

trators, the National Safe Boating Association, the National Safety Council, the Outboard Boating Club of America, the U.S. Power Squadrons, the Yacht Safety Bureau, and the Young Men's Christian Association. To all of these organizations safety in pleasure boating is as important as it is to the individual and his family.

To all those national and local committees actively participating in National Safe Boating Week, I extend my congratulations. I urge all others interested in boating safety to join in making this an even more effective National Safe Boating Week than the successful ones in the past.

OUR POLICY IN VIETNAM

(Mr. ALBERT asked and was given permission to address the House for 5 minutes and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, the use of terror against innocent persons is condemned by this country and by all civilized people. Although there is no proof that Sergeant Bennett was executed as claimed—he may well have been dead for months—the announcement of his having been executed in violation of human ethics is a blatant attempt to terrorize the American people. The bombing of a restaurant in Saigon is likewise an indication of the extent to which North Vietnam is going in order to impose its undesired rule in South Vietnam. As Secretary Rusk suggested last week, this is going to be a long monsoon season and there will be many casualties. We must be prepared for them, including assaults upon the innocent who are the stated targets of the Vietcong.

The Vietcong is strengthened by the direction and material support it receives from the Communist regime in Hanoi which now has infiltrated at least 40,000 men into the Republic of Vietnam. Recent intelligence reports confirm the presence of a minimum of one regular battalion of the North Vietnamese Army and there is now possibly a full division of North Vietnamese regulars in South Vietnam. This stepped-up activity has created an imbalance between the South Vietnamese Army and the Vietcong, with the result that the South Vietnamese people could not be provided sufficient security against Vietcong terror.

But these tactics will not cause us to weaken our resistance to the takeover of South Vietnam. Nor will they incite us to reprisals for acts of terror. We shall stand firm. There is no doubt that our air forces will continue to apply pressures and perhaps increased pressures, against North Vietnam against legitimate military targets. The choice of targets, forces the question of a naval quarantine, are military judgments to which our best experts are applying themselves. We might be justified in imposing a naval blockade or in extending our air strikes. But if we do undertake these steps, our decision will rest upon sound, rational military and poli-

tical judgments. We will not act in anger, or wantonly retaliate in the Communist manner against innocent civilian population centers. And we will act within the framework of the President's repeated assertion that we seek no wider war. The guidelines laid down by the President must be taken into account in deciding all questions of tactics and particularly whether to internationalize the effect of our naval operations by imposing any kind of blockade.

The United States and other allies have augmented the free world's strength in South Vietnam by furnishing combat troops who undertake carefully selected operations in certain zones so that the South Vietnamese Army is thereby better able to provide security for the populace. Our troops are engaging the Vietcong only in certain delineated situations such as base security by static defense or patrolling, or where Vietnamese forces are inadequate to accomplish a vital task. This is not a commitment to a massive land war, but rather the judicious employment of our forces in areas where our men and their firepower are most effective. Our objective is to deter aggression from Hanoi in two ways; first, by convincing her that the game is not worth the candle, and secondly, by convincing her that even increased infiltration and terror cannot snatch South Vietnam from its place in the ranks of independent nations.

The Government of South Vietnam continues to take casualties in order to stave off the vicious drive being mounted against their independence. Our troops are there to assist them and they are needed. Neither air nor naval power, necessary though they are, can totally replace these men. The fighting is going to be hard and we cannot hope for instant cessation of terrorist activities. The difficulty of the undertaking is outweighed by the profound significance of the issue. Our President has said that we stand ready to talk without any prior conditions—yet we will not yield and we will prevail.

RHODE ISLAND LITHUANIAN RESOLUTION

(Mr. FOGARTY (at the request of Mr. Hicks) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, just a short time ago it was my privilege to join in the commemoration of the 25th anniversary of the occupation of the Baltic States. At that time a number of us expressed our sentiment here on the floor of the U.S. House of Representatives. It was an attempt, Mr. Speaker, to bring to the attention of the world the sad plight of the freedom-loving Lithuanians, Latvians, and Estonians.

With this same purpose in mind I include in my remarks a resolution of the Providence chapter of the American Lithuanian Council of Providence, R.I., which was sent to me by the Rev. Vaclovas Martinkus, chairman, and John A. Stoskus, secretary of that organization.

