

surplus Arctic water to the International Joint Commission with the request that an economic and engineering feasibility study be made and that the respective governments be informed of the results of such study by December 31, 1966; and

(2) the President of the United States should invite the government of Canada to join in such referral.

REDUCTION OF DUTY-FREE ALLOWANCE ON FOREIGN GOODS

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, on June 29 the Senate took what I have called a "shotgun approach" to our balance-of-payments problem by voting to reduce the duty-free allowance on foreign goods which may be brought home by American tourists.

As I said in the Senate debate, that portion of the bill which reduced 1 gallon to 1 quart the amount of alcoholic beverages allowed to a returning tourist would prove unduly damaging to some of our staunchest allies in the Caribbean and areas immediately adjacent to the United States.

In particular, the Bahamas—which rely entirely on a tourist economy—reported that the reduced quota on liquor purchases would reduce their gross national product by 12 percent. All this would take place in a country with which the United States has long had a favorable trade position.

Mr. President, I could not understand then and I certainly cannot understand now why, in our efforts to achieve a better balance-of-payments position, we would take a line of action which actually worsens our balance-of-payments position, because it cuts off trade with several countries with which we have a favorable balance of trade. In other words, it increases the deficit.

If we make money in our trade relations with the Bahama Islands, with Bermuda, and with other countries, certainly to prohibit them from getting dollars which they, in turn, spend with us—not only do they spend, but for every \$1 our tourists leave there, they, in turn, spend \$2 with us—to stop that kind of business does not make sense arithmetically or logically, because it hurts our balance-of-payments position instead of helping it.

I am hopeful that the Secretary of the Treasury, the distinguished Henry H. Fowler, from Virginia, will take another look at this approach to improving our balance-of-payments position, and will see fit to make a recommendation to Congress at the beginning of the next session which will permit the removal of such limitations upon those countries which now yield us a favorable balance of trade, because to do so will have the net effect of improving our net balance-of-payments position.

Mr. President, William Tucker of the Miami News, a reporter who does a thorough job, went to the Bahamas recently to do an on-the-spot survey of the effect this ruling will have on one of our friendly neighbors.

His reports confirm the position I took in the Senate some weeks ago and which I shall continue to take until this body acts to redress the economic injury which this "shotgun measure" will cause.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point articles by William Tucker published in the August 26, 27, and 29 editions of the Miami News.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TOURIST IMPORT BAN BACKFIRES ON UNITED STATES

(In a move calculated to help restore the U.S. balance of payments with foreign countries, Congress enacted a law limiting the amount of goods a citizen can bring home duty free. The merchants of Bay Street, Nassau, immediately screamed "foul" and fired off indignant protests to the White House. Miami News Reporter William Tucker visited the Bahamas and discovered the new law will have far-reaching effects here in Florida and in all of the islands of the Caribbean. They're described in this first of a two-part series.)

(By William Tucker)

NASSAU.—The U.S. customs inspector at Nassau Airport surveyed the mountain of colorful hats, beach bags and purses and joked, "starting your own straw market, eh?"

He waived the family group through the gate because the bulky collection of straw goods easily fell within the \$10 a person limit of purchases they could take home from the Bahamas after only a day's visit.

The next traveler also carried a straw bag—but with a difference. This citizen had been away from the United States for at least 48 hours and his bag contained five bottles of liquor—equivalent to a gallon.

Bahamas officials contend that for every visitor who buys a straw hat or beach bag in Nassau on a day's outing, two others will stay long enough to lug away a gallon of booze.

This \$5 million annual traffic will come to a crashing end Oct. 1 under a new U.S. law limiting the amount of liquor a citizen can bring home duty free from abroad to a quart, no matter how long he stays. And Nassau, while visitors throng its picturesque shops and native straw markets at a rates that will topple all its tourist records this year, is undergoing quiet agony on Bay Street.

The liquor shops are as numerous as gift shops and banks, and 90 percent of their business, they estimate, is in "five-pack" gallons for stateside consumption. The liquor merchants hop from one shop to another wringing their hands and muttering imprecations against the United States and Lyndon B. Johnson.

They feel betrayed. They claim and government figures back them us that the Bahamas spent in the last 6 years \$135 million more in the United States than was spent there by American tourists.

