

Senate

WEDNESDAY, AUGUST 31, 1966

The Senate met at 10:30 o'clock a.m., and was called to order by Hon. MAURINE B. NEUBERGER, a Senator from the State of Oregon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D., offered the following prayer:

O God, our Father: For this sacramental moment, closing the doors to a noisy world full of terror and alarm, we enter this pavilion of quietness and peace, to acknowledge our utter dependence upon Thee—Thou who hast made us in Thy image and for Thyself.

Forgive us for smug satisfaction with ourselves and for our cynical contempt of others. Purge our minds of prejudices out of which we make walls separating us from our fellow man. Cleanse our hearts of the uncleanness which blinds our eyes to the splendor of spiritual virtues—for we know that it is only the pure in heart who can see Thee.

So may we be more worthy to belong to the one great family of Thy children and to take our place at the common table of humanity where the bread of fellowship is broken and the wine of sacrifice is shared.

And Thine shall be the kingdom, and the power, and the glory. Amen.

DESIGNATION OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, D.C., August 31, 1966.

To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate, I appoint Hon. MAURINE B. NEUBERGER, a Senator from the State of Oregon, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

CARL HAYDEN,
President pro tempore.

Mrs. NEUBERGER thereupon took the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, August 30, 1966, was dispensed with.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the following subcommittees were authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today:

The Subcommittee on Executive Reorganization of the Committee on Government Operations.

The Subcommittee on Small Business of the Committee on Banking and Currency.

On request of Mr. YOUNG of Ohio, the Joint Committee on the Reorganization of Congress was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

On request of Mr. LAUSCHE, and by unanimous consent, the Committee on Foreign Relations was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

LIMITATION ON STATEMENTS DURING THE TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, statements during the transaction of routine morning business were ordered limited to 3 minutes.

INVESTIGATION BY THE PREPAREDNESS SUBCOMMITTEE OF OUR WORLDWIDE MILITARY COMMITMENTS

Mr. SYMINGTON, Madam President, last week the Preparedness Investigating Subcommittee, under the able chairmanship of the distinguished Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS], commenced its hearing into our worldwide military commitments and our ability to respond to them. The Honorable Dean Rusk, Secretary of State, was the leadoff witness.

To the Preparedness Subcommittee this is an extremely important and significant inquiry. It represents a careful and determined effort by the legislative branch of the Government to review and measure all of our formal and informal defense commitments and assurances so as to ascertain the degree, if any, that we are overcommitted and overextended all over the world, in the light of our present and potential resources.

Inherent in this problem is the question of whether our free world allies, whose stake in the cause of freedom is as great as ours, are bearing their fair share of the common burden.

Let me commend the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, Senator STENNIS, for his wisdom and sound judgment in undertaking this timely and important inquiry. It is one which will go far in providing the Congress and the public with those facts which are essential to informed and intelligent judgment about a matter that involves in vital fashion the security of the United States.

In this connection, Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to insert at this point an article by the able newspaperman, Marshall McNeil, "STENNIS Unit To Probe Military Commitments"; an article in the New York Times by the able and respected Arthur Krock, "Issue of

U.S. Global Overcommitment"; an editorial from the Columbia, S.C., Record "Where Do We Stand?"; an editorial in the Winston-Salem Journal "Senator STENNIS Warning"; and an editorial in the Chicago Tribune entitled "Stretched Thin."

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

[From the Washington (D.C.) Daily News, Aug. 24, 1966]

STENNIS UNIT TO PROBE MILITARY COMMITMENTS

(By Marshall McNeil)

The Senate investigation that starts tomorrow into the extent of our world-wide military commitments, and our ability to respond to them, could have a major impact on future Pentagon plans and budgets.

The inquiry will be conducted by the Preparedness Investigating Subcommittee headed by Sen. JOHN STENNIS (D., Miss.).

This will be no spur-of-the-moment hearing. The Subcommittee staff—the same group President Johnson headed when he was a senator—started preparing for it last April.

