

We, therefore, recommend that; the National Medical Association:

1. Support legislation designed to increase research and development of alternate energy sources.
2. Support national agencies such as the Environmental Protective Agency in promoting comprehensive environmental monitoring programs.
3. Encourage Constituent State organizations to pursue similar programs at the State level.
4. Establish a permanent Committee on Environmental Health and Safety.

"NUCLEONICS WEEK" REPORT

Some 250 Los Alamos scientists, among others, constructively question nuclear power in a manifesto . . . If answers to their questions are not forthcoming within 2 years, however, they call for a moratorium on new nuclear plants. The group, New Mexico Citizens For Clean Air and Water, has about 2,000 members, of which some 400 work at (nearby) Los Alamos Scientific Labs [one of America's 3 main atomic labs—the other 2 being Oak Ridge and Hanford] . . . The group was formed some time ago to tackle the 4 Corners fossil power plant at the junction of New Mexico and 3 other states, but has now turned to question nuclear power.

The manifesto advocates abandoning Price-Anderson liability indemnification protection, since, if nuclear plants are as safe as proponents claim, utilities and others should not need the coverage; Price-Anderson elimination will stimulate utilities and others to be less lax in their standards, the paper says.

A full-scale test of an emergency core cooling system is advocated, using a reasonable mock-up of a several-hundred Mw reactor, said Bartlett (chairman of the group). Nuclear power plants should also be sited in or close to the urban electrical load centers rather than in rural areas—if they are as safe as their proponents say, the manifesto says.

The group is concerned with long term storage of high level nuclear wastes and its manifesto proposes . . . federal funding of solar and geothermal research at a level equal to that of nuclear energy. Bartlett acknowledged that ERDA is examining salt beds in New Mexico for permanent disposal of high level wastes. The group does not think this is any worse or better than putting the wastes elsewhere.

If these problems are not solved or being solved within 2 years, we would oppose further construction of nuclear plants, said Bartlett (and) added, "Lack of public pressure virtually ensures that the situation is ignored."

"The manifesto has taken about 18 months to prepare, and began with a much more extreme antinuclear flavor. The heavy contribution made by LASL people modified its tone considerably," said Bartlett.

(Free copies of the full position paper—which also contains a full-scale discussion of the case with which illicit atomic bombs can be privately manufactured, as well as a detailed account of the actual routing of a trans-national shipment of plutonium from Japan to Cheswick, Penna., are available from: New Mexico Citizens for Clean Air and Water, 100 Circle Drive, Santa Fe, New Mexico 87501.)

NATIONAL ADA POLICY ON NUCLEAR ENERGY

The further construction of nuclear power plants should be stopped immediately for a moratorium period of ten years. Because of the serious dangers to public health and safety and because of the jeopardy imposed upon future generations who must guard indefinitely the nuclear wastes we are now producing, ADA urges the phasing out of the entire nuclear fission power program. The

development of alternative sources of energy must actively be encouraged and funded as a top national priority.

There are several factors which make further construction of nuclear fission plants unconscionable:

1. Serious safety defects found in present nuclear plants indicate that the possibility of catastrophic disaster by accident or sabotage is not negligible, despite assurances to the contrary by the Atomic Energy Commission (Rasmussen Report, 1974). The credibility of the AEC's safety claims is seriously questioned by both the strict limitation of liability for a nuclear accident imposed by the Price-Anderson Act (1974) and the total unavailability of insurance coverage to individuals for nuclear accidents.

2. The storage of dangerous radioactive wastes requires us to impose upon all future generations the moral obligation to safeguard these lethal nuclear by-products. We, therefore, have to guarantee or assume a stable social and political system without human error or acts of God for at least 10,000 years—an obvious impossibility.

3. Theft of bomb-quality, fissionable material for use by terrorists or criminals is a real possibility with present-day safeguards. Production and shipment of huge quantities of plutonium for future nuclear breeder plants is an invitation to theft and nuclear blackmail.

