

CLERK: 25 ayes, 0 nays to cease debate, Mr. President.

PRESIDENT: The motion carries and the debate has ceased. There is time yet to close. Senator Landis, do you want to close or designate someone to close? Senator DeCamp.

SENATOR DeCAMP: Mr. President, there is a lot of emotion on both sides of this issue but I think a couple of things have come out of the Nebraska experience, if I could phrase it that way. I have been told by any number of individuals on both sides, the General who was former head of Air Force Intelligence representing the one point of view against the freeze resolution, Ambassador Colby on the other side, both made an absolute point to say this was the most informative hearing ever held on the subject that they have participated in and the first one that truly involved the public in learning both sides of the issue. So whether you intend to vote for or against the resolution, maybe the most important and significant thing is for the first time we all got involved in asking what it all means, this nuclear threat, what our involvement should be for the future and all these things for the first time have been put on the level of the citizen involvement. I made a statement at the hearing. I said, maybe, and I wasn't intending to offend anybody, I said, maybe war now is too important to be left in the hands of generals. When a war that would occur, a nuclear war today, would by everybody's admission eliminate this country and Russia, then maybe that is the point at which war is too important to be left, and our fate, in the hands of others and we, at least, should become involved ourselves and that is what has happened. So as I say, whether you are for or against this particular resolution, at least for the first time and for the first time in this country in a public political forum, both sides have been thoroughly aired and I think a lot has been learned. Now there is one thing I want to clear up. I do not intend and I don't think any individual who might vote for this, I do not intend to affront the President of these United States or the negotiating process that is going on now in any way or to jeopardize or interfere with it. And with the Marsh amendment, I think the Marsh amendment is important for you to think about. With the Marsh amendment the resolution is significantly different. It doesn't talk about the words "immediate". It basically gets down to a statement that says, hey, Mr. President and anybody else who is involved, we really are concerned and if it is possible, if it's possible and we believe it is, then we would like you to get her negotiated, to stop building the new weapons, and that doesn't mean we get weak, it means we, within the existing technology, build as much strength as possible rather than putting billions