

1963

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

18917

either High Contracting Party shall have given to the other notice of termination.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, the respective Plenipotentiaries have signed this Convention and have hereunto affixed their seals.

DONE in duplicate, in the English and Japanese languages, both texts being equally authentic, at Tokyo, this twenty-second day of March, one thousand nine hundred sixty-three.

For the United States of America:

EDWIN O. REISCHAUER [SEAL]

For Japan:

MASAYOSHI OHIRA [SEAL]

Protocol

At the time of signing the Consular Convention between the United States of America and Japan, the undersigned Plenipotentiaries, duly authorized by their respective Governments, have further agreed on the following provisions, which shall be considered integral parts of the aforesaid Convention:

1. Notwithstanding the provisions of Article 1, this Convention shall not apply to any area set forth in Article 3 of the Treaty of Peace with Japan signed at the city of San Francisco on September 8, 1951, as long as any such area has not been returned to Japanese jurisdiction.

2. The phrase "one or more persons acting on behalf of the sending state" referred to in Articles 7 and 12 includes, when the United States of America is the sending state, the Secretary of State, the Chief of the Diplomatic Mission in Japan, or any other officer of the United States of America acting on its behalf; but does not include any private individual or juridical entity.

3. Notwithstanding the provision of paragraph (5) of Article 2, the term "vessel" shall, for the purpose of paragraph (1) of Article 19, paragraphs (1), (2), (3) and (5) of Article 20 and paragraphs (1) and (4) of Article 21, be deemed to include:

(a) any vessel of the receiving state or any third country chartered on bare boat terms by a national or nationals of the sending state; and

(b) any vessel of the sending state except that chartered on bare boat terms by a national or nationals of the receiving state.

4. Without derogation of such rights and benefits as the sending state may have under international law with respect to diplomatic property, the provisions of Article 12 (except subparagraphs (b) and (c) of paragraph (1)) shall likewise apply with respect to immovable property owned or otherwise held or occupied by the sending state and used either for embassy purposes or for residences for one or more officers or employees of the embassy.

5. The term "members of his family forming part of his household" referred to in paragraph (6) of Article 11, paragraph (2) of Article 14 and paragraph (1) of Article 25 shall be understood to include only those persons residing in the receiving state who are substantially dependent upon the consular officer or employee for support.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, the respective Plenipotentiaries have signed this Protocol and have hereunto affixed their seals.

DONE in duplicate, in the English and Japanese languages, both texts being equally authentic, at Tokyo, this twenty-second day of March, one thousand nine hundred sixty-three.

For the United States of America:

EDWIN O. REISCHAUER.

For Japan:

MASAYOSHI OHIRA.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, on the basis of the information available to me, I point out to the Senate that these

protocols and conventions are noncontroversial. Explanations will be given on the morrow by the distinguished Chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT]. In view of the fact that these protocols and conventions will not be disposed of tonight, and also due to the fact that there will be a yea-and-nay vote on the question of agreeing to the resolutions of ratification, and also due to the fact that Senators will be given due notice, I ask unanimous consent—and the distinguished minority leader, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], joins me in this request—that the following protocols and conventions be considered and voted on en bloc; Executive Calendars No. 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, and 8—Executive D (88th Cong., 1st sess.); Executive E (87th Cong., 2d sess.); Executive F (87th Cong., 2d sess.); Executive E (88th Cong., 1st sess.); Executive B (88th Cong., 1st sess.); and Executive I (88th Cong., 1st sess.).

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

Mr. MANSFIELD. In addition, Mr. President, I ask that the yeas and nays be ordered on the question of agreeing, en bloc, to the resolutions of ratification of all these protocols and conventions.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, it is anticipated that tomorrow the Senate will take up the military construction bill. Following the disposition of that bill and any other measures on the calendar which are disposable, it is anticipated that the Senate will go over until Thursday, at which time whatever bills may be on the calendar will be considered. In addition, there will be memorial services for our late distinguished colleague, Senator Kefauver, of Tennessee.