RUSK

Secretary of State Dean Rusk, who last February told the Foreign Relations Committee that we have formal commitments with more than 40 countries to assist them militarily if they are the victims of aggression, will be the first witness.

"These extensive commitments," Sen. STENNIS said, "make it imperative that we take a new and sober look at them and make a hard and realistic appraisal of what level of military effort and response would be required by us if two, three or more contingencies or outbreaks should occur simultaneously."

He said the U.S. could not supply and maintain all the conventional military forces that would be required to meet all our world-wide military commitments at the same time.

"Nevertheless," he said, "(we) need an over-all assessment of the extent of our military commitments to enable us to reach a decision as to what level of strength (of our military forces) should be provided within our resources."

When that level of strength is determined and fixed by Congress, Sen. STENNIS said, "it should be supported in all aspects as quickly as possible."

A major significance of the investigation is that these other military commitments exist while we are fighting a war in Viet Nam which soon may require more than 400,000 U.S. servicemen.

MANY YEARS

Sen. STENNIS often has said the war in Viet Nam would last many years, and that even after we win it, the U.S. would be required to keep some of its military there—just as we have in Korea.

As do most senators, Sen. STENNIS believes the costs of the Viet Nam war will continue to spiral, and he expects the Pentagon will ask for another supplemental appropriation, possibly as much as \$10 billion, by early next year.

Sen. STENNIS said Mr. Rusk will be expected to give a broad view of our commitments and

August 31, 1966

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

20551

education and including certain travel; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 17462. A bill to amend the Internal Security Act of 1950; to the Committee on Un-American Activities.

By Mr. HAGEN of California:

H.R. 17463. A bill to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act, as reenacted and amended by the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. OLSON of Minnesota:

H.R. 17464. A bill to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act, as reenacted and amended by the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. POWELL:

H.R. 17465. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to authorize the deduction from gross income by teachers of the expenses undertaken by them in pursuing courses for academic credit and degrees at institutions of higher education, including certain travel; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RONCALIO:

H.R. 17466. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow teachers to deduct from gross income the expenses incurred in pursuing courses for academic credit and degrees at institutions of higher education and including certain travel; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ST GERMAIN:

H.J. Res. 1291. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts:

H. Con. Res. 996. Concurrent resolution to urge negotiation under the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, article 28, for relief of tariff on machines used in making pulp, paper, and paperboard; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FINO:

H. Res. 994. Resolution to express the sense of the House that the Federal Aviation Agency shall prohibit such aircraft landings as may be found dangerous to the health and safety of residents of surrounding neighborhoods; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. KORNEGAY:

H. Res. 995. Resolution to create a permanent Select Committee on Standards and Conduct; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. PEPPER:

H. Res. 996. Resolution to create a permanent Select Committee on Standards and Conduct; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. FASCELL:

H. Res. 997. Resolution to create a permanent Select Committee on Standards and Conduct; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. MILLER:

H. Res. 998. Resolution providing for the consideration of the bill S. 774, to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to make a study to determine the advantages and disadvantages of increased use of the metric system in the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. RONCALIO:

H. Res. 999. Resolution to include drum and bugle corps under the Mutual Educational and Cultural Exchange Act of 1961 and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ADDABBO:

H.R. 17467. A bill for the relief of Francesco Fildilio; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CONTE:

H.R. 17468. A bill for the relief of Guiseppe Michienzi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DELANEY:

H.R. 17469. A bill for the relief of Alvaro Carlos Carreras; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DUNCAN of Oregon:

H.R. 17470. A bill for the relief of Veselin Vucinic; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GIAIMO:

H.R. 17471. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Taeko (Natale Anthony) Lauritano; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 17472. A bill for the relief of Sp5c. Joseph H. Barkley; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 17473. A bill for the relief of Khalil Elias Barchini; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCHMIDHAUSER:

H.R. 17474. A bill for the relief of Sung-Won-Ko; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STALBAUM:

H.R. 17475. A bill for the relief of Hermine Grigorian, nee Minassian; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON:

H.R. 17476. A bill for the relief of Miss Corazon Chu Cea; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

August 31, 1966

20553

to "address himself specifically to NATO and its status and problems."