The Bahamas import liquor from Europe and other islands, and such favorite foreign bargains as Swiss watches and German cameras. But in other ways they are as dependent upon the United States for their basic needs as Miami Beach.

Lying so close to Florida, it would be foolish economics to go to any other market for building materials, furnishings, and even food stores. But their proximity and stateside buying practices won no exception for the Bahamas in the law enacted at President Johnson's suggestion to help restore the U.S. balance of payments.

The law also cuts the amount of nonliquor goods a U.S. citizen can take home duty free after 48 hours to \$100 retail. The old figure, still in effect until October 1, was \$100 wholesale, which would allow about \$160 worth retail through Customs.

This cutback is expected to hurt the perfume, camera, china, watch, and cashmere sweater shops, all thronged by Americans, and the merchants are making a last big sales pitch.

"U.S. Customs will discount your purchases by 40 percent," says a sign in some of the shops, giving away the markup then and there. All purchases must be carried home—they can't be mailed—under the new law. This will hit dealers in bulky items like sets of china.

But the liquor shops are the ones really hurting. Each has a red-lettered sign noting that 1 gallon may be taken home duty free until October 1, so "buy now." One shop had a calendar pad with a page ripped off daily noting "only 36 more days" in which to buy a gallon, and the next day it would read only 35 days. After that, said the sign, "you can only take out 1 quart (if you are 21.)"

The merchants don't want to go on record as cussing the U.S. President and have agreed to present a solid front of protest behind David Lightbourn, a perfumer and former president of the Nassau Chamber of Commerce. Lightbourn said the merchants are stunned by the U.S. action. He predicted a sharp drop in the colony's revenue, which comes mainly from the booze and other goodies sold to American tourists.

Three years ago the calypso bands struck up ballads in tribute to President Kennedy when he visited here. They sang another tune about his fellow conferee at the big-two meeting, Prime Minister Harold Macmillan.

They called that one "Mac the Knife," and the colony went on to win semiautonomy from London, happy to fall within the U.S. economic sphere. Now the native balladists are stringing up Mr. Johnson in song the way they did the Prime Minister.

The native Progressive Liberal Party may argue that the calypso singers in the hotels are under control of the "Bay Street boys," the big merchants in the majority party, but even the Progressive Liberal Party admits that the entire Bahamas economy is wrapped up in tourism.

What are the liquor merchants doing in the face of the oncoming cutback? They are reducing imports and rapidly clearing inventories because swarms of tourists are having a last fling with the duty-free gallon.

They are adjusting prices—going up on some types and brands in a bid to get a solid profit per bottle, whether or not it is for taking back to Florida. There is also discussion of cutting prices on some liquors such as rum, which are imported cheaply from other islands.

For a gallon package, the merchants will argue, it will still be cheaper to buy it in the islands than at home, with the duty (including the Internal Revenue levy) tacked on. A five-pack that costs \$15 will run to \$25 with the duty, but a tourist might pay \$30 to \$40 for the same brands at home.

Arrangements also are being made for the duty to be paid in the liquor store and have the whisky packets stamped for clearance so the buyer won't have the customs worry.

A big headache is the limitation of one U.S. quart. The Bay Street dealers import their stock in fifths for the five-packs and in imperial quarts, which contain 40 ounces. The U.S. quart is 32 ounces. And while they are sweating out the bottle size, the mer-

September 1, 1965

chants find themselves suddenly disinclined to import any more American bourbon.

SPIRIT OF '76 NOT ENOUGH FOR BAHAMAS
(The islands of the Bahamas, like others in the Caribbean, face very real economic consequences as a result of the new law limiting the amount of goods a citizen can bring home duty-free. Miami News Reporter William Tucker, who visited the islands, points up the claims of Bay Street merchants and others, who have steadily increased United States-Caribbean trade to a point favoring the mainland.)

(By William Tucker)

NASSAU.—With repeal of prohibition in the United States, the rum-running Bahamians decided, since they could no longer profit by taking liquor to the Americans, their best bet was to bring the Americans to where the liquor was cheaper.

Thus simply did the Bahamas begin the American tourist trade that has since become the lifeblood of the farflung islands, stretching almost from Cuba to Palm Beach.

