics is the art of compromise, or "the art of things possible" as Count Cavour put it a century ago. Unfortunately, there are those who view both "compromise" and "politics" as equally noxious terms. But if that view had predominated in our history, this Nation would not have known an orderly evolution. Indeed, without the constant exercise of compromise, a popularly responsive and responsible government such as we know could not exist.

We have learned, through experience, that compromise is an essential ingredient of a government by consent. The history of our own State is a good example. The tradition of our early years, as you well know, is accented with violence. Many of our pioneers were veterans of the Civil War and our early history reflects some of the vindictive aftermath of that conflict. Vigilante law and the quick draw, not compromise and due process, were an early and accepted way of dealing with differences. In honesty, however, I suspect that the actual casualties which resulted from this approach in all the early years of the State's settlement do not equal the current output of death by violence in a week of TV westerns.

We have come some distance since those early days. Officeholders, today, are no longer removed by hanging but rather by the more refined—and, presumably, less painful—process of the ballot. I, personally and understandably regard this as a great achievement.

One of the keys to this transition has been the general recognition that an orderly society is inconceivable in the absence of the will to compromise. To say this is not to defend those instances in which compromise represents an abuse of public power and a violation of public trust. But I do say that the view which tends to hold compromise in contempt is a most unfortunate one. And it does not matter whether this view is applied in local setting, in State or National politics or, indeed, to international problems. For it is but one step from the disdain of compromise to the application of the opprobrium of appeasement or "sell-out" to all who practice this essential art of political—indeed of all—human relations. And to cast aspersions upon the efforts to solve by compromise, problems which defy the simple solution is to invite chaos. And with it, would only come a return to the law of the vigilante and the quick draw—this, in a world in which one quick draw in the final analysis may be the last.

If there is anything which I have learned in more than 2 decades in Congress, it is that issues which have only two sides—and which can be disposed of largely on the basis of all right or all wrong—are for the most part either unimportant, old and settled matters or rarely, new questions which, not infrequently, have tragic implications. The declaration of war against Japan, for example, was passed in less than a day and with only one dissenting vote in both Houses of Congress. It was a clear-cut issue but it was also a tragic issue.

In Congress, today, most defense measures are also passed by nearly unanimous vote. The necessity for them is clear-cut and long established and remains essentially unchanged in the absence of significant change in the world situation. In every Congress, of course, we also pass many minor bills unananimously. But for the most part, they involve the relief of a single citizen who in some way or other has suffered some obvious injury at the hands of the Government or other matters of very limited implication.

But with respect to significant new issues, quick and unanimous agreement is unusual. There are just too many millions of persons in this country, too many groups and subgroups, whose interests are affected by the passage of legislation. Here are some of the more obvious divisions within our society.

There are 10 distinct geographic divisions and countless subdivisions in the United States, each with its own peculiar problems and interests.

The last census showed 125 million people living in urban areas and 54 million in rural areas. The former stress that the Government's resources and energies should be directed toward cleaning up slums, improving

mass transportation systems and a thousand other worthwhile goals. The latter call for greater investment in conservation, more emphasis on strengthening the agricultural and livestock industries and so forth.

Over 20 million Negroes and numerous whites of almost every religious denomination ask for equality of treatment for all Americans in all walks of life and demand that it be given today. Other millions resist this effort and urge, in effect, there be a slowdown in the process of applying with greater equity the promise of the Constitution to all citizens.

There are more than 18 million persons over 65 years of age, many of whom are living out their final years in poverty and fear of financially catastrophic sickness. They ask that the rest of the Nation consider their past contributions, if not the future to which we are all headed, by providing a self-respecting and adequate system of insurance against the major financial hazards. Yet there are some—and I would hope not too many Americans—who would begrudge any such system to older citizens especially if it is under the general control of the Federal Government. But how, otherwise, it might be adequately provided is not made clear.

On the other end of the age spectrum, there are some 70 million persons under the age of 20. Their needs, if we are to look to a stable national future, include adequate access to higher education, commensurate with ability. They include in many parts of the Nation sufficient classrooms and teachers at all levels of education. And they include action to open up jobs, to end ill-advised or avoidable school dropouts, and to develop a sound, well-rounded national approach to the mounting delinquency problems of our young people. And no one knows better than educators that the term "juvenile delinquency" covers a complex multitude of factors which will not be dispelled simply because we have assigned them this glib name and then wrung our hands and deplored the name.