Subsequently, the chairman added Mr. Rusk will be recalled to testify in a secret session of the Sub-Committee.

The Senator hopes to hold more public hearings, but he warned that because of "security considerations" most of the testimony would have to be taken in executive session.

[From the New York Times, Aug. 28, 1966]
IN THE NATION: ISSUE OF U.S. GLOBAL OVER-COMMITMENT

(By Arthur Krock)

WASHINGTON, August 27.—The purpose of a current Senate subcommittee inquiry is to measure against the Administration's policy of going to the aid of all peoples under the threat or presence of external aggression, its capacity to do this and simultaneously care for the economic and military defense requirements of the United States. And it was evident during the questioning of the first witness, Secretary of State Rusk, that no subcommittee member was satisfied with his answers.

Nor was this dissatisfaction allayed by the staged news conference, after a Cabinet meeting later that day, in which Secretary of Defense McNamara let loose a torrent of statistics designed to show that United States military capability is sufficient to meet any foreseeable strain in carrying out the Administration's global anti-aggression policy.

The questions of the Senate group implied no doubt that this country has the military and economic strength to wage the war in Vietnam without sacrificing any essential requirement of national defense. And there was no suggestion of dissent from what appears to be the position of the large majority of the American people—that the Government is involved in the war in Vietnam to the degree that either withdrawing our forces entirely, or confining them to defensible enclaves, is wholly out of the question.

SENATORS DISTURBED BY RUSK

But Rusk's interpretation of the anti-aggression commitment as a global obligation from which the use of American armed forces anywhere was not excluded, even in "the absence of a defense treaty, Congressional declaration or United States military presence," clearly disturbed the subcommittee. Also, though the Secretary made a passing reference to Congress as a participating partner with the President in determining whether to use force in each instance of external aggression that might arise elsewhere and carefully qualified "force" with the adjective "collective," committeemen were not impressed, for reasons clear in the record of the wars in Korea and Vietnam. Among these are the following:

(1) President Truman engaged the armed forces of the United States in Korea without seeking the constitutional association of Congress. He based his authority on the commitment assumed by the United States as a signatory of the United Nations Charter, before the U.N., by resolution and at the President's request, imposed the same commitment on its other members. But, though this made the war officially a U.N. "police action," its other members contributed only 5 per cent to the cost and military manpower of the war.

(2) President Kennedy expanded United States involvement in South Vietnam from the handful of military advisers dispatched by President Eisenhower to a strong American military presence in the country. He did this without Congressional affirmation on the basis of actions by Presidents Eisenhower and Truman, which Congress had either directly or indirectly endorsed in going to the aid of nations threatened by Communist aggression.

(3) President Johnson inherited what, once it had been ordered by his predecessor, became a direct and evermounting military involvement of the United States in Vietnam. Mr. Johnson initially did not rely on the SEATO treaty as the source of his authority for whatever expansion of our combat force he would deem necessary. That was a later invention of the Department of State. Mr. Johnson found Congressional authority, for any military decisions he might make, in a resolution passed after an attack by small war-vessels of North Vietnam on two United States destroyers in the Gulf of Tonkin.

SUPPORT SOUGHT IN TREATY

It was only when review of the assurances given by Administration spokesmen in the Senate debate showed the resolution had been approved on a much more limited understanding of its scope that the State Department fell back on the SEATO treaty as a blank-check commitment.

But other signatories of the compact have in part accounted for their failure to provide any assistance—military or economic—to the United States in Vietnam by pointing out that there is no such commitment in SEATO, a fact confirmed by the text.

