

I tried to get all the information I could on this particular subject, including talking to a number of military people. Strangely enough, active military people are very cautious about talking about anything that sounds like a nuclear freeze. Retired military people are a different story entirely. Retired military people, generally speaking, are more than willing to support and talk about the craziness of the arms race and the fact that we had ought to talk about bilateral nuclear freezes and that tells me something. It tells me something that if once they are out of the system, once they do not need to be worried about what might happen to them within the system...

SPEAKER NICHOL: One minute.

SENATOR VICKERS: ...then they can speak their mind, they can say what they really believe. I am not intimidated at all by the World Herald or anybody else telling me that since I am not in the Congress that I ought not to be talking about this issue. I think we had all ought to be talking about it. I think we had ought to be thinking about it because I can assure you the generation coming up are thinking about it and they are depending on us to start making some logical, clear decisions. Thank you, Mr. President.

SPEAKER NICHOL: Senator Lamb, please.

SENATOR LAMB: Mr. President and members, I think we are all concerned about the same thing. We are all concerned about nuclear weapons, all kinds of warfare. But I guess the thing that concerns me about this resolution is that it does not take into consideration the fact that some people who may be our opponents are probably way ahead of us at this point. And so to freeze the situation at a disadvantageous point in time seems to me that it may be counterproductive to the security of the nation. So I do have an amendment...I don't know when we are going to start on amendments, but I am having circulated an amendment which would possibly be a compromise that would indicate our concern about nuclear weapons yet not put ourselves on the line as to exactly what should be done. It'd support the Geneva Conference but strike some of the language which refers to the testing and production and further deployment, because I am not sure in my own mind whether we should do that because there are people who are much more