

## **Historic, archived document**

**Do not assume content reflects current scientific knowledge, policies, or practices.**



"The A3D, dimensionally twice the size of the F-111, has a usual launch weight of 73,000 pounds as flown off Viet Nam.

"Such launches are made with 'wind-over-deck' conditions of 30 to 35 knots. Returning to carriers, the A3D's weight is 50,000 to 55,000 pounds, and landing is carried out with 30 knot wind-over-deck conditions. Wind over deck is achieved by steaming the carrier at high speeds into the wind, or in cases of calm conditions, in the preferred direction.

*"Notes cargo bulk*

"Launch weights as guaranteed by Grumman and G. D. for F-111B's will be slightly under 70,000 pounds. This weight will permit carrying six Phoenix missiles, and mission fuels allowing 500-mile direct flight [standoff] from the carrier, three hours on patrol, return fuel, and heavy landing reserves.

"Typical landing weight of the B series 'will be under 55,000 pounds,' engineers have stated in guaranteed-performance data submitted to the navy for the test program due to begin at Patuxent River, Md.

"Some of the early navy skepticism about the F-111 arose from the 'desired weights' as provided by pre-development data. This was for an interceptor with an empty weight of no more than 37,500 pounds, and a maximum gross of 55,000 pounds. Desired stand-off distance was 750 miles, with three hours loiter and returning reserves.

"Engineers told the Tribune that putting six Phoenix missiles [the full load], two TF-30 jet engines as used in the F-111s, two pilots, and the loitering fuel into one package made the navy's 'desired' weight figures unrealistic and unachievable. Actual empty weight of the F-111B's offered for navy approval will be about 42,000 pounds, three tons more than the hoped-for original request.

"G.D. engineers report that the production B's will have 9 per cent more lift capability than was expected, and a more favorable weight-power ratio than initially planned. Approach speeds, even for the heavier planes already flying, are 110 knots [125 miles an hour], much less than anticipated.

*"Energy limits equal*

"Stopping the demonstrated B's will require about the same energy absorption by deck arresting gear as would the desired lighter plane, which would have had faster approach and touchdown speeds.

"In launch, the B, at an actual weight of 21 tons, can fly in minus-9 knot winds. This means they can be launched down-wind from anchor or 'dead-in-the-water' conditions. They can be accepted for landing at 10 knots, wind velocity often found at sea, even with the carrier halted.

"Air force F-111A's will have increased lift, have solved engine troubles, and gained performance because of work for the B's. The A's will carry more on take-offs [because they are not deck or catapult limited], and also normally will make lighter landings. The air force normally will not be bringing back ordnance, and air force fuel reserves are less stringent than the navy's.

"Early in the program, the tactical air force demanded inclusion of Vulcan rapid-fire 20-millimeter cannons as part of the armament system. All 111s including B's, have provisions for a Vulcan so the gun can be included with four Phoenix missiles, or it can be deleted and six missiles carried.

"There has been no earlier disclosure that the gun is part of the weapons systems, but G.D. spokesmen today said this is the case. The Vulcan is an air-to-air weapon with the latest computing sight for deflection shooting.

*"Confident of O.K.*

"The entire developmental program for the F-111s has come along almost exactly as predicted, and Grumman and G.D. officials be-

lieve the navy and air force will accept their respective models without reservations once the test work is completed.

"Improvements in the Pratt & Whitney TF-30 engines used in the F-111s are assuring better fuel economics in cruise and loiter operations than hoped for by the defense department or the manufacturer. The improvements probably will not improve the top speed of 1,660 miles an hour.

"Under defense department contracts, the F-111B's, even with restricted weight, were to be capable of cruising 200 miles from their carriers, then loitering on station as a combat air patrol for three hours. F-111s have flown subsonically for up to five hours without refueling, approximating the carrier range requirement in less efficient earlier models.