4. A security system which could prevent any theft or sabotage of nuclear material would have as a necessary consequence the serious infringement on the civil liberties and privacy of millions of Americans.

5. Plutonium is perhaps the most deadly substance known to man. The possibilities of sabotage or an accident due to human error are demonstrated by the nuclear industries' poor safety record. The benefits of nuclear power from breeder reactors cannot compensate for the jeopardy to human health.

6. The threat to health from the low-level radiation given off by present nuclear plants is unknown. Recent studies have shown that long-range exposure to very low levels of radiation may cause serious damage. Thus, even in normal, "safe" operation, present day nuclear plants pose an indeterminate and potentially serious threat to health.

7. Alternative energy sources, such as solar or geothermal energy, should be economically feasible and can be exploited by full-scale research and development programs.

8. A long-term program of energy conservation, coupled with more complete exploitation of available fossil fuels, should avoid the need for nuclear reactors and provide the needed time for development of alternative energy sources.

9. There is serious question to the economic advantage of nuclear reactors over alternative energy sources.

ADA, therefore, advocates the following measures:

1. The breeder reactor energy program, in view of its known and potential risks and its huge costs should be abandoned immediately.

2. A ten-year moratorium on construction of any nuclear power plants should be implemented immediately.

3. Present nuclear power plants should be phased out gradually, on a case-by-case basis, as alternative power sources are developed, or as operating dangers prohibit their safe operation.

4. Funding of research and development of alternative energy technologies such as solar, geothermal, or fusion energy should be a top national priority.

5. We are opposed to the exportation of any nuclear reactors, because no safeguards can be devised which are adequate in view of the enormous risks involved.

6. A long-term program of energy conservation should be developed and enforced.

[Editorial From the Detroit Free Press,
Aug. 8, 1975]

NUCLEAR POWER DANGERS MUST NOT GO IGNORED

The Nation cannot afford to ignore the warnings about the dangers of nuclear power that were issued this week by some 2,300 American scientists. President Ford should follow the recommendations made by the scientists, lest a major nuclear tragedy occur as a result of our failure to take heed.

The country's nuclear power program has been under attack for many months by a wide variety of consumer and environmental groups. Part of the nuclear power industry's response to this attack was that no reputable scientists doubted the safety of nuclear reactors.

This argument has now been laid to rest. The petition presented to Mr. Ford this week was prepared by five of the most eminent scientists in the nation, and was signed by more than 2,300 biologists, chemists, physicists, engineers and other scientists. Nine Nobel Prize winners were among the distinguished group that endorsed the statement.

In defining the dangers inherent in the nuclear power program, the scientists' petition cited three main areas of concern:

The basic safety of nuclear reactors. The petition asserts that while no major accident has occurred to date, the record shows "many malfunctions of major equipment, operator errors and design defects, as well as a continuing weakness in the quality control practices" of plant construction.

The problem of disposal of nuclear waste. This waste is highly radioactive and dangerous, and no feasible method has yet been devised for its disposal, according to the scientists. This radioactive waste, the petition concludes, is "a grim legacy from the nuclear program to future generations."

The danger that plutonium produced in nuclear reactors could be stolen or diverted to construct "illicit nuclear explosives or radiological terror weapons." Safeguards in this area, the scientists found, are wholly inadequate.

The study concluded that nuclear power plant construction should be "drastically reduced" until research can be done to start solving the dangers cited. It also called for an end to American exports of nuclear plants, and urged a long-term program of energy conservation and exploration of alternative energy sources such as environmentally controlled coal power, solar energy and fusion.

These recommendations are cogent and responsible, and must be adopted promptly by the government. The nation's long-range energy problems are very real, and nuclear power may yet hold part of the answer. But it seems clear that the country has seriously underestimated the dangers of nuclear power, and has overemphasized its potential for solving the energy crunch. It is time to readjust our energy priorities, in accordance with new information, and to demand a higher standard of proof from those who advocate increased reliance on nuclear energy.