World War II interrupted the tourist traffic, but when it resumed it leaped from 32,000 in 1949 to 605,000 last year. This season may bring 800,000 and the goal of a million by 1970 should easily be reached before then.

But, Bahamian leaders point out, what's good for the Bahamas has been a great deal better for the United States.

Sir Stafford Sands, who as chairman of the Bahamas Development Board has done more than any one man to make the islands a tourist paradise, spells it out in figures.

"In 1964 we took in \$63 million from tourist expenditures, but during that year we spent \$93.5 million in the United States for the purchase of good and services," Sands said.

"In other words, we spent 76 percent more in the United States than we received from U.S. tourist expenditures in the colony.

"Over the 6-year period ending last year, we as a colony spent \$358 million in the United States but we only took in \$221 million from the tourist trade. Therefore, every tourist dollar spent in the Bahamas over the last 6 years by American tourists earned 62 percent interest for the United States."

Other sources estimated Bahamas expenditures last year reached \$25 million in the Miami area.

Bay Street merchants and the Government feel doubly hurt by the new U.S. law limiting the amount of liquor a citizen can take home, tax-free, to one quart, compared with a gallon (usually five fifths) under the law expiring October 1.

First, they are wounded because they feel, as Sands stated, the Bahamas have helped, instead of hurt, the U.S. efforts to achieve a balance of payments with foreign nations.

Second, they feel the United States, which has poured billions into backward or impoverished nations, is only giving a stab in the back to a neighbor who has built up a thriving economy on its own efforts.

The Bahamas' business-like Government is called something else by its opponents—business in government. Leaders of the Progressive Liberal Party, who have even gone to the United Nations seeking insular reapportionment, claim the "Bay Street Boys" not only run the Government, but barter with it.

The Bahamas handbook for 1963 lists Symonette as president of two real estate firms and of Robertson Ltd., one of the biggest Bay Street liquor firms.

And the chairman of Burns House Ltd. liquor firm is listed as none other than Stafford L. Sands, the Government's No. 1 tourist-hunter.

Such interest would seem to put the Government very much into the Bay Street merchants' concern over the new U.S. import restrictions.

But Sir Stafford emphasizes two points in stating his case for a fair shake from the United States:

The new Bahamas Constitution, written when the colony gained semi-autonomy from the British Crown, is devoted entirely to basic human rights for all citizens, whatever color or creed, in its first section.

The standard of living of every man, woman, and child in the entire Bahamas has been substantially raised in the tourist boom of the last 15 years.

SENATOR SMATHERS PLEDGES BAHAMAS DUTY-FREE HELP

(By William Tucker)

Senator GEORGE SMATHERS pledged a continuing fight yesterday to lift the new restriction against bringing liquor back from Nassau despite a fresh setback over the issue in Congress.

"We'll get a new bill concerning the balance-of-payments situation next year and I'll try to tack on an amendment then to exclude the Bahamas and Bermuda," SMATHERS said.

SMATHERS asked that a series in the Miami News showing how the Bahamas would suffer under the new law be sent to him so he could insert it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD with appropriate remarks.

Since the balance-of-payments crisis developed in Congress early this year SMATHERS has fought to exclude the nearby islands from emergency measures restricting tourist purchases.

He did manage to delay the effective date for 3 months. But starting October 1, American adults will be allowed to bring back only one U.S. quart of spirits from the Bahamas or any other foreign territory without payment of duty, which includes Internal Revenue taxes.

The expiring law allows any citizen to bring back 1 gallon—usually in "five-packs" of fifths—if he has been abroad 48 hours. This is the staple market of Bay Street liquor merchants in Nassau.

The merchants, backed by SMATHERS, argue that the Bahamas spend considerably more money in the United States for the basic needs of the islands' population than tourists spend for gifts, services and accommodations in the islands.

SMATHERS had argued all along that countries or territories that had such a balance favorable to the United States should be excluded from the new laws.

He thought he saw a chance last week to get through an amendment on a new bill dealing with the balance-of-payments program. This one would impose a tax on investments and loans made abroad.

Senator JACOB JAVITS, of New York, opposed the investment tax and prepared an amendment to give the authority to exclude individual countries when the President decided their payment balance was favorable to the United States.