There is, too, as still another aspect of our national diversity, the endless conflict of industrial interests as among themselves and with agricultural interests. Poultry raisers in Georgia and beef producers in Montana and their Congressmen and Senators, including me, watch with growing concern the rising imports of their products into the United States. Detroit workers who owe their living in part to the export of automotive parts fear that tariffs which we impose will bring retaliation against them.

The Government sustains prices for raw cotton production in order to help one set of farmers. The cotton is disposed of at bargain terms abroad in order to keep the stockpiles from mounting too high. The bargain-term cotton is manufactured into various textiles abroad and when some of these are exported to the United States, we face the complaints of our own textile producers in New England, or, indeed, in the same States where the cotton is grown. And so it goes and we do the best we can to deal with these inconsistencies while at the same time, through compromise, we seek to strike some measure of equity for all parts of the land and for all groups in the economy.

In the political arena, the monopoly by the Republicans and Democrats leads some to suppose that there are only two well-defined parties in the Nation. But there are other political and quasi-political bodies competing for public acceptance and there are repeated divisions and alignments within each party. It is significant, for example, that in the vote in the Senate on ratification of the Nuclear Test Ban Treaty, 25 Republicans joined 55 Democrats in support of the treaty while only 8 Republicans joined 11 Democrats in opposition.

Anyone who has had the opportunity to travel the length and breadth of this great land cannot but be amazed by the tremendous vitality in its diversity. This quality contributes much to our strength and our greatness. At the same time it is a major source of the need for compromise. All of the diverse interests must somehow be contained within a broader concept of national interest. For, in the last analysis there is no future for agriculture in this Nation unless there is also a future for industry and the reverse is true. There is no future for Protestants unless there is also a future for Catholics, Jews and others and the reverse is true. There is no future for the Negro if there is not also a future for the white and the reverse is true. There is no future for Montana if there is not also a future for the other States and the reverse is true. In short, the diversities of interest must in some way find, through compromise and mutual restraint, a common meeting place in the national interest and a common hope in the Nation's future. Unless they do so the immense strength and vitality of the whole may be exhausted in the bitter schisms of the parts.

This Nation has grown great and is great, in short, precisely because we have learned the art of compromise. It has given us a powerful unity which undergirds our position as a nation in the world and provides stable progress at home. Throughout our history, only the Civil War yields an example of the overwhelming and devastating rejection of the process of compromise. That one exception came when the passion of various groups for their own point of view grew so overweening as to foreclose rational reconciliation among them. And even today, we are haunted by this failure of a century ago. Problems which might otherwise have long since been resolved are still with us. And we have still a difficult way to go before the racial and sectional fears and suspicions and misunderstandings—the grim heritage of that one great failure—are finally laid to rest, as one day they will be.

We would do well to consider some of the factors which complicate the art of mutual accommodation and make more difficult the tasks of this Nation. There are two which stand out and which have a special urgency for us today. I have touched upon one of these already. It has to do with the apparent compulsion of some to insist that the simple solution can be applied to every problem—no matter how complex it may be. The other is the tendency of many Americans to question the motives or loyalty of those with whom they disagree. Both tendencies have long existed in mankind. But the complex life of the 20th century has sharpened them—and at a time and under conditions when the Nation can least afford them.

The shrinking of distance, the greater mobility and forced association of peoples who a short time ago would never have come into contact with one another, the increased urbanization, the growing population, and the increasing impersonalism of our economic organization have all contributed to an atmosphere of greater anxiety and insecurity. And overall, hangs the ever-present specter of devastating nuclear conflict, although just a few weeks ago, we witnessed a glimmer of hope in this connection with the signing of the nuclear test ban treaty.

It is not surprising, then, that there is a nostalgic desire on the part of many to cling to the belief that a return to simpler days, days of the relative isolation of individuals, communities, and States is a choice still open to us as a Nation. I can understand this desire. Indeed, there are days when I share it. But the front page of any morning's newspaper is enough to dispel it. The added pressures within the Nation and the awesome dangers from without make it more imperative than ever that we seek solutions which

take full cognizance of the complexities of modern life in this Nation and in the world. If we are to succeed in finding solutions we must draw into a common pool such wisdom and sensitivity as may be available in all parts of the Nation, in all political parties.