RIGHT TO PRIVACY

Mr. MATHIAS, Mr. President, the events of the past several years have dramatized more clearly than ever before the vast and chilling extent of government's capacity—and sometimes, inclination—to invade individual citizens' personal privacy through various forms of surveillance and technological innovation.

I am pleased to note that legislation to curb such excesses and to provide clear

NMA also endorses the Nuclear Energy Reappraisal Act introduced in the House of Representatives with 24 cosponsors by Representatives HAMILTON FISH and NED PATTON.

It is reassuring to see physicians participating in the nuclear power debate, because nuclear power is at bottom an issue of public health.

I would also like to enter here a report from Nucleonics Week about a manifesto issued earlier this year by the New Mexico Citizens for Clean Air and Water. The group constructively questions nuclear power. The manifesto states that if safety, waste disposal and liability insurance difficulties are not ameliorated within 2 years, a moratorium on new nuclear plants will be justified. Some 250 scientists from Los Alamos, a nuclear research center, signed the manifesto.

The final resolution I wish to mention here is a national policy paper of the Americans for Democratic Action. The ADA calls for a 10-year moratorium on nuclear construction coupled with aggressive development of alternative energy sources.

In addition, I would like to enter into the RECORD an editorial published last month by the Detroit Free Press. The paper endorses the statement of the 2,300 scientists and calls for the drastic reduction urged in their statement. The newspaper concludes:

... It seems clear that the country has seriously underestimated the dangers of nuclear power, and has overemphasized its potential for solving the energy crunch. It is time to readjust our energy priorities, in accordance with new information, and to demand a higher standard of proof from those who advocate increased reliance on nuclear energy.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the statement by 2,300 scientists, the NMA resolution, the Nucleonics Week item, the ADA policy paper, and the Free Press editorial be printed in the RECORD.

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

DECLARATION ON NUCLEAR POWER BY MEMBERS OF THE AMERICAN TECHNICAL COMMUNITY

Nuclear fission releases enormous energy locked inside the atomic nucleus. Used in anger, nuclear fission can create world-wide devastation. Applied for peace-time electric power generation, nuclear fission creates massive amounts of radioactive by-products posing grave potential hazards which can only be controlled by an exceedingly high level of care, perception, and diligence.

There was once widely shared enthusiasm among scientists that nuclear fission would represent an inexhaustible new energy source for mankind, valuable because it would be safe, inexpensive, and non-polluting. This early optimism has been steadily eroded as the problems of major accidents, long-term radioactive waste disposal, and the special health and national security hazards of plutonium became more fully recognized. It also became clear that the nuclear power proponents failed to appreciate in due course the practical problems that could interfere with the implementation of this new technology, of how companies and individuals might fail to achieve the high level of performance required to safeguard the prodigious quantities of radioactive materials accumulating in a country-wide nuclear power

program and thus enhance the risks of serious accidents.

The nuclear power program in this country is now the focus of a burgeoning controversy. Many thoughtful members of the technical community, and some of the Government agencies with responsibilities relating to the nuclear power program, hold a variety of reservations about the assurance of nuclear safety. The effectiveness, for example, of basic reactor safety systems is questioned because of the lack of relevant experimental evidence. The operating record of the country's nuclear plants includes no major nuclear accident to date, a very gratifying fact, but the total operating record is small and the absence of casualties is no guarantee for the future. In fact, the record to date evidences many malfunctions of major equipment, operator errors, and design defects as well as continuing weaknesses in the quality control practices with which nuclear plants are constructed. Granted the present state of reactor safety, it is difficult to see how the occurrence of a major mishap can be precluded in decades to come in a full-scale nuclear power program.

No technically or economically feasible methods have yet been proven for the ultimate disposal of radioactive waste: a grim legacy from the nuclear program to future generations. Several proposals for dealing with the wastes exist, and one or more of these approaches may eventually be shown to be satisfactory, but important questions remain unanswered today about all of them.