[From the Dayton Daily News, Aug. 5, 1966]

"TFX ARGUMENTS NOT NEW, PROJECT OFFICER CLAIMS—SUCCESS MAKES DISTRESS, ASD DEPUTY CONTENTS

"(By Jack Jones, Daily News staff writer)

"It's time somebody from Wright field spoke up,' the local boss of the nation's F-111 swing-wing fighter plane project declared today as the news wires carried reports from New York and Washington about renewed controversy over the TFX.

"Maj. Gen. John L. 'Zeke' Zoeckler, Aeronautical Systems division deputy commander for the F-111, said he's tired of hearing that the plane is overweight, that costs are up, that it's running behind schedule, and so forth.

"They're the same old arguments; there's nothing new in them, and in some cases they're not true.

"It looks to me like an attempt to justify a position taken in the past—a position that current data no longer support.

"It looks to me like some people are distressed that we've been successful,' he said.

"Word of renewed controversy over the TFX (Tactical Fighter Experimental) or F-111 came as Sen. JOHN L. McCLELLAN (D-Ark.) chairman of the Senate permanent investigating subcommittee said in Washington he planned to make a statement about the TFX, or F-111, on the Senate floor next week.

"During 1963 McCLELLAN's subcommittee heard more than 2,700 pages of testimony, filling 10 volumes, on the merits of the TFX and the award of the contract to General Dynamics Corp., over the Boeing Co. The committee, however, never issued a report.

"McCLELLAN's statement renewed speculation that he may reopen the hearings on the controversial warplane, especially on the overweight Navy version known as the F-111B.

"Zoeckler conceded that the first three F-111B prototypes were over weight but he said the Super Weight Improvement program had resulted in cutting 4,000 pounds out of the plane's empty weight.

"This still leaves the plane about 3,500 or 4,000 pounds heavier than original specifications, Zoeckler admitted.

"But let's put this into perspective,' he said.

"There have been other improvements, such as high lift devices on the wings, that more than offset the weight penalty, he declared. He said that overall performance, except in terms of ceiling, will be as good or better than the original specifications called for.

"Weight of itself doesn't mean much,' the head of the ASD F-111 System Program Office said.

"What the Navy is interested in is performance—the wind over the deck required for takeoff.

"While specifications call for the Air Force version, to land and take off in 3,000 feet of runway, Zoeckler said they've been landing consistently in less than 2,000 feet and

taking off in less than 3,000 feet even with jet engines producing less thrust than will be available in production models."

**STIMULATION OF MORTGAGE CREDIT FOR FEDERAL HOUSING ADMINISTRATION AND VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION ASSISTED RESIDENTIAL CONSTRUCTION**

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 3688) to stimulate the flow of mortgage credit for Federal Housing Administration and Veterans' Administration assisted residential construction, which was to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That section 304(b) of the National Housing Act is amended by striking out "ten times the sum" and inserting in lieu thereof "fifteen times the sum".

SEC. 2. (a) The second sentence of section 303(d) of the National Housing Act is amended by striking out "\$115,000,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "\$225,000,000".

(b) The second sentence of section 303(e) of such Act is amended by striking out "\$115,000,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "\$225,000,000".

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments to S. 3688, and agree to the request of the House for a conference thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Senators SPARKMAN, DOUGLAS, PROXMIER, WILLIAMS of New Jersey, MUSKIE, LONG of Missouri, MCINTYRE, TOWER, BENNETT, and HICKENLOOPER as conferees on the part of the Senate.

**URBAN MASS TRANSPORTATION ACT OF 1964**

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 3700) to amend the Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1964 which was, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That this Act may be cited as the "Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1966".

SEC. 2. The first sentence of section 4(b) of the Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1964 is amended by striking out "and \$150,000,000 for fiscal year 1967" and inserting in lieu thereof "\$150,000,000 for fiscal year 1967; and \$150,000,000 for fiscal year 1968".