It is anticipated that, if nothing unforeseen develops, at the conclusion of the remarks of Senators concerning the late Senator Kefauver, of Tennessee, the leadership will bring up the foreign aid bill. It is possible, time permitting, that the distinguished chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], will make his opening remarks on the bill that evening. But regardless of whether he makes his remarks then or later, it is anticipated—again, barring unforeseen developments—that from that day, Thursday, the Senate will go over until the following Monday, at which time the foreign aid bill will continue to be the business of the Senate. I assume that its consideration will require some time.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT TO NOON TOMORROW

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate concludes its session this afternoon, it adjourn until noon tomorrow.

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

SENATOR PASTORE AND CIVIL RIGHTS

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, the senior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE] has once again delivered an eloquent speech. This time, speaking before the Rhode Island affiliate of the American Civil Liberties Union, he has very briefly and forcefully summed up the urgent need for the pending civil rights legislation. This is a statement that should be read by all Americans—and was spoken by a man who has been a moving force in the Commerce Committee's consideration of the public accommodations section recently ordered reported by a vote of 14 to 3. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that Senator PASTORE's remarks be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the remarks were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

It is a privilege and a pleasure to be with you on this occasion of your annual meeting. October 20—it so happens—marks a most important milestone in our country's history.

At Philadelphia on this date in 1774 53 members of the First Continental Congress signed the report forming "The Association of American Colonies." The historian tells us that this deed and this day really signifies the birth of the American Nation.

John Adams wrote home that this was "a diversity of religions, educations, manners, interests such as it would have seemed impossible to unite in one line of conduct."

Two years later they showed that united conduct in the Declaration of Independence pledging their lives, their fortunes, and their sacred honor to a belief that all men are created free and equal.

A century ago the Emancipation Proclamation showed that we mean that all men are free and equal—and this year in our Senate Commerce Committee we took further steps to make sure that public accommodations are equal for all men.

All through the month of July and into August in Washington we held hearings to the amount of two volumes and 1,500 pages of testimony as we labored to secure emancipation from humiliation.

Is it so crucial to this Nation of ours whether a Negro can buy a cup of coffee in a corner drugstore? Is it a matter of grave concern whether a family, tired and worn from a day of travel, can purchase lodging for the night even though they be dark-skinned? I think it is. The issue is not merely whether a Negro can buy a cup of coffee, or secure lodging, but whether a nation founded on the concept of human rights and dignity of man can secure those rights for all its citizens. If we fall in the quest of human rights for all, then the very purpose for which this Nation exists is defeated.

If it is simply a matter of human rights—why are the people of this Nation so slow to deal with the problem? After all, nearly 200 years ago we declared that equality of man was self evident. We have built our Nation on this principle. A long and costly Civil War was fought to prove we meant to fulfill our promise of human rights for persons of every race and creed. And we have engaged in wars to preserve the right of people of other nations to enjoy our formula for dignity if they so choose. How, then, can a people more expert in the meaning of human rights than any people in the world

fail to recognize a deprivation of those rights in their own backyard?

Perhaps we have been so busy preserving the right of all nations to apply and enjoy our principles that we have neglected them ourselves. Rather like a doctor who is so busy treating others he neglects his own health. This would be a most sympathetic excuse if it were true.

We have found time for gold and sports cars, for mink stoles and suburbia, for martinis at lunch, for hula hoops and bridge games. How, then, could we have been too busy to insure the dignity of our fellow citizens?

I suppose it is to be expected that a proud people—such as we—are slow to admit, or even realize, we have not entirely succeeded in securing that principle so many thousands of our youth have died to protect.

Each day, however, more of our citizens are realizing that the dilemma prompting public accommodations legislation involves human rights and the dignity of man; and I am not dismayed that those who see the issue for what it is are none the less perplexed about how to correct the inequality now existing in our society. Perplexity is really a very valuable human trait. When one is perplexed or confused about how to proceed, he does not dismiss any reasonable solution without careful scrutiny. This is how to approach the subject of human rights. We cannot seek a fast "cure all" remedy for a problem so exceedingly complex.