The connection between commercial nuclear power plants and nuclear explosives is another legitimate source of concern. Various studies carried out by the Government, as well as by outside reviewers, point up multiple weaknesses in safeguards procedures intended to prevent the theft or diversion of commercial reactor-produced plutonium for use in illicit nuclear explosives or radiological terror weapons. Proposals for satisfactory plutonium safeguards procedures appear to require special pervasive security apparatus incompatible with American traditions of freedom, an apparatus which could take the United States a long way down the road to a police state.

The plutonium safeguards problem has an international dimension because the United States, and to a lesser extent Canada, West Germany, and France, have begun worldwide commercial nuclear power plant sales programs that, if continued in their present way, may give dozens of countries the wherewithal for nuclear weapons: the necessary supply of plutonium.

The problems now besetting nuclear power are grave, but not necessarily irremediable. A major program of reactor safety, plutonium safeguards, and waste disposal research conducted with much enhanced priority and level of competence, might be able to provide the answers to the technical concerns that have accumulated. We urge national consideration and adoption of such a program. In the meantime, however, the country must recognize that it now appears imprudent to move forward with a rapidly expanding nuclear power plant construction program. The risks of doing so are altogether too great. We, therefore, urge a drastic reduction in new nuclear power plant construction starts before major progress is achieved in the required research and in resolving present controversies about safety, waste disposal, and plutonium safeguards. For similar reasons, we urge the nation to suspend its program of exporting nuclear plants to other countries pending resolution of the national security questions associated with the use by these countries of the by-product plutonium from United States nuclear reactors.

In order to reduce reliance on nuclear energy prior to resolution of the problems

discussed above, the United States must adopt realistic policies governing energy acquisition and use, the extraction, conversion, and combustion of coal, and the development of alternative sources of energy. These policies present grave challenges and will call for decisions that have been largely avoided to date in the national debate over energy policy.

We must, in the first place, commit this country to a comprehensive energy conservation program. This program must increase the efficiency of energy use in all sectors and eliminate the present waste in transportation, space heating, and industrial uses of energy.

Secondly, we must commit this country to the prompt application of air pollution control equipment at coal-burning power plants, to vigorous efforts to improve the safety of coal miners, and to a conscientious program to mitigate the damage from strip mining. These procedures are essential if the nation is to make use of our vast coal resources during the period of transition from our present mix of energy sources to the one we develop through research efforts in the upcoming decades.

Finally, we must commit the required technical resources to a full-scale research and development effort to create more benign energy producing technologies that can make use of the energy of the sun, the winds, the tides, and the heat in the earth's crust. Fusion energy research should also be given an enhanced priority.

It was no mistake, following Hiroshima, to try to make use of nuclear energy for peaceful purposes. But it was a serious error in judgment in the following decades to devote resources to nuclear development to the virtual exclusion of other alternatives. It has also been unfortunate that the efforts to commercialize nuclear energy allowed safety and national security problems to receive less than the required consideration. The nation, on the thirtieth anniversary of Hiroshima, must take note of these facts, diminish the large growth rate of the nuclear program, and take other appropriate steps to ensure adequate energy for the nation.

NUCLEAR POWERPLANTS—A RESOLUTION OF THE NATIONAL MEDICAL ASSOCIATION

Whereas, Nuclear powerplants in normal operation have low-level emissions of radiation; when there are mechanical failures, these emissions may increase; in 1973-74 the AEC investigated 1148 safety violations involving reactors.

Whereas, Radionuclides contained in the emissions enter the soil, air and water. They are inhaled or ingested by the general population at random, localizing in various tissues in the body and irradiating these tissues until their radioactivity is spent.

Whereas, The biological effects of low-level radiation are not known. Significant research on this subject is now in progress; several investigators have suggested correlations between the increase in nuclear reactors and the increase in cancer, infant mortality and congenital abnormalities.

Whereas, There are serious technological problems in the transportation and disposal of radioactive wastes and in the back-up cooling systems in nuclear plants. Numerous minor accidents have occurred, several major accidents have occurred and a catastrophic accident is possible.

Whereas, The environmental monitoring safeguards in many areas are inadequate. The local populations in the vicinity of many nuclear reactors, often the rural poor, are ill-informed as to the potential hazards.