PROVIDENCE CHAPTER, AMERICAN LITHUANIAN COUNCIL, Providence, R.I.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FOGARTY: Rhode Islanders of Lithuanian extraction gathered on June 20, 1965, at Saint Casimir's Auditorium in the city of Providence in solemn commemoration of the 25th anniversary of the occupation of Lithuania by Soviet Russia, unanimously passed the following resolution:

Whereas Soviet communism has demonstrated by principle and by act that its whole purpose is the domination of the world by the proletariat through the ruthless destruction and annihilation of all existing forms of government; and

Whereas the Soviet Union took Lithuania, Estonia, and Latvia by force of arms; and

Whereas Soviet communism is bent on only one purpose, its victory and experience has shown that the victory of Soviet communism means very concretely the enslavement of all other peoples; and

Whereas Soviet Russia has deported nearly 400,000 Lithuanian citizens to concentration camps in Siberia and other areas of Soviet Russia for slave labor and death; and

Whereas Lithuanians, Estonians, and Latvians sincerely desire, fight and die for their national independence and liberation; and

Whereas Lithuania has been for over 20 years unjustly subjugated by Soviet Russia which has to this date steadfastly refused to permit the people of Lithuania to hold free elections: Now be it

Resolved, That we thank the President of the United States, Members of the U.S. Senate, and Members of the U.S. House of Representatives for their many kindnesses shown the Lithuanian cause, which caused the free world to recall and keep in mind the atrocities committed upon Lithuania and other Baltic nations by Soviet Russia; and be it

Resolved, That our Government take immediate and concrete steps to compel Soviet Russia to leave the territory of Lithuania, to return free elections in Lithuania under the supervision of the United Nations; and be it further

Resolved, That the representatives of free Lithuania be given a full-fledged seat in the United Nations which would permit her to state her righteous case to the world.

Rev. VACLOVAS MARTINKUS,
Chairman.

JOHN A. STOSKUS,
Secretary.

(Mr. BINGHAM (at the request of Mr. Hicks) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

[Mr. BINGHAM'S remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

A WORTHWHILE HOUSING PROGRAM

(Mr. OTTINGER (at the request of Mr. Hicks) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, the legislation before us today—the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1965—is not perfect. No legislation is. But this is a good bill, containing many and it certainly deserves our support.

As a member of the Committee on Banking and Currency, I know how much time and bipartisan effort went into making this bill as good as it is. I

want to particularly commend the chairman of the committee [Mr. PATMAN], the chairman of the Subcommittee on Housing [Mr. BARRETT] and the ranking minority member of the committee [Mr. WIDNALL] for their leadership in working out an effective, comprehensive program.

There has been considerable controversy, both in and out of Congress, over section 101 of this bill, the rent subsidy provision. When this provision was discussed in committee, I voiced reservations about it, mainly because I felt at that time the legislation did not contain adequate safeguards against the subsidy program being applied too broadly. We just do not have money enough to subsidize housing for everyone in this country, and while I can support assistance to provide housing for the very poor, I did not think, with hundreds of thousands of impoverished people still in slum housing, we should go further.

In response to my reservations and those of other Congressmen, the administration has revised the bill so that now only those persons who qualify for public housing will be eligible for rent supplements. This satisfies my objections and make this section a very worthy experiment to better deal with the housing needs of the poor.

It is important to note that the present public housing program simply has failed to do the job of providing decent, safe and sanitary housing for American families afflicted with poverty. Today in the United States there are more than 3 million families living in substandard housing who have incomes too low for decent private housing in their communities.

In addition, there are more than 2 million elderly or handicapped lacking decent housing, and each year 80,000 families are displaced by some kind of Government action.

Since the public housing program started, only 580,000 units have been built. Today, 500,000 families are on waiting lists for public housing units. The rent supplement program gives us another tool to meet the need for housing without getting us into a federally operated housing program of incredible proportions. The rent supplement program enables us to meet the housing needs of low-income families through the private sector of the economy, and this is certainly a laudable approach.

Despite the fact that Westchester County, N.Y., which I represent, is one of the Nation's three most affluent counties on a per capita basis, for many years it has been confronted with the problem of slums and decay and poverty in the midst of gracious, attractive communities. The 1960 census revealed that 6.5 percent of the dwellings in the county, housing some 50,000 persons, were substandard. It also revealed an unfortunate connection between substandard housing, old housing, rental housing, nonwhite occupancy, and low income. In the three largest cities of Westchester—Yonkers, Mount Vernon, and New Rochelle—32 percent of the nonwhite rental units were classified as substandard and 7½ percent of the rental units occupied by whites were substandard.