SEC. 3. Section 6(b) of the Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1964 is amended by striking out "and to \$30,000,000 on July 1, 1966" and inserting in lieu thereof "to \$30,000,000 on July 1, 1966, to \$40,000,000 on July 1, 1967, and to \$50,000,000 on July 1, 1968".

SEC. 4. The Secretary of Housing and Urban Development shall, in consultation with the Secretary of Commerce, undertake a study to prepare a program of research, development, and demonstration of new systems of urban transportation that will carry people and goods within metropolitan areas speedily, safely, without polluting the air, and in a manner that will contribute to sound city planning. The program shall (1) concern itself with all aspects of new systems of urban transportation for metropolitan areas of various sizes, including technological, financial, economic, governmental, and social aspects; (2) take into account the most advanced available technologies and

materials; and (3) provide national leadership to efforts of States, localities, private industry, universities, and foundations. The Secretary shall report his findings and recommendations to the President, for submission to the Congress, as rapidly as possible and in any event not later than eighteen months after the date of enactment of this Act. There are authorized to be appropriated such amounts as may be necessary for its preparation.

SEC. 5. (a) The Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1964 (as amended by this Act) is further amended—

(1) by redesignating sections 9 through 12 as sections 10 through 13, respectively; and  
(2) by inserting after section 8 the following new section:

"GRANTS FOR TECHNICAL STUDIES

"SEC. 9. The Secretary is authorized to make grants to States and local public bodies and agencies thereof for the planning, engineering, and designing of urban mass transportation projects, and for other technical studies, to be included, or proposed to be included, in a program (completed or under active preparation) for a unified or officially coordinated urban transportation system as a part of the comprehensively planned development of the urban area. Activities assisted under this section may include (1) studies relating to management, operations, capital requirements, and economic feasibility; (2) preparation of engineering and architectural surveys, plans, and specifications; and (3) other similar or related activities preliminary to and in preparation for the construction, acquisition, or improved operation of mass transportation systems, facilities, and equipment. A grant under this section shall be made in accordance with criteria established by the Secretary and shall not exceed two-thirds of the cost of carrying out the activities for which the grant is made."

(b) Section 3(c) of such Act is amended by striking out "section 10(c)" and inserting in lieu thereof "section 11(c)".

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments to S. 3700 and agree to the request of the House for a conference, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Senators SPARKMAN, DOUGLAS, PROXMIER, WILLIAMS of New Jersey, MUSKIE, LONG of Missouri, McINTYRE, TOWER, BENNETT, and HICKENLOOPER as conferees on the part of the Senate.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS, 1967

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 15941) making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is time yielded back on the amendment offered by the Senator from Arkansas?

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia yield 1 minute to me on the McClellan amendment?

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. I yield.

Mr. STENNIS. I merely wish to say that as I understood the Senator from Arkansas—if I may have his attention—as far as I was concerned, his amendment would be an expression of our determination not to buy the plane. Mr. President, if that is the way it is presented, as a member of the Committee on Armed Services, I do not wish to be a

party to spending money on research and development for a plane that we are determined not to buy; and furthermore, as a matter of policy, I do not think we should get into that decisionmaking phase of the matter, if that is the intent of the amendment.

Mr. McCLELLAN. The Senator misunderstood me. I said not to buy it out of money provided in this bill.

I said I hope they can develop it, and we may buy it. This is not a final determination. I do not intend it as such. I do not think this is the time to make a final determination.

I only wish to protect the money in this bill. Let them proceed with the development and build the plane, and make a wonderful plane out of it. Then we can appropriate the money to buy it.

Mr. STENNIS. Then this would represent merely a determination that no money appropriated in this bill shall be spent for research and development of that particular plane; is that correct?

Mr. McCLELLAN. That is correct.

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is time yielded back on the amendment?

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. Has the amendment offered by the Senator from Arkansas been agreed to?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment has not been agreed to.

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Texas.