We must endeavor to secure human rights while still preserving the ideals and principles of that system which demands such rights be secured.

I was privileged to chair the inquiry and deliberation involved in reaching the Commerce Committee decision on the public accommodations measure. As you may know, that bill is being reported out favorably for Senate action.

During the months of hearings and committee discussion on the bill, I was compelled to reexamine my thoughts on this matter many times in every day. Those whose positions I disagreed with were every bit as sincere as I in the quest to do what is just. There are honest differences of opinion about how to deal with this problem.

Yet I am convinced that we must have legislation of this type. I am convinced that human rights will be advanced by such action. All legislation involves a weighing and balancing of competing interests. The interest this bill serves far outweighs, in my mind, the arguments advanced against Federal public accommodations legislation.

It seems not at all unreasonable to require one holding himself out as willing to deal with the public for commercial gain to stick to his bargain, unless he has some reasonable grounds to withdraw his offer.

How can the color of a man's skin, or his religion be considered a reasonable ground for excluding a person from a benefit admittedly intended to be conferred upon the public?

I am not speaking of excluding a person because he is dirty, improperly attired, or of an unruly or boisterous nature. I am speaking of a respectable and well behaved person. If he is otherwise, then it seems entirely reasonable that the proprietor refuse him the services of his establishment. One should not be required to cater to those who conduct themselves in a manner that disrupts the business of an establishment, or offends members of the public who wish to deal with that establishment. Refuse such persons service regardless of the color of their skin . . . not because of the color of their skin.

However, those deserving of dignity should be treated with dignity. Color, religion, or national origin must not be the criteria by which we measure one's right to dignity. It must, rather, be measured by the way

that person conducts himself in relation to other members of society. This is the purpose of public accommodations legislation. This is also the requirement imposed upon us all if we intend to serve the cause of human rights and the dignity of man.

Much of the debate and controversy in regard to this bill has been devoted to issues other than the reasonableness or need of such legislation. There has been considerable concern over use of the commerce clause of the Constitution as a basis for legislation in aid of human rights. It is argued that use of the commerce clause for such a purpose is unconstitutional, and if this bill should be sustained on that basis, the result would be a complete distortion of the historical purpose and meaning of that clause. I do not share that concern.

This legislation would not, as some argue, open the door wide to regulation of every facet of our lives. Sustaining this legislation on the basis of the commerce clause would be entirely consistent with the history and interpretation of that clause through the years. In 1914 the U.S. Supreme Court held that the Federal Government could regulate purely intrastate rail rates because they affected interstate rail rates.

Innumerable subsequent decisions have advanced the proposition that Congress may constitutionally legislate with regard to so-called "local matters" if they affect interstate commerce.

Only establishments affecting interstate commerce are subject to the provisions of the public accommodations bill. There is, then, clearly no extension or distortion of the commerce clause. Nor does the fact that the bill has a purpose in addition to protecting and fostering interstate commerce detract from its validity. The Supreme Court has said that: "The motive and purpose of a regulation of interstate commerce are matters for the legislative judgment upon the exercise of which the Constitution places no restriction and over which the courts are given no control."

Regulation of commerce has been the means to serve many purposes. Congress has used this power to discourage various practices deemed undesirable. The commerce clause served as a vehicle to make the transporting of women across State lines for immoral purposes a Federal crime. Congress has strictly regulated the transportation of liquor. Illegal gambling is deterred by commercial clause legislation requiring those in the business of taking wagers pay a tax and disclose their names and addresses. In the area of civil rights Congress has used its commerce powers to combat bombing of schools or religious structures by making the transportation of explosives in interstate commerce for such purpose a Federal crime.