On the basis of this record, it was to be expected that the Senate subcommittee's concern over the nation's global commitments would not be removed by Rusk's ceremonial references to the role of Congress, or by his implication that a *sine qua non* of the use of United States armed force in redeeming these commitments was that it be a "collective" (allied) undertaking.

The Secretary's exposition of the policy under examination by the subcommittee was actually a literal, militant interpretation of the Truman Doctrine far beyond that made in practice by its author. Though Mr. Truman described the Doctrine as stating an unqualified obligation by the United States to go to the aid of "any peoples threatened by external aggression or internal subversion," he invoked it on the limited basis of economic and technical assistance until the attack on South Korea from the Communist North. And even then he gave the United States military intervention the semblance (as it proved) of "collective" action by enveloping it with the Charter and the flag of the U.N.

U.N. IMPOSED RESTRAINTS

In the final analysis this tactic of President Truman provided the U.N. with the authority to impose the restraints on the U.S. armed forces that prevented this nation for the first time in its history to carry a war to a conclusion. And important sources of the restraint were our allies in the Security Council, despite their small contribution in Korea.

In view of this background, of the 40 military commitments of the United States abroad and of the hollow ring which experience has given to the word "collective," the subcommittee merely indicated a wide public uneasiness about the Administration's global anti-aggression concept. Particularly since its choice of a testing-ground has proved so fallible that, as Chairman STENNIS remarked: "A relatively small and undeveloped country such as North Vietnam has been able to tie us down."

[From the Columbia (S.C.) Record,
Aug. 28, 1966]

WHERE DO WE STAND?

The question of how well the United States is prepared for war which would be superimposed upon that in which we are already engaged in Southeast Asia is indeed a vital one, and one which has been forcefully raised in the Senate Preparedness Investigating Subcommittee.

Perhaps the nuclear power of our country and of Russia is a sufficient deterrent to general war, and perhaps for other reasons

no such war is in prospect. And perhaps no more smaller conflicts are in the cards. The people of America so hope.

But it is right that Congress propound the question to the State and Defense Departments, as Senator STENNIS, chairman of the subcommittee, has done. It is the kind of watchfulness for which this committee was created.

There was a response from the Administration so immediate as to suggest a feeling of urgency on the part of the White House. Secretary McNamara sought to show that despite the extent of our current commitments around the globe we are fully able to meet them.

But the basis of Senator STENNIS' question remained unanswered. He has said his committee wanted to know "whether or not we are, or may be, over-extended either now or in the future." He had posed the question of what would be our capacity if two or three other Viet Nams should develop. What, especially, would be our resource in manpower?

It would be comforting to conclude that the only task before us is that of prevailing in Viet Nam, but the subcommittee properly asks if we are sufficiently secure in Europe and what are the "realistic assessments" of the future with respect to our whole current obligation and possible additional demands.

These are indeed hard and searching questions, including difficult looks ahead, but lest there be a slumbering along the line and an over-emphasis of the goal in Southeast Asia, they should be asked recurrently and firmly.

[From the Winston-Salem (N.C.) Journal,
Aug. 27, 1966]

SENATOR STENNIS' WARNING

Of all the anxieties that the war in Viet Nam has generated, none is more persistent or more critical than that raised again this week by Senator JOHN STENNIS of Mississippi: Has the war distorted our commitment and left us in a weakened condition elsewhere?

Secretary Rusk insisted that the war has had no such effect. And Secretary McNamara made what was the only reasonable comment a Secretary of Defense could make in a public hearing. "We are," he said, "better prepared today to fulfill our worldwide commitments than at any time in recent years."

But Senator STENNIS' question is serious, and it cannot be laid to rest, as he said by "rosy generalizations." As he said, "the hard fact is that a relatively small and undeveloped country such as North Viet Nam has been able to tie us down and require a very substantial commitment of our military manpower and resources over many months." It is no more than realism to insist that this danger exists and that we ought to be concerned, as Senator STENNIS is, about it.