Mr. TOWER. I simply wish the Senator from Arkansas to state for the Record that his amendment does not inhibit, in any way, continued research and development in an attempt to refine this aircraft for Navy use.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I have said so repeatedly, and the chairman of the committee has said so repeatedly.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Do the Senators yield back the remainder of their time on the amendment of the Senator from Arkansas?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia. I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time having been yielded back, the question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Arkansas.

The amendment was agreed to.

REGULATION OF TRANSPORTATION, SALE, AND HANDLING OF DOGS AND CATS FOR RESEARCH—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 13881) to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to regulate the transportation, sale, and handling of dogs and cats intended to be used for purposes of research or experimentation, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The

report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the report.

(For conference report, see House proceedings of Aug. 11, 1966, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, pp. 18276-18278.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I shall make a brief statement regarding the conference itself because this bill aroused a great deal of interest in the country and in Congress.

It is my pleasure to report that the House and Senate conferees have agreed upon a substitute H.R. 13881, and the House has acted favorably on the conference report.

The substitute bill agreed upon by the conference is a landmark measure in the field of animal welfare legislation. Its existence is owed to a public aroused by exposés of pet stealing operations supplying many of the animals used in medical research. Thousands of letters have been received by Members of Congress demanding action. This legislation is the answer to those demands.

The bill has two major objectives:

First. To control and regulate the transportation and sale of dogs and cats in order to prevent the use of stolen pets in medical research; and

Second. To provide humane care and treatment for those animals which are destined for use in medical research.

It is important to note, however, that these noble objectives have been achieved without impairing our vital and necessary medical research programs. Regulation by the Secretary of Agriculture is limited to nonresearch conditions.

There were two major differences between the House and Senate version:

First. The House measure failed to provide for the establishment and regulation of humane standards within the research facility and

Second. The House version was limited to dogs and cats while the Senate bill also reached monkeys, guinea pigs, hamsters and rabbits.

In resolving the first of these differences, the managers for the House agreed to include research facility regulation in the bill and the managers for the Senate agreed to strengthen this provision by permitting the Secretary of Agriculture to issue cease-and-desist orders with a civil penalty for violation of such an order.

The second major difference, an extension of coverage to more than dogs and cats, was resolved in favor of the Senate version. However, only the dog or cat dealer will be licensed under H.R. 13881, as agreed to by the Senate and House managers.

Before describing the bill in detail, let me pay deep and sincere tribute to the House members who worked on this measure, particularly to the sponsor of H.R. 13881, Representative W. R. (Bob) POAGE. It was his wise leadership which has enabled us to take this great step forward in humane animal care. Tribute must be paid as well to the Senior Senator from the State of Oklahoma [Mr.

MONRONEY], whose concern with the care many animals receive within the research facility made possible the inclusion of research facilities in this legislation.

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] sponsored one of the first bills in the Senate. He was of immeasurable help to us in the hearings.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a summary of the conference substitute.

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

#### SUMMARY OF THE CONFERENCE SUBSTITUTE

The Conference substitute contains the following major provisions:

The Secretary of Agriculture will issue licenses to dealers who buy and sell dogs or cats in commerce. These license fees are to be reasonable and equitable with the Secretary considering the types and nature of the operation to be licensed. Research facilities will be required to register with the Secretary of Agriculture but will not be required to be licensed.

Dealers and research facilities will be required to keep and retain records of their purchase, sale, transportation, identification, and previous ownership of dogs and cats.

In addition, identification of dogs and cats will be required.

One of the most important provisions of the bill is the requirement that the Secretary establish standards to govern the humane handling, care, treatment, and transportation of animals by both dealers and research facilities. These standards are to include minimum requirements with respect to the housing, feeding, watering, sanitation, ventilation, shelter from extremes of weather and temperature, separation by species, and adequate veterinary care. However, the Secretary is not to set any standards with respect to actual research or experimentation by a research facility as determined by the Research facility itself. These standards would also apply to department, agencies, and instrumentalities, of the United States which have laboratory animal facilities.