The Supreme Court has already ruled that Congress has authority to prevent racial discrimination in interstate commerce. The Interstate Commerce Act forbids discrimination in interstate commerce common carriers, and grants all persons, regardless of their race or color, a right to be served in restaurants within the carrier terminal. The Supreme Court sustained this as a valid and proper exercise of the commerce clause power.

It seems clear that Congress may regulate that which affects interstate commerce for any reason that seems just and necessary to Congress. I feel that the public accommodations measure is necessary. It usurps no freedom or liberty of the individual. It is intended to preserve and promote the liberties of all.

But there is more to human rights than buying a cup of coffee—or seeing a movie—or securing a lodging. There is the right to compete with your fellowman. Do we all have that opportunity now? Not really. It is hard to compete if you do not have the education modern society requires to excel in any field. The Negro does not have that

now. There must be a two-pronged attack on this problem. We must encourage the education process by ending discrimination in public schools—and at the same time we must be willing to utilize the skills of the educated Negro. Labor unions and the professions, business and trade associations must not deny membership on account of race, color, religion, or national origin.

We must always preserve the concept that ability, desire, decency, and honest perseverance are the necessary prerequisites of those who would command respect and dignity. The labor union owes nothing to a man who is not willing to work and apply his faculties in a productive manner. Nor am I interested in permitting a man to practice law or medicine when he is not competent—whether he be black or white. But there must be no discrimination beyond character, competence, and conduct.

Those who practice such discrimination must come to realize that they are harming themselves by this action. Denying human rights to others creates a serious weakness in our social system. By denying to the Negro his human rights we pave the way for someone to deprive others of their rights. We are involved in a struggle not merely to secure equal rights for nonwhites. It is an effort to secure human rights for each and every one of us.

In that far-off year of 1774 at the start of the First Continental Congress, it was thought there could be no opening prayer because of the diversity of religions. But upon motion of the Puritan Sam Adams a local Episcopalian minister was called and gave the prayer.

There was the beginning of our national unity. There was the beginning of tolerance.

As we mean to perpetuate this country of our opportunities, let us resolve to perpetuate that tolerance. It is a resolution that we make naturally in this community of Roger Williams. It is a resolution that we take as Americans—that, under God, ours may forever be the land of the equal and the home of the free.

U.S. MILITARY OFFICERS IN VIETNAM

Mrs. SMITH. Mr. President, in recent weeks we have read of derogatory remarks made about U.S. military officers in Vietnam.

To those who would impugn the motives of such officers and who seek to deprecate them back here in the United States while they are risking, and giving, their lives for the cause of freedom on the other side of the world, I would call attention to the case of Naval Lt. Wesley Hoch, of Rockland, Maine—son of one of my very best friends in Maine, Mrs. Ruth Hoch.

What young Lieutenant Hoch is so heroically doing in South Vietnam has been related by Orville Schell in the Boston Sunday Globe of October 20, 1963. I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Schell's piece be placed in the body of the RECORD at this point because it is a thundering answer to those who seek to discredit our military officers in South Vietnam.

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

A LEGEND IN REMOTE SEAS: MAINE NAVY LIEUTENANT LEADS VIET JUNKS

(By Orville Schell)

ANTOI, VIETNAM.—On a remote island off the tip of southern Vietnam, a Navy lieutenant from Rockland, Maine, lives an almost squalid life among Vietnamese who

man junks in patrols along the swampy, treacherous delta coastline of the Ca Mau Peninsula.

The junks stop and search craft that might be secretly bringing arms and supplies to Communist guerrillas in the area.

In his sea-sprayed New England twang, Lt. Wesley Hoch, barefoot and dressed in a baggy black tunic that is the uniform of junkmen, sounds peculiarly out of place standing at the door of the structure that is his district headquarters. Before him, out in the harbor beyond the barbed wire, is part of his fleet—a motley collection of junks.

Hoch is as much at home with the Vietnamese as if he were born in one of the small grass roof shacks that make up the village out of which he operates.