The news of the day is not reassuring either. The American contingent in Viet Nam has now risen to more than 300,000 men. Congress has closed the door on a selective tapping of the manpower pool that the Reserves provide. Draftees are finding their way to Viet Nam in very short order these days. The dollar cost of the war is rising and is having a distressing effect on the nation's economy.

The defense of South Viet Nam and the attempt to stabilize Southeast Asia have seemed to us logical and reasonable and honorable things for the United States to undertake. And certainly our intervention has denied the Communists almost sure success in Viet Nam.

The war, however, must be kept in some overall perspective. If the American commitment does rise, as many people have predicted it will, to 600,000 or 750,000 men, what will happen to our national commitments

elsewhere then? Are there enough men to supply the needs? Is the Administration facing up to the tough political decisions that would keep our military strength at adequate levels? And most fundamentally, is it really in the national interest to expand the war to such dimensions and to devote so large a share of our resources to this war?

Such questions have emerged at each stage of the war, as it increased in intensity, but they will become more acute now. The strain of the war on the national economy is becoming heavier now. And it is easy to see that the strain on our capacity to meet our responsibilities elsewhere is growing commensurately.

Senator STENNIS has been an accurate prophet thus far of the costs and risks of this war. His warning now deserves a more specific and more convincing answer from the national administration.

[From the Chicago (Ill.) Tribune, Aug. 26, 1966]

STRETCHED THIN

The Senate preparedness subcommittee yesterday provided the useful reminder to the American people that our global commitments, pledging us to the defense of more than 40 countries, have stretched our military strength very thin. Sen. STENNIS, the chairman, said the hearings were intended to explore "whether or not we may be overextended either now or in the future."

Secretary of State Rusk, the lead-off witness, said, yes, we are committed by treaty to more than 40 countries on five continents, but that we weren't posing as the "world's policeman" and that we weren't seeking to impose a "pax Americana" on the globe.

"These commitments," he said, "do not increase the likelihood that we will have to fight. Rather, by making clear in advance our estimation of the requirements of national security, they reduce that likelihood."

He added that no prospective troublemaker should jump to the conclusion that in the absence of a defense treaty or other commitment the United States would not necessarily come to the defense of a country which had come under attack. On that basis, we apparently have taken every non-communist country in the world under our wing; yet Mr. Rusk says we aren't to be considered a global policeman.

Sen. STENNIS did not sound persuaded. He pointed out that a relatively small and undeveloped country such as North Viet Nam has been able to tie us down and require a very substantial commitment of our military manpower and resources over many months.

With so many military commitments, he said, the United States could not afford to become overly preoccupied with one area of the world. The question in his mind, he said, was how we could expect to respond if brush fire wars broke out at a number of places at once. That, as we mention elsewhere on this page, is the strategy outlined by Red China's defense minister, Lin Piao, who sees the United States nibbled to death in "people's wars."

We do not expect that the Senate committee can arrive at a definitive answer to its questions. The fact, however, is that the United States has entered so many defense treaties that probably few citizens can keep track of them. There are NATO, SEATO, CENTO, ANZUS, and the Rio pact with 19 Latin American countries. There are separate arrangements with countries ranging from Nationalist China, Japan, and Korea to Liberia.

All of these commitments have been assumed without consideration of the factor of equality of risk and sacrifice. How many of these so-called allies could give us real help in a showdown? Most of them refuse to respect our trade embargo on communist

Cuba. A large number of them trade with our enemy, communist North Viet Nam. Some of them sell wheat to communist China, or arrange to build steel mills for the Red Chinese. In Korea, for what in theory was a United Nations war, the United States provided about 95 percent of the fighting power, aside from the troops of South Korea, and it also paid almost all of the cost. In Viet Nam, with the exception of some Koreans and Australians, we fight alone.

