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radioactive. While it may be theoretically possible to demonstrate the risks inherent in any treaty, and such risks in this treaty are small, the far greater risks to our security are the risks of uncontrolled testing, the risk of a nuclear arms race, the risk of new nuclear powers, nuclear pollution, and nuclear war.

NATIONAL DEBATE

This limited test-ban, in our most careful judgment, is safer by far for the United States than an unlimited nuclear arms race. For all these reasons, I am hopeful that this Nation will promptly approve the limited test-ban treaty. There will, of course, be debate in the country and in the Senate. The Constitution wisely requires the advice and consent of the Senate to all treaties, and the Constitution has a duty to be considered. All this is as it should be. A document which may mark a historical and constructive opportunity for the world deserves a historic and constructive debate. It is my hope that all of you will take part in that debate, for this treaty is for all of us. It is particularly for our children and their grandchildren, and they have no lobby here in Washington. The debate will involve military, scientific, and political experts, but it must be not left to them alone. The right and the responsibility are yours.

If we are to open new doorways to peace, if we are to seize this rare opportunity for progress, if we are to be as bold and far-sighted in our control of weapons as we have been in their Invention, then let us now show all the world on this side of the wall and the other that a strong America also stands for peace. There is no cause for complacency.

We have learned in times past that the spirit of one moment or place can be gone in the next. We have been disappointed many times once and we have no illusions now that there are short-cuts on the road to peace. At many points around the globe the Communists are continuing their efforts to exploit weakness and poverty. Their concentration of nuclear and conventional arms must still be deterred.

BADGES REMAIN

The familiar contest between choice and coercion, the familiar places of danger and conflict are still there, in Cuba, in southern Asia, in Berlin, and all around the globe, still requiring all the strength and the vigilance that we can muster. Nothing could more greatly damage our cause than if we and our allies were to believe that peace has already been achieved, and that our strength and unity were no longer required. But now for the first time in many years the path of peace may be open. No one can be certain what care will bring. No one can say with certainty what has come for an easing of the struggle. But history and our own conscience will judge us harsher if we do not now make every effort to test our hopes by action, and this is the place to begin. According to the ancient Chinese proverb, "A journey of a thousand miles must begin with a single step."

My fellow Americans, let us take that first step. Let us, if we can, get back from the shadows of war and seek out the way of peace. And if that journey is 1,000 miles or even more, let history record that we, in this land, at this time, took the first step. Thank you and good night.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, at the present time the Committee on Foreign Relations, the Committee on Armed Services, and the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy are meeting, in informal session, to hear a briefing on the proposed partial test-ban treaty by the Under Secretary of State, the Honorable Averell Harriman, who is accompanied by William Foster. At the meeting the questions are both searching and blunt, judging from what I can gather; and I am sure everyone would agree that the proposed agreement was openly arrived at and could be considered an open agreement.

In response to questions, the distinguished Under Secretary of State, Mr. Harriman, stated that there were no gimmicks or side issues attached to the proposal, which shortly will be before the Senate.

In connection with the proposed partial nuclear-test-ban agreement, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Record a statement issued by me over the weekend, relative to this most important matter.

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

STATEMENT BY SENATOR MANSFIELD

The proposed partial test-ban agreement represents a breakthrough in the cold war in a way it could, if properly observed by both sides, be the first break in the clouds in many years.

It is a tribute to the persistence, bipartisanship and wisdom, first, of President Eisenhower in 1959 and, then, of President Kennedy and of the many Members of the Senate and Congress as, for example, the distinguished Senator from Tennessee [Mr. Gore], the majority whip [Mr. Humphrey], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. Doke] whose resolution in favor of an agreement along the lines which have been reached is cosponsored by 33 other Senators, members of both parties.

These men recognized the need for an end to above-ground testing—on public, on military grounds, if no other—and refused to be discouraged in spite of many setbacks and disappointments. They thought in far-sighted terms and in human terms—of this generation and of children yet to be born—American children, Russian children, indeed, all the world's children.