SMATHERS' amendment would lift restrictions to what tourists could bring back home when the same favorable balance was reached, at the President's discretion.

But JAVITS' amendment was routed at a finance committee hearing by opponents who protested that it would grant taxing powers to the President without congressional approval.

When he saw that, SMATHERS said, he didn't offer his own amendment because it was certain to bring the same reaction.

"But I did mention in the discussion that I had prepared an amendment," SMATHERS said. "I am all for restoring the balance of payments, which would correct a very bad situation, but I don't like the shotgun approach."

SMATHERS said he and other opponents of the first balance-of-payments legislation did manage to get the limit on nonalcoholic goods

that could be brought back raised from \$50 to \$100 retail.

"We lost the head and shoulders and the belly but we saved the rear part of the cow," he said.

He blamed the failure to exclude the Bahamas from the liquor limitation on a bloc led by Senator THURSTON MORTON, Republican, of Kentucky who comes from a big bourbon-producing State.

"Senators from the dry States like Kansas and Nebraska thought I was defending the liquor lobby when Senator MORTON spoke about 6-months-old infants bringing whisky back from Nassau," SMATHERS said.

"It was a case of whose whisky you were trying to sell."

DR

THE SITUATION IN THE DOMINICAN REPUBLIC

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, in the last 2 days, events in the battered Dominican Republic have taken a hopeful turn. The resignation on August 30 of the military-civilian junta headed by Gen. Antonio Imbert Barreras at last paved the way to the announcement yesterday that a provisional government, to be led by Hector Garcia Godoy, will be installed Friday in Santo Domingo.

To paraphrase the late President Kennedy, this development is but a single step in a journey of a thousand miles—a journey toward freedom and justice in a nation that has known little of either in its tragic history. Nevertheless, it is a significant and welcome step. It is the first tread on a long staircase to peace and democracy and has been brought about by the untiring efforts of President Johnson and such skilled and distinguished negotiators as Ellsworth Bunker and W. Tapley Bennett.

But, even as we applaud what has just taken place in the Dominican Republic, we and Dominicans must remain alert to the dangers that still abound. These are dangers that can be quickly identified by a close study of some of the roots of the uprising that began a little over 4 months ago.

Mr. President, on April 24 of this year, the city of Santo Domingo erupted in chaotic and uncontrolled bloodletting. With the war cry that "constitutional forces are on the move against usurpers," rebel military forces and frenzied mobs raced through the streets, toppling the government of Donald Reid Cabral. For at least the 26th time in the 121 years of its independence, the Dominican Republic was plunged into a full-scale revolt.

On April 28, 4 days after the outbreak of violence, President Johnson, having calmly and carefully assessed the situation, ordered a contingent of several hundred U.S. Marines into Santo Domingo to protect the lives of Americans and aid in their evacuation. Subsequently, as events continued to whirl hopelessly out of control, the American troop commitment was increased manifold to a total of more than 23,000 by mid-May.

During the 4 months since April 24, often unreasoning debate has raged in the pages of the daily press, in academic circles, even in the Halls of Congress over the propriety of American involvement in the Dominican crisis.

Many normally strong supporters of the present administration have deplored the President's decisions in this instance, and, relying on reports from a certain segment of the press, they have accused the United States of misusing its might to thwart a legitimate democratic revolution.

It is unfortunate that the tone of this debate has tended to obscure the actual substantive issues at stake. Liberal spokesmen who, in the past, have counseled—and wisely, I believe—against viewing domestic events in simple, absolute terms of black and white have themselves been guilty of this same folly when speaking of Latin America. Able to discern existing evils in the nations of the hemisphere, they have fallen prey to a fatal attraction for any movement, regardless of its roots, which promises an end to old injustices and the establishment of a better society.

With careless ease, these individuals divide Latins into two groups, the reactionary military and rich on one hand, and the masses of poor and their allies, the intellectuals, on the other. Whenever a revolutionary figure rises from this latter group bearing the banner of liberation and calling on his followers to throw off their shackles, his cause is embraced without question by many Americans who proclaim him a new Bolivar. His opposition, automatically wrong, is branded worthy of destruction.