RARE RAPPORT

He has a rare rapport with the junkmen, with whom he works. They, in turn, are devoted to him.

For Dai Wei Hoch (their name for him) is one of them—24 hours a day.

He wants no escape to separate quarters, clean restrooms, Western food, military clubs, and air-conditioned rooms when 5 o'clock rolls around.

Unlike so many other American advisers in Vietnam, Hoch lives, sleeps, eats and fights 24 hours a day, every day, with his junkmen. He refuses to accept any privilege for himself that he cannot give his men. He says he hates to see stuff sit in Saigon warehouses rotting when his men are cold at night, wet during the day, undernourished and manning junks that are short of arms.

He has been known, when making one of his rare trips to Saigon, to drive a borrowed truck up to a warehouse during lunch hour and just start loading things into it—as if he owned the place. In this way he brings precious things to people fighting a war with empty stomachs and hardly a shirt on their backs.

The first thing he did when he arrived at Antoi, a small fishing village on the island of Pho Quoc, was to rip the sign off his door that said Cam Vao (do not enter). He runs an austere mobile force that fights the Vietcong guerrillas on their own terms. He does not want a large-scale, super-organized force that would sacrifice the comradeship of his smaller group of men who can live off the land and trust one another.

In the life of Lt. Wesley Hoch—in a war most Americans forget—there is no time for the beer runs and the endless movies that keep most other American advisers entertained at night. There is no hot water heater that will be transported at the expense of something more necessary to the people or the war.

He says that one has to give everything or nothing at all, or one will fail. This is the creed he lives by.

PRICE ON HEAD

The result: His men respect him. And the enemy has placed a 500,000 piastre bounty (about \$7,000) on his head.

When not out on patrol, Hoch lives in the sparse remains of a garrison building the French vacated. Two rickety double-decker bunks junkmen share with him (depending on who gets tired first), a gas ice box filled with medicine and a few squash or melons are the only furnishings. The kitchen consists of a tub of water.

On the wall, several .45 automatics and a rack of M1 rifles and clips complete the scene. The "Antoi Hilton," as Hoch calls his quarters, sits close to the beach looking to a number of tropical islands in the distance. Behind his small compound sits the village of Antoi.

And behind the village, a hill rises. Almost every other night the Vietcong muster on the hill after dark and launch an at-

tack. During the day the Vietcong are too wary to attack.

When at the base he does anything from writing reports to requesting more equipment to distributing whatever he has managed to beg, borrow or otherwise appropriate from what he calls the "air conditioned empire" of Saigon. Other days are spent trying to get damaged junks back into working order.

For a week, Hoch will put to sea in one of his patrol junks to check posts up and down the coast. He takes no special rations for himself. Instead, he brings paper, pencils, books, shoes, medical supplies, and food to the people who live in the forgotten backwaters of this embattled nation.

If the men catch no fish on their long sea journeys, he goes hungry with them; if the mosquitoes are biting, he is fair game. If the area is dangerous, he shares in the danger.

He is a strange mixture of soldier, sailor, dentist, mechanic, linguist (he speaks a fractured Vietnamese), doctor and teacher. He claims to have no special proficiency in any of these things, but maintains that anything that one can do as an amateur is better than sitting around doing nothing at all.

BEYOND CALL

Most of the small coastal villages to which he goes are dirty, poverty-stricken areas accessible only by sea. What is more, they are infested with the enemy.

Hoch runs his junk force in a way that is seldom found in the impersonality and coldness of the war here in Vietnam. He is a man who has been presented the job of building an effective junk patrol force for the Navy. He has done this, but he has not stopped there.

Hoch has a private theory, that if one will only sacrifice a little more, share a little more the dirty work with the people about whom the war is being fought—then it will be won a lot sooner.

To him, this does not mean going on a dangerous mission and then returning with relief to the comfort of Saigon, leaving the men who were being advised behind in the mud.

The war, for him, is not like holding your nose for a brief moment through a bad smell.