We cannot read any able citizen out of the community simply because we do not happen to agree with him politically. We cannot arbitrarily decide as some have done that an American as distinguished in his service to the Nation as former President Eisenhower or his Secretary of State, John Foster Dulles, were not only useless but even worse—virtual enemies of America. 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 single political party has a monopoly on virtue or patriotism. None 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 accommodation.

The democratic process—the practice of compromise—does not necessarily provide perfect answers. But it has supplied and will continue to supply suitable answers and the only answers suitable to a free people.

It does not matter whether the place where these answers are sought happens to be the Congress of the United States or the City Council of Missoula—or for that matter, the PTA, or the MEA. The problems facing Congress may be more complex. The decisions made by it may affect far more people. But in the final analysis in the House of Representatives, it is almost 440 men and women and in the Senate, it is 100 men and women meeting in a face-to-face situation trying to do the best that they can to serve the interests of the States and people whom they represent. There is nothing to keep Senators from pulling the Government apart in this process; nothing that is, except self-discipline, mutual respect, tolerance for the views of others, and a willingness to compromise. The system is far from perfect and the answers which it produces are not necessarily always the best. Nevertheless, the institution is bound together by the desire to safeguard and advance particular interests in the context of the total national good. It works largely because individual Senators are prepared not to press their concept of what is 100-percent perfect 100 percent of the time.

When a Senator is elected to the Senate leadership, he remains the Senator from Montana or Minnesota or Illinois or California. His primary responsibility is unchanged. Unless he serves the people whom he represents, he cannot serve the Nation.

To put it another way, leadership responsibilities in the Senate are not assumed at the expense of State responsibilities. They are an addition, not a subtraction.

The function of leadership in the Senate is to help to operate a principal branch of the Federal Government and to keep it geared into the other branches on behalf of the people of all 50 States. In practice, this means a great deal of work in concert with the President and with the Speaker of the House in an effort to see that what needs attention gets attention from all concerned. It means regular conferences every Tuesday morning with the President and other meetings, as critical issues of foreign or domestic policy arise. It means planning with the other Senate leaders—minority and majority—with committee chairmen and individual members for the legislative program. It means cooperation, understanding, and accommodation with my distinguished Republican counterpart, Senator EVERETT DIRKSEN, of Illinois, because if this is not forthcoming the Senate would find it difficult to function

as effectively as it has. The leadership's first function is to communicate the President's sentiments to the Senate and to make known the Senate's tendencies to the President. The followthrough involves the process of achieving the practical. It means riding herd on legislative measures, from their inception through the committees to the Senate as a whole and, long hours thereafter, on the floor until some disposition is made of these measures.

Presidential proposals may be voted up or down or modified in the Senate. But significant issues presented by the President warrant, as a minimum, the courteous but independent consideration of the Senate and a decision one way or the other. To bring this about, the leadership has only the persuasiveness of the Presidential proposals themselves, the patriotism and reasonableness of the Members of the Senate of both parties and the interest of the people of the States in the President's program. The leadership has no special powers to lead. It has only such respect and cooperation which may be freely bestowed upon it by the Senate as a whole.

Power is widely diffused in the Federal Government and it is very widely diffused in the Senate. Each Senator, including the majority leader, has one vote, no more or less, on every issue. Insofar as the Senate is concerned, it operates 99 percent of the time on the basis of the procedural cooperation of every Member. The 1 percent when it does not so operate accounts for almost all of the ridicule and criticism which from time to time throughout history has been directed at the institution.

By changes in the rules it may be possible that the operations of the Senate could be improved. But in the last analysis, the key to its effectiveness will remain where it always has been—in the voluntary restraint 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, each equal in his constitutional power. On the whole, the Senate has functioned effectively by this process. In the last Congress a great deal of significant legislation was considered and disposed of. Before this Congress expires, the great bulk of the program now before us will be considered by the Senate and much of it will be enacted. The achievement will reflect credit not on the leadership but on the Members of the Senate of both parties and on the way of life of the Nation which has produced a capacity for a cooperative unity and accommodation in diversity in its great institutions no less than in our society as a whole.

I have emphasized the legislative branch of the Government because it is most familiar to me. But these observations apply to a considerable degree to the executive branch of the Government. Too often we forget that the President of the United States is only a human being faced with a superhuman task. 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 on an even keel and moves in an orderly and unified progress. The President, too, does the best he can on the basis of patriotic dedication to the Nation and that applies, may I say on the basis of my personal observations for two decades, no less to President Eisenhower than it does to President Kennedy and to the Presidents who preceded them.