There can be no doubt that grave wrongs are today perpetuated in many of the lands south of our borders; that hunger is a fact of everyday life for far too large a number of our neighbors; that for some Latin Americans, democracy is only a vague, seemingly unattainable dream; and that the rule of law is sometimes replaced by the rule of decree. But, nevertheless, if we are to effect improvements, we must learn to distinguish between the widely varying factions that compete for political power in every part of the hemisphere. We must recognize, bad as existing evils may be, their proposed remedies can be even worse.

Mr. President, it is a tragic fact that the failure of an unquestioning majority of Americans to make these distinctions in 1959 aided Fidel Castro in the consolidation of his power in Cuba. By cunningly covering his basic motives with a cloud of rhetoric designed to appeal to the democratic sensibilities of liberal North Americans, Castro was able to hasten the replacement of the tyranny of Batista with the tyranny of communism.

Therefore, although overt Communist influences were carefully submerged at first, when revolt spilled into the streets of Santo Domingo on April 24, responsible Americans were especially wary and were concerned that a second Cuba could be in the making.

The prevention of a Communist coup, however, was not the motive behind President Johnson's initial decision to land U.S. marines. Rather, after the short-lived provisional government of Raphael Molina Urefia collapsed on April 27, the situation in Santo Domingo quickly degenerated into a state of an-

archy. Leaderless mobs roamed everywhere sacking, burning, and killing without reason. After repeated attempts by our distinguished Ambassador W. Tapley Bennett to bring key Dominican leaders of both sides together to restore order failed, the Ambassador put through an urgent request for American troops.

President Johnson, acting upon this request, and appeals from individual American citizens and foreign nationals stranded in the midst of a frighteningly violent civil war, responded in precisely the correct manner.

On April 28, he announced:

I have ordered the Secretary of Defense to put the necessary American troops ashore in order to give protection to hundreds of Americans who are still in the Dominican Republic and to escort them safely back to this country. The same assistance will be available to the nationals of other countries, some of whom have already asked for our help.

Shepherded by U.S. marines and paratroopers, over 5,000 people, Americans and citizens of 45 other countries, left the violence of Santo Domingo for safety during the early days of the Dominican revolt.

We can all be proud of this accomplishment. In the face of a complete breakdown of law and order, rifle fire from snipers, acts of terrorism, growing violence on the part of undisciplined gangs of marauders, and indiscriminate killings taking place throughout the city, the evacuation mission was successfully carried out. Not one of the thousands of Americans, nor any of the other foreign citizens who turned to us for safety and evacuation, was physically harmed. A few heroic marines, however, gave their lives to carry out their mission of mercy.

The fact that the President ordered the marines to land solely in order to protect innocent lives does not, of course, mean that our Government was unaware of the growing Communist strength and influence on the rebel side. We were well acquainted with the personnel and tactics of the Dominican Communist Parties long before the revolt began. We knew that many leading Communists had secretly returned to Santo Domingo from exile late in 1964 and in the early months of 1965, after training in subversion and guerrilla tactics in Cuba and other Communist countries.

Mr. President, there are today three Communist parties active in the Dominican Republic. One of these, the Dominican Popular Movement—the MPD—was an underground party prior to the April 24 revolt, consisting of about 500 hard-core members, and following the Chinese Communist line of violent change through open insurrection.

The second of these parties was known as the Popular Socialist Party—PSP—and was also an underground organization before April, with between 700 and 1,000 dedicated members. This party has followed the Moscow line, preferring to attain its ends by subversion and penetration rather than by the more violent methods advocated by the MPD. Just 2 weeks ago, emboldened enough to openly proclaim its true identity, this party discarded its popular-Socialist

name and declared itself as the Dominican Communist Party—PCD.

The third party, called the 14th of June Popular Movement, is an especially illuminating example of Communist tactics. It takes its name from the landing in the Dominican Republic on June 14, 1959, of a group of young Dominicans who were opposed to the then dictator, Trujillo. It is because of its anti-Trujillo activities that this movement was long regarded, and still is by some people, as a democratic, patriotic Dominican organization. The group that landed in the Dominican Republic in 1959, however, came from Cuba and was thoroughly trained by Cuban Communists. Castro's government supported and equipped this band of guerrillas, and the movement has always openly identified itself as pro-Castro.