Whereas, Several nuclear powerplants have been constructed or are being planned in areas where instability in the underlying geological strata are known to exist.

procedures to protect U.S. citizens from unwarranted surveillance, H.R. 214, has been under active consideration by a House Judiciary Subcommittee and may well be acted upon by the full committee and House this session. As the principal sponsor of the Senate version of this bill, S. 1888, which I initially introduced in the spring of 1974, I would like to take this opportunity to thank my friend and colleague in the House, Mr. MOSHER, for his vigorous and effective efforts in that body on behalf of H.R. 214, of which he is chief sponsor.

I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues a recent article which explores the need for and progress being made by H.R. 214. Entitled, "Privacy Rights Pushed," this article appeared in the September 8 issue of the Capitol Hill Forum, a promising new periodical which has now joined the 25-year-old Roll Call in providing useful and informative coverage of events and developments on and around Capitol Hill. I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in full in the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. MATHIAS. In addition, Mr. President, I am pleased to note another recent development related to the privacy issue—namely, the publication by the House Republican leadership of its legislative agenda, including the following statement:

We must consider legislation to assure American citizens that they will not be subject to arbitrary or unjustified surveillance by government agents and to protect citizens' right-to-privacy.

Coupled with the excellent report issued last year by the House Republican Task Force on Privacy, this statement helps to underscore the commitment of the Republican side of what I hope will be a major bi-partisan effort on this crucial issue.

The exhibit follows:

EXHIBIT 1

PRIVACY RIGHTS PUSHED

(By Marc H. Rosenberg)

Political Washington is a city that is constantly caught up in a tug-of-war between the executive and legislative branches of government. Occasionally, the courts pitch in to add their weight on one side or the other or to pull in a new direction.

Lately, the Central Intelligence Agency (CIA) and other intelligence-related agencies have been a primary focus of executive-legislative contention. From the preliminary reports, it is increasingly clear that the agencies have been guilty of various transgressions in the not-so-distant past and that some new legislation may result from the ongoing inquiries.

As the Congress moves closer to creating new statutory restrictions on the intelligence agencies, the tug-of-war will intensify. The executive branch will swear that the "horror stories" that have come to the public's attention were unique and will never happen again. New administrative guidelines will be announced, and the argument will be made that any legislation in this area would impede the President in the exercise of his constitutional authorities as Commander-in-Chief.

Let us hope that Congress and the American public are not diverted by these arguments. We must take care that Congress

and the public do not become so spellbound by the wrangling over past activities of the intelligence agencies that they lose sight of the broader issues that underlie the whole debate.

The news media are titillated by stories about how we attempted to slip Fidel Castro a poisoned cigar, and some continue to wax indignant over CIA involvements in coups in Iran and Chile and who knows where else. These are legitimate subjects of investigation and do raise serious questions about the nature and conduct of our foreign policy.

But the gut issue is the domestic activities of the CIA, the Federal Bureau of Investigation, the military intelligence services, and other federal agencies. Starting with the Ervin Committee's mind-boggling disclosure of the Huston plan, and continuing to the present time, we have seen myriad revelations of cases in which the U.S. government violated the rights to privacy of American citizens.

To cite a few of the more blatant examples, we have learned in recent years of Army spies at the 1968 Democratic convention; CIA openings of thousands of pieces of mail; National Security Agency interceptions of thousands of telephone calls; FBI break-ins and burglaries at hundreds of locations; mail covers placed on hundreds of citizens by the Post Office, acting on behalf of dozens of agencies; and Internal Revenue Service personnel spying on the private activities of dozens of individuals. Every one of these activities involved the federal government spying on private citizens; in none of these cases was a warrant or other prior court approval sought or granted.

Are these isolated cases? I don't think so. Neither are they necessarily related, however. What all of these examples point out is that federal statutes are sufficiently vague, and executive agencies' self-restraints and internal controls are so weak, that time after time, in wholly unrelated cases, we see evidence of a gross lack of awareness or concern for citizens' rights to privacy. Admittedly, those rights are not very precisely defined, but it does not take much imagination to figure out what is an invasion of someone's privacy and what is not.