The questions voiced by the Stennis committee are very real ones. We are stretched very thin.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Madam President, as a member of the subcommittee from this side of the aisle, I want to join the Senator from Missouri. I believe the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS] has endeavored to have the committee really understand and be advised of the preparedness conditions of our military strength throughout the world. Certainly, discussion of our overall commitments will be very helpful to every Member of the Senate.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I thank the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts for his approval. He is the ranking Republican member of the subcommittee in question.

DEATH OF ANDREW EDMISTON, FORMER MEMBER OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES FROM WEST VIRGINIA—LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. RANDOLPH. Madam President, the Honorable Andrew Edmiston, former Member of the House of Representatives from West Virginia, has died at his home in Weston in our State of West Virginia. My wife joins me in expressing condolences to his widow, Beth, and his daughter, Ann.

He had a very distinguished record of service for the people of the congressional district which he represented for four terms and also for the citizenry of the country he loved.

Andrew Edmiston was the manager of my campaign when I ran in my first primary for office in the Senate, in 1958.

I ask unanimous consent that I be granted leave of absence for this afternoon to attend funeral services in West Virginia for my cherished friend.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that I may be recognized for 10 minutes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

REDUCTION OF U.S. FORCES IN WESTERN EUROPE

Mr. MANSFIELD. Madam President, I have a resolution at the desk, which I ask to have read.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be read by the clerk.

The legislative clerk read the resolution (S. Res. 300), as follows:

Whereas the foreign policy and military strength of the United States are dedicated to the protection of our national security, the preservation of the liberties of the American people, and the maintenance of world peace; and

Whereas the United States in implementing these principles has maintained large contingents of American Armed Forces in Europe, together with air and naval units for twenty years; and

Whereas the security of the United States and its citizens remains interwoven with the security of other nations signatory to the North Atlantic Treaty as it was when the treaty was signed but the condition of our European allies, both economically and militarily, have appreciably improved since large contingents of forces were deployed; and

Whereas the means and capacity of all members of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization to provide forces to resist aggression has significantly improved since the original United States deployment; and

Whereas the commitment by all members of the North Atlantic Treaty is based upon the full cooperation of all treaty partners in contributing materials and men on a fair and equitable basis but such contributions have not been forthcoming from all other members of the organization; and

Whereas relations between Eastern Europe and Western Europe were tense when the large contingents of U.S. forces were deployed in Europe but this situation has now undergone substantial change and relations between the two parts of Europe are now characterized by an increasing two-way flow of trade, people and other peaceful exchange; and

Whereas the present policy of maintaining large contingents of U.S. forces and their dependents on the European continent also contributes further to the fiscal and monetary problems of the United States: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate, That—

1. It is the sense of the Senate that, with changes and improvements in the techniques of modern warfare and because of the vast increase in capacity of the United States to wage war and to move military forces and equipment by air, a substantial reduction of U.S. forces permanently stationed in Europe can be made without adversely affecting either our resolve or ability to meet our commitment under the North Atlantic Treaty;

2. Senate Resolution 99, adopted in the Senate April 4, 1951, is amended to contain the provisions of this resolution and, where the resolution may conflict, the present resolution is controlling as to the sense of the Senate.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Madam President, the resolution just read is cosponsored by the entire membership of the majority policy committee—Senators LONG of Louisiana, SMATHERS, HILL, RICHARD RUSSELL, HAYDEN, MAGNUSON, PASTORE, SYMINGTON, MUSKIE, HART, BREWSTER, and INOUYE. It is intended to express to the President the sentiment of the Senate that there be a substantial reduction in the U.S. forces stationed in Western Europe. The Senate will recall that recent unofficial counts put these forces somewhere between 400,000 and 450,000 and, together with dependents, the total is between 900,000 and 1 million Americans—military personnel and families—stationed and supported in Europe.

The Senate should be cognizant of the circumstances which have led to the introduction of the proposed resolution. Consideration of the question began in a wholly spontaneous fashion at the July