In these remarks, I have tried to emphasize that the words "compromise" and "politics" are not in themselves unsavory terms, but rather they are the staff of freedom. Successful compromise is as necessary as the air we breathe. This is true for all aspects of

government—from the smallest community in Montana to the Congress and presidency of the United States.

I have every confidence that we will continue to exercise the goodwill toward one another and the moderation which have done so much to make this Nation great. And while the TV westerns will continue to awaken a warm and an understandable nostalgia for the simpler days of 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 for a responsible, useful and satisfying life than to help them to understand what the Nation and world today are really like and to emphasize to them the place of compromise, mutual accommodation and tolerance in making both run in freedom.

DIXIE PROJECT, UTAH

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 552, S. 26.

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

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 26) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Dixie project, Utah, and for other purposes.

The 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 diversion of the waters of Crystal Creek into the Kolob Reservoir, and after completion of the Dixie project said waters of Crystal Creek and of the natural watershed of said Kolob Reservoir shall be exported for use of Cedar City and vicinity in accordance with an agreement entered by Cedar City and Iron County, Utah, on the 26th day of August 1953, with Kolob Reservoir and Storage Association, Incorporated, and Washington County, Utah."; on page 4, line 11, after the word "period", to insert "but not to exceed \$3,500,000"; in line 23, after the word "project", to strike out "in a manner consistent with the other project purposes" and insert "but these undertakings shall be coordinated with the other project purposes"; on page 5, after line 12, to strike out:

(b) The Secretary may make such reasonable provision in connection with the Dixie project as, upon further study in accordance with section 2 of the Fish and

Wildlife Coordination Act (48 Stat. 401, as amended; 16 U.S.C. 661, 662), he finds to be required for the conservation and development of fish and wildlife. An appropriate portion of the cost of the development shall be allocated as provided in said Act and it, together with the Federal operation and maintenance costs allocated to this function, shall be nonreimbursable and nonreturnable under the reclamation laws.

In line 23, after "Sec. 7.", to insert "(a)"; and on page 6, after line 3, to insert:

(b) In the operation and maintenance of all facilities under the jurisdiction and supervision of the Secretary of the Interior authorized by this Act, the Secretary of the Interior is directed to comply with the applicable provisions of the Colorado River compact, the Upper Colorado River Basin compact, the Boulder Canyon Project Act, the Boulder Canyon Project Adjustment Act, the Colorado River Storage Project Act (and any contract lawfully entered into by the United States under any of said Acts), 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 joinder of the United States as a party in such suits, as a defendant or otherwise.

So as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That for the purposes of developing the water resources of the Virgin and Santa Clara Rivers, including the furnishing of municipal and industrial water supplies, the furnishing of an irrigation water supply to approximately twenty-one thousand acres of land, the control of floods, the generation and sale of electric energy, the conservation and development of fish and wildlife resources, and the enhancement of recreation opportunities, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to construct, operate, and maintain the Dixie project, Utah. The project shall consist of the Virgin City Dam and Reservoir, tunnels, canals, siphons, pumping plants, and other works necessary to serve irrigated and irrigable lands along and adjacent to the Virgin River; a dam on the Santa Clara River near Gunlock, Utah, and other works necessary to serve irrigated and irrigable lands along and adjacent to the Santa Clara River and on Ivins Bench; and hydroelectric plants and transmission facilities at the Virgin City Dam and at such other points as are desirable. The Dixie project shall be coordinated with the Cedar City water development program which includes the diversion of the waters of Crystal Creek into the Kolob Reservoir, and after completion of the Dixie project said waters of Crystal Creek and of the natural watershed of said Kolob Reservoir shall be exported for use of Cedar City and vicinity in accordance with an agreement entered by Cedar and Iron County, Utah, on the 26th day of August 1953, with Kolob Reservoir and Storage Association, Incorporated, and Washington County, Utah.

Sec. 2. The project shall include such measures for the disposition of saline waters of La Verkin Springs as are necessary in the opinion of the Secretary to insure the delivery of water at downstream points along the Virgin River for water users in the States of Arizona and Nevada of suitable quality for irrigation, or provision shall be made to indemnify such water users for any impairment of water quality for irrigation pur-

poses directly attributable to Dixie project operations.