Because several departments already are concerned with animal welfare in research or experiments, the Secretary is to consult and cooperate with departments or agencies when establishing humane standards.

Inspections by the Secretary to see that dealers and research facilities are not violating any provisions of this legislation or any regulations established thereunder are made mandatory. The Secretary would also establish regulations which would permit inspectors to confiscate or destroy in a humane manner any animal found to be suffering as a result of a violation of the legislation or any regulation if animals are held by a dealer or a research facility and are no longer required for research.

The Secretary will also be required to issue rules and regulations requiring dealers and research facilities to permit inspection of their animals and records at reasonable hours upon the request of legally constituted law enforcement agencies in search of lost animals. However, such regulations are not to be construed as authorizing interference with research or experimentation by a research facility.

In order to fully control the movement of dogs or cats destined for use in research facilities so as to preclude the use of stolen pets, research facilities and federal agencies will, as a general rule, be required to purchase dogs or cats only from persons holding valid licenses as dealers. However, there are two exceptions to this rule. First, under section three is language which is intended to permit farmers to sell dogs or cats directly to research facilities without acquiring a li-

cence. This exemption is limited to the sale of dogs or cats which were bred and raised on the exempted person's premises. If a farmer purchases a dog or cat, he cannot sell it to a dealer or research facility without first obtaining a license as a dealer.

Second, state, county, or municipal pounds or their duly authorized agents are not persons under the Act and therefore would not be required to purchase a license before supplying dogs or cats to research facilities. This is also intended to include non-profit organizations which contract with a city or county to act as the city or county's pound.

Dealers who violate the Act or regulations issued thereunder are subject to license suspensions or revocations and violations of the Act can also mean a \$1,000 fine and a year in jail.

Research facilities violating the Act or regulations can be ordered to cease and desist by the Secretary. Failure to obey a cease and desist order will subject the facility to a \$500 civil penalty and each day such failure continues will be deemed a separate offense.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, the Senator from Oklahoma may want to say something on this matter. He handled many of the knotty problems in the conference.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I wish to express my appreciation to the leadership in the passage of this bill and to the chairman, the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] for his assistance in the conference.

I believe the bill carries into law the best provisions of both the House and Senate versions. The provisions for licensing of the dealers, for requirements regarding sales, and for the prevention of the theft of dogs for sale, and for research institutions had been rather effectively established by the House of Representatives, but the bill lacked the provision for adequate humane care, or, in fact, for any control at all over the humane care of animals in the laboratory institutions.

I believe that, by careful work and compromise, we have the strongest provisions that we could enact at this time.

I am very grateful to all those who had a part in helping to obtain passage of this measure.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I join with the Senator from Washington in paying tribute to all those who took part in this endeavor.

Mr. President, H.R. 13881 seeks an end to the growing practice of pet stealing for research purposes, and while the coverage of H.R. 13881 does extend somewhat into the research facility, it does not deal comprehensively with all the complex problems of treatment of laboratory animals.

In passing H.R. 13881, Congress has only begun its work of providing humane treatment for research animals. That a more comprehensive solution acceptable to the scientific community is possible is evidenced by my bill, S. 3218, which I introduced at the request of the New York State Society for Medical Research. This very fine and dedicated medical society sees the need for comprehensive protection for laboratory animals, not only out of ethical consideration for the laboratory animals that are suffering for us, but also for the sake of producing better results from research. Animals

housed and cared for humanely throughout the sojourn in the laboratory and spared avoidable pain, fear, and suffering, are better biological models and produce better research results.

My bill provides for such care throughout; it provides for proper use of anesthesia where anesthesia can be used; it insures the proper use of postoperative pain relieving drugs. It is a comprehensive solution to the laboratory animal problem, one which fulfills our ethical responsibilities by insuring that laboratory animals are housed and cared for humanely and spared avoidable pain, fear, and suffering.

Therefore, Mr. President, I urge that the Congress finish its work by enacting comprehensive laboratory animal legislation.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, we could suggest the names of many other Senators who have a deep interest in this subject other than the Senators who have been named.