Mr. Speaker, a program which provides housing that is privately sponsored, privately built, and privately financed under FHA will meet important needs in New York's 25th Congressional District, as I am sure it will in many areas of the Nation.

A vote for this program is a vote for breaking the vicious, continuing cycle of poverty in the world's richest nation.

THE NEW LOOK IN FOREIGN AID

(Mr. JOELSON (at the request of Mr. HICKS) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Speaker, one of the most persistent cries we hear about foreign aid is that it is always the same. We keep giving the same people the same huge amounts of money with the same lack of results. The program is fine in principle, but it needs a new look. We need some way to make those so and so's who administer it stop being so soft-hearted and do the job right.

These cries almost entirely ignore the significant changes in direction that the foreign aid program has made in the past. In 1948 the Marshall plan was created to assist in the reconstruction of Europe. In the 1950's the program changed to build up, largely with military aid and supporting assistance, free world defenses against direct aggression such as that in Korea. In the last few years the program has changed its focus again—to meet the long-term challenge of building nations that can stand on their own feet.

It is not surprising that these changes have gone unnoticed because so much of the public discussions of aid is so uninformative and because the changes are much more noticeable over a period of years than they are from year to year.

The important point, however, is that there is a new look to foreign aid. We are today devoting a much higher percentage of our funds and energies to the basic job of development than ever before and we are beginning to see the kind of results that make this kind of aid worthwhile. One significant indicator of this change in direction is that despite Vietnam we are today spending \$1 billion less for military and supporting assistance than we did in 1960 and 1961.

This is not the only change that has taken place in the past 3 years. Foreign aid today is better planned and better managed than it has ever been before.

Perhaps the most important single aspect of the new look in foreign aid is the emphasis on self-help. This is not just a slogan but a recognition of the practical fact that what a country does with its own resources has a greater impact on its development than what is done with the resources we are able to provide. These countries themselves provide \$6 toward development for every \$1 which we provide. In order to make as rapid progress as possible we have been paying more and more attention to the total economy of the country and using our aid in increasingly sophisticated ways to insure that the countries

themselves are doing the right things. Last year we used the leverage of our large program loans to Brazil, Chile, and Pakistan to secure commitments to needed basic reforms—in Pakistan to a free import system for raw materials for private industry, in Brazil and Chile to specific measures for holding down inflation. This emphasis on self-help is beginning to pay off and we expect to get better at it as time goes on.

The emphasis on self-help has lead directly to another new emphasis—concentration. Today more than ever before we are seeking to concentrate our aid—to concentrate it on the countries which are doing the most to help themselves and within those countries to concentrate our aid on the critical sectors. Two-thirds of all development assistance today goes to just seven countries.

Another important aspect of the new look in foreign aid is the emphasis now being made on private enterprise. The range of incentives to private enterprise, such as guarantees, loans, and other forms of assistance, is much broader than it was just a few years ago. This is perhaps seen most dramatically in the increasingly rapid rate at which specific risk investment guarantees are being issued. Last year—calendar 1964—AID issued \$707.8 million of these guarantees as opposed to just \$63.7 million in 1960.

In the past few years there has also been a significant increase in the amount of free world cooperation on aid matters. We have put a great deal of pressure on our allies to contribute more aid and to contribute their aid on better terms. We still have not done all we would like on this but have met with considerable success. We have taken the lead in increasing the resources directly administered by the World Bank, IDA, and similar institutions and in organizing the major international groups concerned with aid matters, the DAC, the Alliance for Progress, CIAP, the international consortia to coordinate aid to India and Pakistan, and elsewhere. All of these efforts are improving the effectiveness with which our aid and that of our allies is being used and we hope to be able to continue the leadership we have been supplying in this field.

The new look in AID also includes an increased emphasis on strict management. Better quality people are being sought through increased use of contracting out and through an upgrading of personnel. The total number of personnel has been reduced by nearly 1,100 in the past year. Significant cost reductions have been made in a number of areas. ICA and DLF procedures have been brought together and improved. And a significant amount of decentralization has been effected. There are still improvements to be made in this area. One which is being worked on now is an improvement in the management reporting system.

The new look also includes a number of measures taken in the past few years which reduce the cost of the program to the United States.

Today the program is more than two-thirds loans repayable in dollars as opposed to two-thirds grants in 1959. Last