Sec. 3. In constructing, operating, and maintaining the works authorized by this Act, the Secretary shall be governed by the Federal reclamation laws (Act of June 17, 1902, 32 Stat. 388, and Acts amendatory thereof or supplementary thereto), except as is otherwise provided in this Act.

Sec. 4. Construction of the project shall not be commenced until there shall be established a conservancy district or similar organization with such powers as may be required by the Secretary, these to include powers to tax both real and personal property within the boundary of the district and to enter into contracts with the United States for the repayment of reimbursable costs.

Sec. 5. The interest rate to be used for purposes of computing interest during construction and interest on the unpaid balance of those portions of the reimbursable costs which are properly allocable to commercial power development and municipal and industrial water supply shall be determined by the Secretary of the Treasury, as of the beginning of the fiscal year in which this bill is enacted, on the basis of the computed average interest rate payable by the Treasury upon its outstanding marketable public obligations, which are neither due nor callable for redemption for fifteen years from date of issue. If the interest rate so computed is not a multiple of one-eighth of 1 per centum, the rate of interest to be used for these purposes shall be the multiple of one-eighth of 1 per centum next lower than the rate so computed. The portions of the costs which are allocable to commercial power development and to municipal and industrial water supply shall be repaid over a period of fifty years with interest at the rate determined in accordance with this section. The portion of the costs which is properly allocable to irrigation and which is beyond the water users' ability to repay in fifty years plus a ten-year development period but not to exceed \$3,500,000 shall be returned to the reclamation fund within such period from revenues derived by the Secretary of the Interior from the disposition of power marketed from Federal projects in the Lower Colorado River Basin.

Sec. 6. (a) The Secretary of the Interior is authorized as a part of the Dixie project to construct, operate, and maintain public recreation facilities including access roads, to acquire or to withdraw from entry or other disposition under the public land laws such adjacent lands or interests therein as are necessary for present and future public recreation use, and to provide for public use and enjoyment of the same and of the water areas of the project but these undertakings shall be coordinated with the other project purposes. The Secretary is authorized to enter into agreements with State or local public agencies or other public entities for the operation, maintenance, or additional development of project lands or facilities or to dispose of project lands or facilities to State or local agencies or other public entities by lease, transfer, exchange or conveyance, upon such terms and conditions as will best promote their development and operation in the public interest for recreation purposes. The costs of the undertakings described in this section, including costs of investigation, planning, operation, and maintenance and an appropriate share of the joint costs of the Dixie project, shall be nonreimbursable.

Sec. 7. (a) The use of all water diverted for this project from the Colorado River system shall be subject to and controlled by the Colorado River compact, the Boulder Canyon Project Act (45 Stat. 1057; 43 U.S.C. 617t) and the Mexican Water Treaty (Treaty Series 994) (59 Stat. 1219).

(b) In the operation and maintenance of all facilities under the jurisdiction and supervision of the Secretary of the Interior authorized by this Act, the Secretary of the Interior is directed to comply with the applicable provisions of the Colorado River compact, the Upper Colorado River Basin compact, the Boulder Canyon Project Act, the Boulder Canyon Project Adjustment Act, the Colorado River Storage Project Act (and any contract lawfully entered into by the United States under any of said Acts), 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 joinder of the United States as a party in such suits, as a defendant or 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 one. The 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. Multiple-purpose 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 recreation areas. Its total cost will be about \$45 million—most of which will be paid back to the Government, with interest—and it has been calculated that the benefits from the project will exceed the costs 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—better perhaps than most because of its excellent benefits to cost ratio—but important mainly because its enactment will represent another transaction in 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 resourceful pioneers the West has ever known. Their forebears went into the southern Utah wilderness at the direction of Brigham Young, and under the most heart-breaking circumstances developed a half-dozen self-sufficient communities. Their story has become a legend celebrated in stories and verse.

The Dixie Cotton Mission, as it was called, was established in the winter of 1854. The first settlement was on the banks of the Santa Clara, one of the streams which the Dixie project will now harness, and settlements then spread to the Virgin River, the larger of the two streams involved. By cooperative effort the pioneers built diversion structures on the two rivers, and irrigated the lush green river bottoms to grow cotton, figs, sugarcane, tobacco, and other tropical agricultural products. They even experimented in the cultivation of silkworms so they could make silk as well as cotton cloth.