In late 1963, the 14th of June movement resumed its guerrilla tactics, this time against the triumvirate which succeeded Juan Bosch. Again, the guerrilla fighters were led by Dominicans indoctrinated and specially trained in Communist Cuba. Despite the fact that many of the members of the 14th of June movement were—and a large number still are—non-Communist, the fact is that Communists hold its key leadership positions and that it has consistently served Communist ends.

It was the 14th of June movement that took the leadership in rallying popular support for the rebel side from the very beginning of the current upheaval.

Joining with their other comrades, these Castrolike fighters sought to even the sides by aiding in the large-scale distribution of arms, including automatic weapons and grenades, to civilians. Soon the Communists completely took over control of this activity in order to make sure that their own followers and sympathizers had guns.

From their point of view, this was a necessary measure, because at the height of rebel strength, there were no more than 1,000 trained Dominican soldiers who had defected to their cause. By arming more than 1,500 hard-core Communists and as many as 4,000 other civilians, the rebels greatly increased their prospects for success.

In addition, they moved quickly to organize street demonstrations, seize newspaper plants, take control of rebel propaganda over radio and television, organize paramilitary units, and establish commando units and command posts.

Skillfully adapting the tried and proven model of Cuba, Dominican Communists hid behind and manipulated scores of non-Communist rebels.

For instance, there were several thousand armed civilians who were not Communists, ranging from patriotic Dominicans who sincerely believed in what they were doing to youngsters—some only 12 years old—who were in the fight for the thrill, and hoodlums who were out to kill policemen and to loot. Although many of these civilians probably never came under direct Communist control and discipline, they were dependent in varying degree on the Communists for leadership and for arms and ammunition.

Borrowing yet another page from the Castro manual, the Dominican Communists attempted to create that aura of legitimacy so necessary to gaining sympathy from certain liberal quarters in the United States. On the 25th of April, they propelled a well-known supporter of ex-President Juan Bosch, Raphael Molina Urena, into a provisional presidency. Molina Urena declared that the Constitution of 1963, suspended with the fall of Bosch, was again in effect, and that he was only holding the reins of power until Bosch could return from Puerto Rico. But, within 2 days, the Molina Urena government toppled and its key political and military leaders fled to asylum in foreign embassies, leaving behind them a leadership vacuum into which well-trained, well-prepared Communists moved swiftly.

All signs of moderation disappeared and the violent extremists took charge.

Mr. President, this then was the scene on April 30, when President Johnson ordered additional American troops into Santo Domingo.

It was not an ambition for territorial or material gain, or the desire to impose our will on other peoples that prompted the President to send more young American men to a small and troubled island. Rather, after careful, prudent calculation, President Johnson decided to seek several specific and altogether proper goals. Uppermost was the continued protection of large numbers of American citizens still remaining in Santo Domingo.

Second, the activities of such well-known Communists as Luis Gomez Perez; Jose Cuello Hernandez, who was trained in Cuba in 1964; Moises Blanco Gerano, a leader of the 14th of June movement; Daniel Ozuna Hernandez, a leader of the Cuban-inspired 14th of June invasion in 1963; Antonio Isa Conde, who received instruction in Cuba in 1963; his brother, Narciso, a member of the Central Committee of the Dominican Communist Party; and many, many others caused increased concern here in Washington over the ultimate direction the growing anarchy in Santo Domingo—given impetus by the lack of unity among anti-rebels—might take.

There were well-founded fears that the lawlessness and bloodshed, hitherto confined to the capital city, was about to spread to the countryside.

Most important for the long-range prospects for peace, the President was convinced that the U.S. military presence in the Dominican Republic, by impartially enforcing a cease-fire, would give the Organization of American States the necessary time to take collective peacekeeping action.

Mr. President, we saw the President's judgment on this last point vindicated with the formal creation of the Inter-American force in Santo Domingo on May 23. The presence of this hemispheric army, composed of units from the United States, Brazil, Costa Rica, Honduras, Nicaragua, and Paraguay, has allowed us to cut our own troop commitment by over 50 percent. Under the command of the distinguished Brazilian,

Gen. Hugo Penasco Alvim, the inter-American force undertook the difficult task of halting violence while OAS negotiators effected a political settlement.