The agreement would not mean a cutback in defense appropriations but a stabilization rather than an increase of those expenditures. In a sense it is a gamble, but in view of the critical nature of the problem and the fact that we can continue underground testing, it is in my opinion worth the effort. The escape clause protects us in an honorable manner and safeguards rather than weakens our defense. The fact that our chief negotiator was Averell Harriman who has never been taken in by the Soviet Union, ever since he first served as Ambassador to the Soviet Union two decades ago, is an earnest that our rights have been fully protected. The agreement, in my opinion, serves the interests of our country, our people and our security. If this agreement is approved it does not mean that there will be total or unilateral disarmament either soon or in the future. What this new agreement will give us is more clean milk and water and food for our children, less strontium to pollute the air, and some basis for hoping that future generations will grow up as normal, healthy human beings.

This agreement will, in my opinion, serve the people's interest, give us some time to face up to other differences, and allow more "breathing" space to the end that a better kind of peace for mankind can be achieved.

It would be wrong to make too much of this agreement. But, even more, it would be wrong to make to little of it. A step, however, small, in the direction of preserving a world fit for human habitation is an immense stride in the history of human civilization.
The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, and was called to order by the Vice President.

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

'O Thou God of grace and glory, when with each new day Thou dost spread the mantle of light about us as purple morning breaketh, fairer than morning, lovelier than daylight, dark as the sweet consciousness we are with Thee.

We would yield our flickering torch to the flame of Thy redeeming love, facing whatever the day may bring, sustained by a faith that will not shrank, though pressed by every foe.

Strengthens us, we pray, to carry on share of the burden of mankind's climb to the kingdom of Thy desire and to the radiant realm where Thy will shall be done in the Nation and in all the earth. Toward that shining goal our puny mortal strength is unequal to the tests and tasks of the decisive days which are upon us. We dare not trust our own devices and counsels. Because Thy weary feet so often stumble and falter, that is as it should be, for an occasion which involves the constitutional responsibility of the Senate to advise and consent with respect to treaty ratification. The Senators who are going—the distinguished chairman of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy [Mr. Fulbright]; the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. Humphrey], the majority leader, whose name has long been associated with this effort; the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. Pastore], who as chairman of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy has great knowledge of the subject matter of the treaty; the distinguished Senator from Vermont [Mr. Aiken], the senior Republican in this body, wise with a long experience in the Senate and in foreign relations and atomic energy; and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. Saltonstall], ranking Republican of the Armed Services and Appropriations Committees—this group of Senators who are going, Mr. President, is admirably equipped to represent the Senate with dignity and wisdom on this highly significant occasion of worldwide significance.

This bipartisan group, Mr. President, of which I personally am extremely proud of, is keeping with the spirit of bipartisanship which has guided the policy of the United States from the outset on the matter of nuclear testing. In a manner which involves the safety of
Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I appreciate the opportunity to explain to the distinguished majority leader [Mr. MANSFIELD], I need no defense for my conduct. I have always been willing to assume the burden of whatever I say and do. Under the Constitution the Senate has the duty and responsibility to advise and consent to a treaty. That action must be an independent judgment, and that judgment I will render under my oath, according to my conscience, and within the limit of my perception as I can bring it to bear.

I recall that once a President sought assistance in building up support for a League of Nations. Members of my party followed him throughout the country. He returned from that tour a broken and dejected man. It always hurt me to think that happened to a great scholar who was then the President of the United States—Woodrow Wilson.

For myself I try never to embarrass the President of the United States. I shall always bend over backward to make certain that he is not projected into any awkward situation.

This evening I went to the Press Gallery of this body. The question was asked whether I had been invited to go to Moscow. I said that I had not been invited, directly or indirectly, remotely or otherwise, by anyone, anywhere, at any time.

Second, I stated that if I were invited, I would not go. I made that statement publicly on a number of occasions. In so doing, I closed the door for myself and for anyone else who might undertake to invite me. I will never embarrass anyone. I made that abundantly clear. Not the least, of course, of the considerations that entered into that decision is the fact that we are beset with so much work. I did not feel that I could take time off and go to Moscow for that purpose, since the occasion was a ceremony of signing, and no negotiation was involved.

I am deeply grateful to my distinguished friend from Montana for the generous statement that he made on the floor of the Senate. Beyond that, I know of nothing I need say. I have neither encouraged nor discouraged any Member of this body from taking that trip if he were invited to go. Every Senator has equal prerogatives. I do not feel that it is either my responsibility or my prerogative to undertake to tell other Senators of this distinguished body what they should do under those circumstances.