He is in it the whole time and asks no exceptions because he is an American.

This rare dedication has one visible side effect among the sincere and grateful Vietnamese: To them, Dai Wei Hoch already is a living legend.

LIEUTENANT HOCH, MARITIME GRADUATE

Lt. Wesley A. Hoch, 31, is the son of Mrs. Ruth Hoch of Glen Cove, Rockland, Maine, and the late Raymond Hoch. He is single.

He was graduated from Rockland High School in 1950 and the Maritime Academy with honors in 1953, with a B.S. in marine science. He went to sea for a year in the maritime service before joining the Navy.

He served with the Navy in the installation of the DEW (distant early warning) line before his assignment to the Republic of Vietnam as an adviser to its junk fleet in December 1962.

He has two brothers, David, superintendent of the Rockland-Rockport Lime Co., and William, a student at the University of Maine.

ART BUCHWALD

Mrs. SMITH. Mr. President, the art of satire is truly rare. Many aspire to be satirists but few make the grade. I speak specifically of satire that is genuinely delightful in its good-natured humor and not of that all too prevalent type of satire that is sadistic and petty and seeks to make someone or something the target of negative and cruel ridicule.

Satire is doubly delightful when it combines defense of the underdog with good-natured humor—when it praises with wit that which has been heretofore riddled with ridicule.

Art Buchwald is such a satirist. He is in a class by himself and other would-be satirists would do well to emulate him. His most recent piece is easily one of the best things of its kind ever. I like it because he defends that underdog that practically all of us at one time or another have maligned and picked to pieces—the TV commercial.

Because I feel that his article of October 20, 1963, is delightful reading and will bring smiles, laughs, and a refreshing contrast to the less pleasant side of life, I ask unanimous consent that it be placed in the body of the RECORD at this point and I invite the attention of all Members to it.

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

COMMERCIAL ADDICT: MORE TIME TO DRINK BEER THAN ANYBODY (By Art Buchwald)

There has been a great deal of talk lately about the number of commercials on television. The Federal Communications Commission Chairman, William Henry, has complained, as have the viewers, who, for some reason, think they have rights.

We happen to be one of those who think there aren't enough commercials on TV. After watching what the new television season has to offer we have decided we'd rather watch commercials. But every time we tune in one we discover it's interrupted by a program. Some of the commercials would make wonderful shows if there weren't so many programs scheduled on the air.

For example, we always get terribly frustrated when we see a young woman and a young man lolling on the grass with the breeze blowing in their hair. Suddenly the man lights up a cigarette and then places it in the girl's mouth. She puffs deeply as he looks into her eyes. You get the feeling they understand each other, but before anything happens, we're switched back to Chet Huntley complaining about something happening in the United Nations.

A few weeks ago we were watching a wonderful scene of a plane following a beautiful girl in her car down the highway. The plane landed and the pilot got out and went up to the girl and asked her the name of her car. "It's a Dodge, of course," she said. But before she could ask the pilot what kind of plane he was flying, the commercial was interrupted by a stupid world series game and they never did get gack to the couple.

It's the same with the toothpaste commercials. We happen to enjoy toothpaste commercials, particularly the ones that tell you how half the school used a certain kind of toothpaste and half the school didn't. Its revealed that the half that used the special toothpaste had far less cavities than the half that didn't.

But they never show you the half that didn't get to use the special toothpaste. We'd be interested to know how they felt about being given the wrong toothpaste. Surely the parents must have been furious to have to pay for all those cavities. Perhaps the kids with fewer cavities had their teeth knocked out by the kids who were forced to go to the dentist.

But nobody knows, because just when the commercial gets interesting somebody like Ben Casey or Perry Mason comes on the screen and spoils the show.

It's the same with headache commercials. Some kid is screaming and the teacher shouts at him.