Their accomplishments were won against the greatest of odds. Again and again the diversion structures built with such sweat and toil on the Santa Clara and the Virgin were washed out, and again and again the carefully tilled farmlands were strewn with mud and boulders. Lesser souls would have been daunted, but the hardy people of this southwestern area of Utah stayed on to rebuild and build again. They suffered greatly from food shortages, sickness, disease, and other setbacks. After decades of effort, permanent diversion dams were finally constructed, and the silt laden waters of the two rivers brought under some restraint, but never over the whole long century since the Cotton Mission was founded have the waters of the Santa Clara and the Virgin Rivers been put to full and beneficial use.

That is what my bill before us here today would do. It would—at long last—make it possible for this arid and colorful area to realize its full potential. The project has been needed for a hundred years, has been a dream for over 50, and an objective actively and fervently sought for 25.

Hearings were held on it in St. George, and again in Washington, D.C. It was almost unanimously supported—by officials of the State of Utah, and by businessmen and farmers and citizens, and even schoolchildren of the area. And it came out of the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee by unanimous vote.

The area the Dixie project will serve is a delightful garden spot. It has spectacular semidesert scenery, a mild winter climate, and the proximity of Zion National Park and other scenic wonders to make it a growing tourist center. The water from the project will place both its farms and towns on a firmer foundation. Let me hasten to interpose here, in case some of my colleagues from the South might be concerned lest Utah's Dixie should try to compete with the Southland's Dixie in cotton cultivation, that there is no danger. Utah's Dixie gave up cotton cultivation shortly after the Civil War, and is now concerned with fruitgrowing, cattle feeding, and turkey raising and processing—to name a few of the most important agricultural pursuits. In fact, St. George is the center of one of the largest turkey operations in the country.

I feel I can say without reservation that the problems which have held up consideration of the Dixie project for so many years have now all been suc-

cessfully solved. The Virgin River is a tributary to the Colorado River, its small flow entering at Lake Mead, above the Hoover Dam. It is therefore a part of the Lower Colorado River Basin, as defined in the Colorado River compact. My bill provides that the use of all water diverted for the Dixie project from the Colorado River system shall be subject to and controlled by the Colorado River compact, the Boulder Canyon project and the Mexican Water Treaty.

The amount of water actually contributed to the Colorado by the Virgin and its tributary, the Santa Clara, is less than 1 percent of the flow of the mighty Colorado, so we are actually talking about an infinitesimal amount of water. But the terms of the water treaties in effect are being adhered to, and there is no problem in this respect.

The bill provides that the portion of the costs which is properly allocable to irrigation and beyond the ability of the water users to pay in 50 years, plus a 10-year development period, shall be returned to the reclamation fund by revenues derived from the disposition of power in the Federal projects in the lower basin. A committee amendment limited the amount that can be used to \$3½ million; the Bureau of Reclamation indicated that only about \$3,230,000 will be needed.

Funds are included in the project cost to work out a small saline water problem, and agreements have been reached with the State of Utah on the road problems.

Even the shadow cast over the project by the long controversy between California and Arizona over the division of the waters of the Colorado River has been completely lifted by the refusal last week of the U.S. Supreme Court to review its earlier decision. Of course, as I have pointed out, the Dixie project never would have any substantial effect on the amount of water available for division between these two lower basin States—the less than 1 percent the Virgin contributes to the Colorado River's flow is too small to be any real point of controversy. But could anyone have ever wanted to raise this question to hold up Dixie, the time has now passed.

Mr. President, enactment of S. 26 will mean the rehabilitation and rebirth of Utah's Dixie. The project it will authorize will have a great impact on both the economy and spirits of the people of this remarkable section of Utah. I trust it will pass the Senate today without further delay.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, it gives me great pleasure to stand before the Senate today to voice my complete and enthusiastic support of the Dixie project bill, S. 26; and in so doing I also would like to inform this body of the unqualified support of virtually the entire State of Utah.

Today marks another important milestone in the fulfillment of a 100-year-old dream of the residents of Utah's so-called Dixie in the southwestern portion of our State. The story of the Dixie Cotton Mission is one of the most fascinating in all the history of Utah. The State's earliest leader, Brigham Young, decided to colonize that portion of the State and