

UNITED STATES



OF AMERICA

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 91st CONGRESS
FIRST SESSION

VOLUME 115—PART 9

MAY 5, 1969, TO MAY 14, 1969

(PAGES 11209 TO 12644)

The people of the State of Hawaii have always had a special aloha for President Truman, a man who knew the true meaning of the spirit of aloha—the spirit of love. The strength of character and integrity which he showed in office have endeared him to the people of Hawaii and the Nation.

I join the Nation today in extending my warmest congratulations to President Truman on his 85th birthday anniversary and in wishing him many happy years of good health.

MINNESOTANS OPPOSE ABM

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, the Minneapolis Star & Tribune has just published the results of a poll of Minnesotans on ABM and related issues.

For the first time, the poll reveals that a slight plurality—45 percent—were critical of the ABM system proposed by President Nixon. Only 44 percent of those polled said that they supported the proposed Sentinel system.

Considering that the public normally has no basis for rejecting a recommendation of the President of the United States on a matter affecting national security, I believe these results are extremely interesting. They demonstrate the eminent good sense of the American people.

They also underline that the administration, despite having the vast resources of the Pentagon and a substantial portion of the press in support of its position, has not been able to convince the American people of its case.

That, of course, is because the case is so weak.

I hope that the citizens of other States will stand with those of Minnesota in opposing this senseless plan.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the article reporting the results of this survey be printed at this point in my remarks.

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

MINNESOTA POLL: MINNESOTANS SPLIT ON ABM PLAN

Minnesotans are sharply divided over the antiballistic missile (ABM) plan advanced by the Nixon administration.

Forty-four percent of a statewide sampling interviewed by The Minneapolis Tribune's Minnesota Poll said the plan sounded good to them. "Anything that indirectly protects us is good," said a Minneapolis housewife. "We got to show Russia we are protected and never let our guard down."

Just as many people (45 percent) were critical of President Nixon's approach. A retired businessman from Bemidji touched upon many reservations people voiced in the survey when he said: "I'd save the \$7 billion. If missiles were coming from all angles, how could that protect missile sites? The government puts fear in people's minds to get more money."

Eleven percent offered no opinion on the ABM question.

Mr. Nixon reviewed the Johnson administration's plans for ABM defense and recommended that the nation concentrate on protection of U.S. missile sites and not try to defend cities. That did not satisfy congressional leaders who would like to scale down the arms race between the United States and Russia.

In this showdown battle between the Pentagon and some congressmen, Mr. Nixon is said to need strong support from the people to have his plan adopted. Rarely has public opinion played such a crucial role on a military issue.

At the present time most Minnesotans do not think they have a good grasp of the subject. Sixty percent said they do not understand the ABM issue at all well.

Can the United States and Russia agree to stop building up their defenses? Fifty-four percent in the survey said it was possible and 43 percent said it was not.

Most Minnesotans believe that at the present time Russia could not destroy the United States in one blow and escape unharmed. More people think that, in the next 20 years, a major world power actually will try to destroy another major world power, but a majority still reject that possibility.

Having expressed themselves on those subjects, Minnesotans were told these things:

"The ABM is a weapon which defends an area by destroying attacking missiles. President Nixon wants the United States to build an ABM system designed primarily to protect our missile sites from attack but would not protect American cities. It would cost about \$7 billion."

Of the people who said it sounded like a good plan to them, the 44 percent, the idea of being prepared to defend our own missile sites was given most frequently as the reason for their support. The next most frequent reason for approval was that the plan struck a reasonable compromise between protection and cost. Some of those people felt cities still would gain some protection from the proposed setup.

Those who termed the administration proposal a poor plan (45 percent) mainly said it did not provide enough protection, it would not be necessary and soon would become obsolete, and that it would cost too much money.

Five hundred ninety-four men and women living in all parts of Minnesota were interviewed about two weeks ago. They represent in miniature all adults in the state. People were asked questions on a variety of subjects in home interviews by trained field reporters.

The questions relating to ABM and the answers obtained are as follows:

"Do you believe it is possible or is not possible for both the United States and Russia to stop building up their defenses by agreement between the two countries?"

[In percent]

Is possible.....	54
Is not possible.....	43
No opinion.....	3
	100

"Do you believe Russia could or could not destroy the United States at this time by surprise attack and come out relatively unharmed?"

[In percent]

Russia could do this.....	25
Could not.....	69
No opinion.....	6
	100

"In the next 20 years do you think it is likely or not likely a major world power will try to destroy another major power in one blow?"

[In percent]

Is likely to happen.....	43
Is not likely.....	52
No opinion.....	5
	100

"There's been a great deal of public debate over the ABM or antiballistic missile. How well do you feel you understand the ABM issue—very well, fairly well, or not well at all?"

[In percent]

Understand very well.....	5
Fairly well.....	35
Not well at all.....	60
	100

The background statement on ABM quoted above was followed by this question:

"Does that sound like a good plan to you or a poor plan?" The answers should be read across the page.

[In percent]

	Sounds like good plan	Sounds like poor plan	No opinion
All adults.....	44	45	11
Men.....	49	45	6
Women.....	38	45	17
Democratic-Farmer-Laborites.....	37	50	13
Republicans.....	51	40	9
Independents.....	47	43	10

TRIBUTE TO POLISH 3D OF MAY CONSTITUTION

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I rise today to pay tribute to the citizens of Polish origin in the United States and around the world who throughout the month of May commemorate the signing of the Polish 3d of May Constitution. This is a time when all Americans have an opportunity to demonstrate their friendship toward the Polish nation, to honor the light and spirit of which the May 3 Constitution of 1791 is such a bright symbol, and to express their sorrow that a Communist tyranny has dimmed—though by no means quenched—that light.

Only 2 years after our own Constitution was adopted in 1789, Poland adopted its own trailblazing Constitution without a revolution or even disorder. That Constitution succeeded in reforming Poland's public life and stopping her internal decline. It made Poland one of the first pioneers of liberalism in Europe.

One of the principles at the foundation of the 3d of May Constitution was stated in these words:

All power in civil society should be derived from the will of the people, its end and object being the preservation and integrity of the state, the civil liberty and the good order of society, on an equal scale and on a lasting foundation.

It is clear that our own Constitution and the great 3d of May Constitution had each drawn inspiration from the same enlightened philosophy of government.

Thus the close ties between the Polish nation and the United States are ancient bonds.

A TIME FOR DECISION

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial carried by the Courier-News, Plainfield, N.J., on April 26, 1969, entitled "A Time for Decision." In these days of emotional charge and countercharge, the editorial provides a welcome relief. I think all Members of the Senate will find the pragmatic approach which it sets out a useful contribution.

There being no objection, the editorial