"Control yourself," her subconscious tells her, so she takes a couple of pills and pretty soon she's smiling again. So far, so good. But we'd like to see how she made it up to the kid. Maybe she gave him an A. Maybe she let him go home from school. Maybe she slipped him a couple of pills. But you never find out.

Then there are the deodorant advertisements. A girl complains to her girl friend that no one ever takes her out on dates. The friend whispers the name of a deodorant in the girl's ear. Sure enough, in the next scene she's dancing at the prom. Will the guy ask her to marry him? Will he ask her the name of the deodorant? Will he ask her the name of her girl friend? Nobody knows.

We guess the most maddening commercials are the ones for soap. We see a beautiful girl getting into a shower. She starts sudsing herself up real good and tells you how wonderful the soap feels on her skin. You wait patiently for her to rinse herself off and step out of the shower. Wouldn't anybody? But just at the moment when the shower door opens, you find yourself staring at "Wagon Train" and some dirty old ranch hand eating beans with his fingers.

These are only a few examples of how television is cheating the audiences out of good commercials. If we were the Chairman of the FCC, we'd do away with television programs and just let them broadcast commercials. There is more plot, more substance, and better writing in one detergent ad than in most of the stuff they show on the air.

HERBERT H. LEHMAN VILLAGE

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I was pleased to hear recently of the dedication of an important New York City public housing project in honor of one of America's great public servants, my friend, the distinguished former member of this body, Senator Herbert H. Lehman.

On the occasion of the dedication of the Herbert H. Lehman Village, the Honorable Robert F. Wagner, mayor of the city of New York, made an address in which he not only dedicated the village in Senator Lehman's honor, but also presented to Senator Lehman the Gold Medal of Honor of New York.

Joining with Mayor Wagner in the ceremony was Manhattan Borough President Edward R. Dudley.

I know that my colleagues share with me deep pride in this latest honor to a former colleague who continues to hold our admiration and affection.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, to have printed in the Record at this point the remarks of Mayor Robert F. Wagner and of Edward R. Dudley on Wednesday, September 11, 1963, in New York City.

There being no objection, the remarks were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

REMARKS OF MAYOR ROBERT F. WAGNER

Today, in the name and praise of a beloved New Yorker, we dedicated the increase of our city's supply of decent, modern home facilities by 622 new units.

We call them units, but each unit is for a family and is a family, it is a man and his wife, in the case of elderly couples—and in this village there are 83 specially designed apartments for elderly couples. The rest of the units are for regular families: for small families, middle-size families, and big fami-

lies, for Negro families, Puerto Rican families, Italian, Greek, Jewish—in short, for American families, for New York families.

The families that will live in this village will be distinguished by one common characteristic: they will be families whose overall incomes are low. They will be families needing the help which government can and must provide, to make homes available, at rents they can afford.

The Herbert H. Lehman Village is called a "village" because it is a village, a community, with a school on the site and others nearby, with its own community facilities and services, a community that will become part of a neighborhood that is part of our city.

New York City is proud of what we have been able to do here with the indispensable help of the Federal Government and its Housing Administration, the head of which is here today, a man President Kennedy picked right out of my administration, a very distinguished American, Bob Weaver, of New York City.

The 622 units in Herbert H. Lehman Village are part of the 120,600 units of low-income families which we in New York City have already completed, to date, in the 26 years the low-income housing program has been in operation. Last year alone we completed 3,226 apartments in this category, housing 13,455 individuals. In the past 9 years, we have built 53,000 public housing apartments for low-income families.

Today the New York City Housing Authority is the beneficent landlord for half a million New Yorkers.

In the past 5 years, we have been moving ahead to eliminate slum conditions. We have also built many new schools, new streets, new hospitals and many other public improvements requiring the relocation of low-income families. Many of these low-income families can find adequate shelter only in public housing. Today our need for low-income housing is greater than ever before. Today, public housing for low-income families holds the main key to our urban renewal programs. But at this very moment, we are at the end of our Federal allocations. The State government has actually been holding back on us. I am determined to fight as hard as I know how—for all the authority and money that is needed—Federal and State—for more public housing for low-income families, and, in general, for more housing opportunities for low-income families, housing that will be integrated, housing that will provide sound home conditions for the raising of families and the building of that healthy family life that is the basis of a sound city.