The Senator from New York is one of those who has urged the passage of such a measure for a long time.

We thought that a separate Senate bill which provided for the actual research problems within the research facilities would be a better approach to the problem. I am very hopeful that the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare will report the Senator's bill. The Senator will get the support of the Senator from Washington, the Senator from Oklahoma, and other Senators. That bill would add to the whole objective. We could then really do something about this very serious problem of animal welfare which we have in the United States.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I am very grateful to my colleague.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I move that the conference report be agreed to.

The report was agreed to.

#### ALLIANCE FOR PROGRESS

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, in assessing the Alliance for Progress after 5 years, it is necessary that we point out some of its inadequacies along with its accomplishments, so that the lessons learned can be put to good use by all the participating nations in charting, if possible, a more appropriate course for this cooperative venture in the coming years.

Where has it fallen short?

It has not yet effectively touched the life of a large majority of the people of Latin America.

It has not developed into a cohesive political doctrine that could become a strong motivating force for rapid but evolutionary change.

It has still not become a fully cooperative venture in the sense that the basic control over the disposition of Alliance funds still rests in the hands of the U.S. Government, although CIAP and IA/ECOSOC are gaining in importance with this field.

It has yet to make a significant impact in such key areas as housing, food production, and population control.

Despite the Alliance for Progress since 1961, 11 military coups have taken

place—3 in the Dominican Republic, 2 in Argentina, 1 in Peru, 1 in Guatemala, 1 in Ecuador, 1 in Honduras, 1 in Brazil, and 1 in Bolivia.

What has it achieved?

It has prevented widespread dissatisfaction with social injustice and slow economic growth from turning into violent, leftist Latin America-wide revolution.

It has resulted in improved economic planning and achieved the start of agricultural and tax reforms.

It has made reform respectable.

It has aided the decline of Castroism as a major political force.

It has helped to replace military dictatorships in the Dominican Republic, Peru, Guatemala, Ecuador with legitimate civil government.

What are the principal lessons it taught us?

It has taught us that no single program even as generous and highly motivated as the Alliance for Progress can be the complete answer to the deeprooted and manifold problems of a continent.

It is clear now that the Alliance for Progress must continue to provide external support for the reforms and modernization that can be carried out only if the Latin American governments and peoples want it badly enough.

It is also clear that every advance under the Alliance creates new needs and requirements which will necessitate a substantial increase in the flow of funds from the United States and other industrialized nations to Latin America.

Several other steps seem to be highly desirable if the accelerated economic growth and social reform objectives set out in the Charter of Punta del Este are to be achieved in our lifetime: First, a Latin American common market and multinational projects of infrastructure; second, closer cooperation with and greater involvement of the private sector in the attainment of economic and social objectives; third, improved inter-American communications; fourth, top-level political leadership in the implementation of these measures.

Latin American Presidents have shown interest in convening a summit conference of hemisphere Presidents this year. I approve such a conference and hope it will be held. Certainly the fifth anniversary of the Alliance for Progress should be a good occasion—for the leaders of the hemisphere to face some of the basic problems facing the South American Continent on the basis of the lessons taught by the past 5 years at such a summit conference.

Mr. President, one extremely hopeful sign has just occurred, and that is a meeting at the summit of the Presidents of five Latin American countries, three Presidents being present, and two being represented, which has just resolved to take the most historic advance so far known to this hemisphere—an effort to organize a Latin American common market. I commend them highly for this action. I have very ardently cooperated before, and I shall continue to cooperate, in the effort to bring about what I believe to be the greatest single advance which can be made in the affairs of Latin

America—to wit, to convert the Latin American Free Trade Association into a common market.

Mr. President, the other three critical problems which they face in the second half of the Alliance for Progress are: food production, housing, and population control.