There is presently an effort underway in Congress to help provide better protection for US citizens against undue surveillance by their government. New legislation is quietly working its way to the floor.

The Bill of Rights Procedures Act (H.R. 214) appears to be the main bill under consideration at this time. Originally introduced last spring by Senator Charles McC. Mathias (R-Md.) and Rep. Charles A. Mosher (R-Ohio), this bill is now co-sponsored by a strong bipartisan group of 73 congressmen; it has been endorsed by the House Republican Task Force on Privacy, The New York Times, and many groups in between. The proposed legislation would make it a criminal offense for any agent of the federal government to conduct any form of surveillance of a private American citizen unless a court order is first obtained.

The House Judiciary Subcommittee on Courts, Civil Liberties and the Administration of Justice, chaired by Rep. Robert Kastenmeier (D-Wis.), has been holding hearings on H.R. 214 sporadically during the past six months; the last day of hearings is now scheduled for September 8. By early October, the bill should be in subcommittee mark-up, with favorable action expected.

The Bill of Rights Procedures Act embodies two very fundamental concepts. They are:

(1) No individual citizen's rights to privacy should be abridged by the government without the prior knowledge and written approval of the courts;

(2) Any federal agent conducting warrantless surveillance should be held personally liable for criminal law penalties.

In joint testimony before the Kastenmeier

subcommittee, Mathias and Mosher said, "It is our firm belief that discretionary authority in the area of government surveillance should be removed entirely from the executive branch. It should not be the prerogative of the executive to determine whose rights should be infringed upon and whose should not. We feel the Constitution correctly indicates that the courts are the only proper place for decisions of this sort to be made."

The practical effect of passage of H.R. 214 would be to compel federal agents to go into court and to explain to a judge, before the fact, why a particular surveillance act is necessary. There would be no exceptions to this requirement, although Congressman Mosher concedes that standards of proof may vary in some cases, such as in matters relating to espionage or international intelligence-gathering.

The main point that Mosher and others make is that Americans need to be assured that their rights will not be tampered with unless a court has given its prior approval. Privacy advocates cite the problem of the so-called "chilling effect" as evidence of the need for this assurance.

Mosher notes that he has received letters from several constituents who feared they might be subject to government surveillance. More importantly, he believes that citizens are refraining from participating in legitimate political exercises—such as writing to congressmen or newspaper editors, joining in peaceful demonstrations, contributing to controversial political parties, etc.—out of fear of becoming targets of government surveillance.

The Ohio Republican is still in the process of polling a sampling of his colleagues on this subject, but preliminary results already show substantial agreement that the chilling effect is a valid theory and that a high percentage of congressmen say they have received letters or calls from constituents who feel they are being monitored by the government.

The Judiciary Committee and, later, the whole House will soon have the opportunity to correct this imbalance, to tug our national policy away from permitting arbitrary executive decisions in the privacy area and instead move toward a strict statutory definition of limitations on surveillance, with the courts—not the snoopers—interpreting the laws.

UNITED STATES-CUBA RELATIONS

Mr. STONE. Mr. President, on July 2, 1975, three Cuban trained agents, natives of the Dominican Republic, infiltrated this country through Palenque Beach, situated west of the capital city of Santo Domingo, in San Cristobal Province.

The three agents had lived in Cuba, and infiltrated the Dominican Republic via Puerto Rico, where they were assisted in their operation by members of the Puerto Rican Socialist Party—PSP. Three members of this party, John Thomas Sampson Fernandez, trained in Cuba himself; Angel Gandia, a member of its central committee; and Rafael Garcia Zapata, transported guerrilla members Claudio Caamano Grullon, who headed the group, Manfredo Casado Villars, and Toribio Pena Jaquez from Puerto Rico to the Dominican Republic on a motorboat outfitted with two 115-horsepower outboard motors capable of a speed of 30 knots. The Puerto Ricans, headed by Gandia, departed with the Cuban trained agents from a beach in northeastern Puerto Rico.