But, Mr. President, the dangers of the Dominican crisis, though sharply reduced by the latest developments, are still apparent.

The Communists continue to play an important role in the rebel movement. Their paramilitary strength still comprises the major elements of the rebels under arms. Some Dominican officers who are not Communists have defected in recent weeks from the rebel movement, telling officials of our Government that the growing intransigence of the Communists has led to Communist threats against the lives of non-Communist rebel leaders. Others have declared that the influence of the Communists is increasing, and that at least 75 percent of the military command posts in the rebel area are under the direct control of the Communists.

There is evidence that the Communists are actively making preparations for longer term subversion. Some of their leaders, furnished with false identities, are ready to go underground to direct future violence. The Communists have acquired large numbers of rifles and automatic weapons during the course of the revolt; and many of these are already hidden away for future use—not only in Santo Domingo itself but also in secret caches in many parts of the country.

The Dominican Communist Party continues to adhere to the Moscow line, and is attempting to sponsor a so-called Popular Front in which all the Communist parties can join with reputable and much larger political factions and thus attain their objectives through subversion and deceit.

One of the leaders of this party, Juan Ducoudray, who worked for Radio Havana in 1962, and who has traveled widely in the Soviet Union, Poland, and Communist China, declared on August 17 that his group will actively oppose a negotiated settlement on the lines proposed by the OAS. Instead, the Dominican Communist Party will attempt to continue its course of armed insurrection.

The 14th of June movement has also come out openly in favor of violent action against any provisional government. Its Cuban-trained Communist leaders and its hard-core extremist faction of Castro sympathizers are guiding the 14th of June movement ever closer to an alliance with the other two Communist parties. The movement has been very active in the past 2 months in enlisting new members, conducting Communist indoctrination course, and giving guerrilla warfare training to hundreds of young people. Many of these are brought in from other parts of the country and returned to their home towns after training so that they may become the guerrilla fighters of future Communist moves in the Dominican Republic.

The MPD—Dominican Popular Movement—the Communist Party which follows the Peiping line of violence to attain

its objectives, also began 2 months ago to conduct guerrilla warfare training courses in the rebel zone of Santo Domingo. It, too, has publicly called for terrorism throughout the country in order to oppose any provisional government. This party, a hard-core underground movement before the April 24 revolt, is now operating openly and has just held a widely publicized meeting in Santo Domingo. It has declared that present conditions provide a good opportunity in the near future for a nationwide Communist uprising. It is laboring actively to create a common front with workers' and farmers' groups and organizations and has called for a "united front" among the reputable political parties and the Communists for open, concerted action in the political field. But it is also working to establish a "liberation front," a clandestine alliance among all the Communists and their sympathizers for direct, violent action against the proposed provisional government.

The very term "liberation front" extends a cruel and false promise to the Dominican people. For, like the Vietcong in South Vietnam, its means would be terror and repression, its aims the very antithesis of liberty.

The Dominican Communist Party's central committee has admitted, in the August 16 edition of the party's official publication, *El Popular*, that it attempted to capitalize on a popular uprising at the outset of the April 24 revolt. The party claims credit for the slogan "Arms for the People," and for giving a popular keynote to what it alleges would otherwise have been a cut-and-dried military coup by rebellious army officers. The party has engaged in the Communist version of self-criticism, analyzing the reasons for failure in April, and calling on all its members to prepare, in its own words, "for victory in the next popular insurrection."

Mr. President, this solid evidence of the determination of some rebels to undo the patient, painstaking efforts of the administration, and the OAS, gives added weight to the impression that the new provisional government could become a sand castle at the edge of the sea that could be kicked over by the Communists.

I am confident, however, that the Garcia Godoy government will be aware of the threats to peace, and that it will strive to be responsive to the needs of the Dominican people by constructing a framework of freedom in which Dominicans can achieve their goals without fear of domination by an alien ideology.

Even when that framework is established, Dominicans and the nations of the hemisphere will still have to remain vigilant, for the Communists have served notice of their true intentions. Though they have been foiled for the present, they will not bow to that great force they pretend to honor, the popular will.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

HIGHER EDUCATION ACT OF 1965

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 9567) to strengthen the educational resources of our colleges