Food production: Latin America will face a major food crisis within a decade, for while food production rose 16 percent in the last 5 years, it barely kept pace with population growth. As a result, Latin American countries have to spend millions of dollars on food imports each year in addition to millions of dollars worth of food provided by the United States under food for peace. In comparison to what is needed, the \$112 million in loans and grants extended through U.S. aid for food and agricultural development in fiscal year 1965, the \$111 million spent by the IADB and the funds devoted by Latin American governments to speed agricultural development are, of course welcome, but not adequate. This suggests the need, first, to give top priority to agricultural development in the Alliance for Progress; second, for the early implementation of President Johnson's proposal for a common market for the production and marketing of fertilizers, pesticides, and other products required to increase agricultural production; and, third, for Latin American governments to take the internal steps—in such areas as infrastructure, investment reforms, credit—that will create a rate of food production that will fully satisfy Latin America's consumption needs.

Housing: According to the estimates of the Inter-American Development Bank, the total housing deficit in Latin America today is between 15 and 19 million housing units, and 1.5 million units at a cost of \$4.5 billion must be built each year just to meet the needs of new families. In contrast not more than 400,000 to 500,000 new housing units are now being built. The total investment in housing, by Latin American governments and by the Alianza since 1961 has been about \$1 billion.

The \$900 million now available to the Fund for Special Operation to finance social development projects by the IADB should, in part, be made available to develop new institutions such as cooperatives and savings and loan associations to finance additional housing of all types. U.S. private investment should now take full advantage of the broadening of our Latin American housing guarantee program which makes possible \$400 million in new investment in housing and in credit institutions that finance housing. New housing legislation enacted in 1965 will also enable savings and loan associations in the United States to invest up to 1 percent of their assets—as much as \$1.2 billion—in housing for Latin America, over and above the housing financed by 122 savings and loan associations already established in Latin America.

I would also like to see the Congress of the United States establish an International Home Loan Bank, a private institution, to channel additional "seed

capital" from the U.S. savings and loan associations to similar institutions in Latin America and other developing nations as yet another way to help Latin America in its effort to create adequate housing for its people.

Population control: The population of Latin America will increase from the present 220 million to 600 million by the year 2000 at the current rate, and this alone could wipe out all other economic and social gains.

The principal effort in this area must be made only by the Latin American governments themselves. There must be a decision and soon that the best knowledge available anywhere will be brought to bear on this problem if the gains made in the past 5 years are to be preserved and pressed forward in a meaningful way. I readily admit that the support provided by my own country in this area has been very limited—\$800,000 in the last fiscal year—1965. This year it may rise to \$2 million. As indicated in President Johnson's recent message to Congress on international health earlier this year, we are prepared to do more.

Mr. President, any discussion of the 5-year record of the Alliance for Progress must go beyond an examination of its effect on the rate of social and economic progress to a consideration of the political and military stability of Latin America. In the long run it had been hoped that the economic development and social progress of Latin America would enrich the lives, increase the security, and contribute to the political stability of the people of the Americas. The record of the past 5 years shows that we have far to go in this respect.

Indeed, the military and political aspects of American life have not kept pace with the social and economic aspects. The basic problem still confronting the American states is how to deal with political instability resulting from the overthrow of democratic governments by the Communists or by the ultraright.

The problem of Communist subversion on a large scale while extremely vital is relatively new to this hemisphere, whereas a rapid turnover of governments and the seizure of power by dictators—often military has been a feature of the Latin American scene for decades. It is the concurrence of these two factors, in the current economic and social atmosphere, which now threatens Central and South America with even more governmental upheavals.

Eleven military coups have occurred in Latin America since the beginning of 1961. It may be argued very convincingly that not all of these takeovers were necessarily undesirable. But it may be argued with equal persuasiveness that, however transitional may be the entry of the military into the political affairs of some Latin American countries, in their totality these coups are a manifestation of continued political instability which has become increasingly damaging to Latin America's development and should therefore inspire great hemispheric concern. The real danger lies in the continued erosion of the hope and faith of the people in the viability of