The three Puerto Ricans were arrested by Dominican authorities after docking

September 17, 1975

in La Romana sugar mill to refuel the motorboat after landing the three agents. They admitted at a June 24 press conference in Santo Domingo to having transported the agents under orders from the PSP. Sampson said that he met Caamano, the guerrillas' leader, in a San Juan, Puerto Rico, house about 1 month before, and that Caamano told him the part of the Dominican coast where he wanted to land. Sampson also said that he and the other two Puerto Ricans received direct instructions from Nestor Nazario, a member of the political committee of the PSP.

In a June 6 joint communique, the Dominican Armed Forces and National Police stated that the Cuban trained agents clandestinely entered the country in order to carry out acts of sabotage, kidnappings, assassination attempts and destruction of public and private property. The guerrillas wanted to establish a focal point in the Dominican mountains from which to carry out these activities.

This guerrilla warfare tactic is typical of those exported by the present Cuban regime, which has so far failed in Latin American countries including Uruguay, Bolivia, Venezuela, and the Dominican Republic. The Cuban-trained guerrilla group headed by Colonel Francisco Caamano Defio, which left Cuba and invaded the Dominican Republic in February of 1973 attempted to carry out this same tactic. The three Cuban trained agents who infiltrated the Dominican Republic in June of this year also participated in the 1973 invasion and their leader, Claudio Caamano Grullon, is the nephew of Colonel Francisco Caamano Defio. After the aborted invasion in 1973, the three eluded capture by Dominican authorities and returned to Cuba where they received training to renew guerrilla warfare activities in the Dominican Republic. This time, however, our commonwealth island of Puerto Rico was used as the base of operations against that country.

A report attributed to the Dominican Foreign Ministry and dated June 6, 1975, describes the involvement of the three Puerto Rican PSP members. According to news stories, the report was handed to the U.S. Ambassador in Santo Domingo, Robert A. Hurwitch, by Dominican Foreign Relations Minister Ramon Emilio Jimenez. The report refers to the June 11 statement of Assistant Secretary of State William Rogers that the United States "is concerned with Cuba's attitude about Puerto Rico." The report states that this remark refers to the belief that Cuba is using Puerto Rico as a "bridgehead" for the exportation of revolution to the surrounding countries, and that the case of the three Puerto Ricans detained in the Dominican Republic may be the first instance of this belief.

In this regard it is interesting to recall that in 1967, the present leader of the PSP, Juan Mari Bras, declared:

Just as imperialism uses Puerto Rico as a bridgehead for its penetration of Latin America, so will the Movimiento Pro Independencia offer itself as a bridge over which world revolution can penetrate into the United States.

The MPI, of which Mari Bras was chairman at that time, subsequently became the Puerto Rican Socialist Party, which according to the above mentioned Dominican Foreign Ministry report maintains "close and strong relations with Cuba." Puerto Rican Gov. Rafael Hernandez Colon recently declared that many members of the PSP frequently travel to Cuba, where it maintains a delegation which is recognized by the Cuban regime as the legitimate representative of Puerto Rico.

At this time I ask unanimous consent that a letter I sent to State Department Assistant Secretary for Congressional Relations Robert McCloskey concerning this matter be printed in the RECORD accompanied by its reply as well as translations of the report in question and of the joint communique of the Dominican armed forces and national police.

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

JULY 30, 1975

HON. WILLIAM D. ROGERS,
Assistant Secretary for Inter-American Affairs,
Department of State, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. ROGERS: I have in my possession a copy of the attached report of the Ministry of Foreign Relations of the Dominican Republic. The report was handed in Santo Domingo by Minister of Foreign Relations Ramon Emilio Jimenez to United States Ambassador Robert A. Hurwitch.

I would like to know to what extent this report may be taken as an indication of the position of the Dominican Republic regarding the militant activities of last month in that country, and what significance it contains in our Cuba policy.