Of course, today it gives me special pleasure—indeed, it is a great privilege—for me, for the housing authority, and for the city of New York to give this village the name of Herbert Lehman.

Herbert Lehman has become not only a legend in his own time but to represent a noble tradition—a tradition of public integrity, of pure and unswerving purpose, of zealous dedication to high principle, and finally of a generous and modest humanitarianism.

Herbert Lehman represents all these values and more. He represents them because he practices them, because he embodies them.

The tradition of Herbert Lehman in public and political life is one of the chief treasures of our city, State and country—as precious as any I can think of—because that tradition is a standard by which other public men and women are and will be measured in the future. Herbert Lehman's life is an invitation to greatness on the part of others still to come, in generations yet to come.

This is why I am so greatly pleased with the naming of this development after Governor Lehman. To the extent that his valiant spirit may affect and inspire the

people living here, this neighborhood as well as the city will benefit.

The life of Herbert Lehman has been one of devotion to the welfare of people, especially underprivileged people.

He has been not only a friend of the underprivileged but their fighting champion.

I know how proud he must feel to have this development in this neighborhood bear his name.

In the name of the people of the city of New York and of the government of the city of New York, I now declare the Herbert H. Lehman Village to be formally and officially dedicated and named.

Now I have an additional privilege. It is a surprise—a secret that I have been keeping for almost 6 months now—since March 28, which was Governor Lehman's birthday. That day, March 28, I proclaimed as Herbert Lehman Day—one of the few occasions in which a day has been proclaimed in honor of a living, a very much living, New Yorker.

In honor of that day, I gave an order which is finally going to be carried out today. I ordered that New York City's Gold Medal of Honor, usually reserved for visiting sovereigns, kings, and presidents, be awarded to Governor Lehman. Today I present to you, Herbert Lehman, the Gold Medal of Honor of the city of New York for all the many great works and generous acts you have performed during all the fruitful years of your life, for the people of this city of ours.

It is my proud privilege now to introduce to this audience for a brief response the patron of this development, former Governor, former Senator, the Honorable Herbert H. Lehman.

REMARKS BY EDWARD R. DUDLEY, PRESIDENT, BOROUGH OF MANHATTAN

This is an appropriate occasion to acknowledge a debt and express a feeling of gratitude to Herbert Lehman.

Our form of government is not a static concept, like a rock that has been carefully hewn and placed in a perfect vacuum.

It is organic. It changes and expands in scope to meet changing conditions and to serve better the needs of those governed. This elasticity of our Constitution is a major hallmark of the genius of the Founding Fathers who wrote it.

But the Constitution itself is not a self-changing document. It must be implemented by men. And, in a manner reminiscent of Lincoln and Franklin D. Roosevelt, Herbert Lehman dedicated much of his life to fighting social inertia and making our form of government reflect the aspirations and meet the needs of our people.

I do not pretend to know why this man, born into a family of substantial means, devoted the last ounce of his enormous energy to an all-out crusade for the common man.

Perhaps the reason is that the small man's greatest need is to have a big man speak and fight in his behalf * * * and God provides.

Perhaps the light that illuminates men with greatness shines into all homes, irrespective of race, creed, national origin, or economic status and only too infrequently finds a man who can reflect the warmth of its rays.

This much I do know. Herbert Lehman reached for the stars in his unending campaign to improve the lot of the common man whether he was acting as philanthropist, administrator of great humane enterprises, or as the holder of office of great public trust.

He demonstrated a soaring, almost poetic, view—in all his activities of the role America should play in promoting domestic tranquillity and in exercising international leadership for peace and freedom. And he implemented that vision with remarkable industry, courage, and adherence to principle.