Again I say that I am extremely proud of this country in which all of us have been selected to represent this body and this country at Moscow. I do not believe that under any circumstances a more capacious vision of greater humanity and patriotism, could have been selected.

Mr. President, when any program is imposed upon the American people that lacks popular backing, that lacks a feeling of tension throughout the world, and that has for its purpose the averting of a war throughout the world, even though such a proposal might be in my opinion that is what the proposed test-ban treaty does—I do not think I have any right to say that I am not interested in any effort for peace in the world regardless of whether it promises immediate and early success or not.

Mr. President, as one Member of this body who was asked to go to Moscow I can say that I have not been asked to commit myself in any way. I understand that no Member of the Senate will be asked to sign the treaty. I agree that Congress should examine every line of the document when it is submitted to us for our approval or disapproval. It is proper that we should weigh the benefits of approval against any possible disadvantages or risks which we may run. It is probable that we may have to weigh the advantages against the disadvantages. I do not think that I have heard it said that Congress ought not to be represented at this meeting because Congress did not participate in writing the treaty. I may say that many Members of the Congress were shown the treaty 10 days ago—a week ago last Monday. I have examined it closely. I have read and reread it from end to end. From the middle towards both ends. I know that probably half the Members of the Senate have had the same opportunity that I have had.

I do not believe it is a proper function of the legislative branch of Government to write treaties. It is our function to approve or to disapprove them after they have been prepared by the executive branch of the Government.

In this case I must say that the executive branch of the Government did seek the approval of three committees of the Congress before finally authorizing the initiating of the treaty a week ago.

My position now today is that I am shown more evidence than has appeared to date that the treaty will be disadvantageous to the United States, I expect the Senate to support its approval in the same way that I supported it before the Senate for a vote. I reserve the right to vote as I believe proper when the time comes and after full hearings have been given.
been appointed Ambassador to the Republic of Vietnam. His past experience, derived from his service in the Senate and as chief delegate of the United States to the United Nations, his qualities as an administrator, his qualities of mind, and his decisiveness in thought and action, will be needed in his newest appointment.

I know that in these troublous times Ambassador Lodge will faithfully serve the interests of the United States. We who served with him in the Senate remember him as a Member of this body. Since that time, we have observed his career with admiration. We are glad that he has been appointed to this high, though difficult, position. Above all, his service in Vietnam will be of great value to our country.

**APPLIMATIONS OF PROPOSED NUCLEAR TEST-BAN TREATY REGARDING RECOGNITION OF EAST GERMANY**

Mr. MANSFIELD. Madam President, questions have been raised by Members of Congress as to the recognition of East Germany as to the implications of the proposed nuclear test-ban treaty for the question of recognition of East Germany. It is, as the Senate knows, the policy of this Government and our Western European allies not to extend formal recognition to the East German Government. This does not mean, of course, that there are no contacts between the zones. West Germans, for example, are in substantial contact with East German officials, largely in connection with the trade between the two zones, which amounts to several hundred million dollars a year, and with travel of Germans between the zones. In the course of this contact, Madam President, countless documents are signed by both West and East Germans; or are stamped by East German officials, although this in no way constitutes recognition by the West German or American governments.

Similarly, Madam President, Americans and Western Europeans have frequent contact with East German officials. Occasionally, in this contact, we recognize that these East German officials exist. If we did not, we would bump into them at the checkpoints at the border. But this in no way constitutes recognition of East Germany in a formal legal sense.

I should also point out that under President Eisenhower and Secretary John Foster Dulles and now under President Kennedy and Secretary Dean Rusk the United States has signed an Indochina agreement to which Red China is a party, but there has been no consequent acceptance of Peking as a representative of Nationalist China as a party. In Washington, there is little likelihood that the new agreement between Peking and Moscow would be altered (and little possibility that the capitalists would be credited with tricking Khrushchev).

While these nuances have significance to the diplomats, the cardinal issue here is whether the treaty, imperfect as it is, has any value. There is no magic in it, no cure-all for the ills of the world. Time undoubtedly will uncover loopholes and surely will test good faith. At this crucial point in history, however, it is the best that contending nations have been able to produce. It simply binds the nations not to carry out or to participate in nuclear experiments in the air, in outer space, or under water. That its significance is not limited to the signatories—no whether the second-round signers are worthy of holding the pen.
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