I will appreciate your answering this letter at your earliest convenience.

Warm personal regards.

Most cordially,

RICHARD (DICK) STONE.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, D.C., August 29, 1975.

HON. RICHARD STONE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR STONE: Thank you for your letter of July 30 enclosing various documents concerning three Puerto Rican-Americans implicated in a guerrilla landing in the Dominican Republic. These documents are not signed nor is it clear to us to whom they were directed.

The position of the Dominican Armed Forces and National Police was expressed publicly in the joint communique of June 6, a copy of which is enclosed.

Concerning the alleged guerrilla landing, it is our understanding that the three Dominicans said to have entered the Dominican Republic from Puerto Rico have not been located. The three Puerto Ricans charged with transporting them claim that they did not in fact bring any such persons into the Dominican Republic.

The three Puerto Ricans were tried and found guilty on July 31 of three violations of Dominican law: introduction of subversives, attempts against the legally constituted government, and conspiracy. As of this date, appeal procedures have not been exhausted and there are indications that the sentence will be appealed by defense lawyers. The Department is not in a position at this time, to evaluate fully or reconcile the various statements which have been made concerning the alleged invasion. Recently the Dominican Chief of Police expressed the

possibility that the three Dominicans had again left the country.

As you know, Cuba's policies in the Hemisphere are closely watched by the United States Government. We are following developments concerning the alleged guerrilla landing in the Dominican Republic closely in the context of Cuba policy.

Sincerely,

ROBERT J. McCLOSKEY,
Assistant Secretary for Congressional Relations.

DOMINICAN REPUBLIC JOINT MILITARY-POLICE COMMUNIQUE

(Informal English text)

JUNE 6, 1975.

The armed forces and the national police inform the public that the security measures that were adopted throughout the country on 4 June are due to reports received by the official intelligence services to the effect that Claudio Caamano Grullon, Toribio Pena Jaquez and Manfredo Casado Mejia, as well as others so far not identified, have secretly entered the country from Cuba and plan to stage terrorist acts (kidnappings, sabotage, attempts against public and private property and against certain persons, and so forth) in order to create the necessary conditions for the eventual disruption of public order.

Both the armed forces and the national police will endeavor to the extent of their ability to avoid unnecessary inconvenience to the public with these measures. However, they cannot under any circumstances permit these evil plans by bad Dominicans who—in connivance with international groups—are trying to create uneasiness and unrest among Dominicans.

The cooperation of all persons who appreciate the peace the country is enjoying at the present time will be of great help to the armed forces and the national police in locating and capturing this group of delinquents.

TRANSLATION OF REPORT ATTRIBUTED TO DOMINICAN FOREIGN MINISTRY AND REPORTEDLY HANDED TO AMBASSADOR ROBERT HURWITCH BY DOMINICAN FOREIGN RELATIONS MINISTER JIMINEZ, MINISTRY OF FOREIGN RELATIONS

YEAR OF THE WOMAN, QUALITY, DEVELOPMENT AND PEACE

a.—The Dominican Government is exercising its sovereignty in the case of the three Puerto Rican citizens who were apprehended on our shores without (being able to show any) real apparent reason (for being there).

The respect for sovereignty is one of the most elemental principles of international law.

b.—In the specific case of these three Puerto Rican citizens, apprehended on the east coast of the Dominican Republic, there exists another aggravating circumstance which is that all of them are members of the Puerto Rican Socialist Party. One of them is, according to the assertions of his own comrades, a member of the central committee of said organization.

It is universally known that the PSP is part of the International Communist movement and that it has close and strong relations with Cuba.

c.—In a recent appearance of the Secretary for Latin American Affairs before a congressional committee of the United States, William Rogers stated that one of the major concerns of his country regarding Cuba was the attitude of the Cubans towards Puerto Rico. The interpretation of this concern is translated in the fact that there exist certain suspicions that Cuba may use its Puerto Rican contacts as a bridgehead between the other countries in the area.

The possibility exists that this may be the first instance of this suspicion, in the case of