

UNITED SERVICE FOR NEW AMERICANS

Address

of

SENATOR HUMPHREY

January ¹⁷ 18, 1953

Reported by

The State Law Reporting Company

30 VESEY STREET

NEW YORK

UNITED SERVICE FOR NEW AMERICANS

Address

of

SENATOR HUMPHREY

January 17, 1953

Thank you. Thank you very much. ^{Bride} Mrs. Breadeau, Reverend Clergy, Mr. Bregman, Mr. Bieringer, Mr. Rosenwald and distinguished guests and any friends and neighbors of America that are fortunate enough to be at this wonderful banquet tonight.

Mrs. Breadeau, first of all I want to know who sent you that biographical sketch. If anyone did from my office, they'll be immediately dismissed without even the opportunity of a polite hearing. Discriminatory and very definite action will be taken. While I am a pill pusher of a sort, may I say my work is really in the work of political science. I just took pills for the peoples' ills. (laughter) I think I can use a few tonight.

I must make a word of apology because some of you, I think, are not accustomed to my kind of speaking, which is not always the most slow and I can say not even temperate.

Today, while my spirits are good, my body is weak. I have been wrestling around with a slight touch of the grippe. Just before I came here I proceeded to give myself some self medication which, I hope, will tide me through as the principal department is running short. But, if I have looked a little distressed I want to assure those at the head table,

it isn't because of the company I have been keeping, I have just been struggling with this slight fever and slight cold and I'm having my fair share of difficulty from keeping those eyes of mine from dripping all over the place. But, I think my subject will give me new spirits to tide me through for as one of the nation's generals once said when he was going into battle "the flesh is weak but the spirit is strong." May I say to the Reverend Clergy, "the flesh is weak but the spirit is strong."

This is a wonderful occasion. I came here because I knew that it was a great endeavor on the part of great people. I want to pay tribute to the United Services for New Americans. I want to thank you as one person in the government and just as a plain ordinary American citizen for all that you have done to give happiness to so many people -- to give people the opportunity to see what this country symbolizes. You ought to feel good, your heart ought to be rejoicing and your spirit ought to be at all times high. I say that despite the fact that there are many difficult and dark days ahead of us. The challenge of the times ought to give you more vigor. These serene moments, if you have ever had one, are rather dull. It is, we think, more difficult to test the mettle of institutions and people within those

4

institutions and believe me, ladies and gentlemen, you're going to have that opportunity to test that mettle.

I'm not a pessimist. I'll never be a pessimist about America. I shall never be pessimistic about democracy. I have always been one that believes the greatest attribute anybody can have is faith -- strong faith -- and you do have faith. I have faith in the resilience of our people, in their genuine goodness and compassion in their sense of fair play and I have great faith in these eternal institutions and the principles of democracy because democracy comes from the people and the peoples' God and I tell you we'll not be defeated! Our good works will continue, even if they do not progress as readily as you and I want.

The year 1952 was an eventful one in many ways. Of course, in the field of politics it was extremely eventful. I am looking forward to all of the festivities that are about to take place in Washington. I'm looking forward to them despite the fact that I was on the losing end of the election. The results make no difference to me. I'm just a typical American -- I go to every festive occasion that I can find and I'm going to enjoy it. I'm going with no anger, no bitterness and no jealousy, just in the spirit of the occasion and in all sincerity I am going to wish well and

and pray for our new president when he takes that office (applause). I pray that he may manifest, may well determine the future course of this nation; rather than to be critical, rather than to be filled with any sense of bitterness or sadness. Those of you that may have had different views, may I suggest that we dispose of them and that we wish the best and give the benefit of our advice and counsel to those who will guide the destiny of this nation.

I said 1952 was a very eventful and difficult year. In 1952 the Displaced Persons Act came to an end. I regretted that in the sense that it was such a wonderful program and there are men here tonight who can testify to that because they were so much a part of it. As has been pointed out by Mr. Beringer, it did represent some of the finest qualities of the American spirit and I know that it brought us great good will all over the world. And, I would remind this audience that the late Wendell Wilkie talked to us about this reservoir of good will; and, our beloved and late president talked to us about the policy known as "Good Neighbor Policy." We need to think in those terms again, the reservoir of good will that we need to build up, in our own people at home, as well as abroad, not this terrible disease of fear -- insensible fear -- which seems to grip us about

that wholesome, healthy attitude of good will, good will to all; and, the idea of the good neighbor, not the suspicious neighbor, not the jealous neighbor but the good neighbor. If I ever wanted to reach back into history to those two great phrases, from two great men, the reservoir of good will and the good neighbor policy, you couldn't do better.

But, 1952 saw something else. Not only the great world wide problems that confronted us every day of our lives and may I say that no one knows what the answer to those problems will be, except that I'll say, as I said to the President of the United States, President Truman, that we'll win out, we're bound to, and I resent the fact that there are people in America tonight who have fears that we'll not win out. Of course we shall win. It's inconceivable to think that decency and humanity and democracy would lose. If you talk of the lose, if you get your mind in the framework of losing you have already conceded defeat. I am not one to give up. There's no room for pall mall retreat but there's plenty of room for steadfast work and constant progress.

1952 saw, however, the enactment of what we call "The Immigration and Naturalization Act of 1952", commonly referred to as the McCarran-Walter Act. I shall refer to it

tonight in those terms and may I say lest I be misunderstood, I am not here in the spirit of personal criticism. I'm here as a member of the United States Senate. I try to conduct myself with a sense of good manners. Good manners is very important in this day and age and people are losing them and I think we could very well adopt them as part of our personal policy; so, what I say is in the substance of policy, it's in the terms of issues, not in the terms of personalities. I'm not here to rebuke individuals as such but I'm here to state my position on basic legislation before our country and to state it as frankly and honestly as I can. Now, I don't claim to have all the wise knowledge or complete information. I'm a bit of a novice at process of legislation. I'm one of the youngsters in the United States Senate and I'm glad of it. It gives me so much time to learn. I have the edge -- that is I hope I'll have that much time to learn (laughter). One never knows these days.

Just let me review for you, just a moment, what you already know but education is essentially saturation and repetition (laughter). Very few people learn anything the first time. That's why we make so many of the same mistakes over and over again; and, even remembering the good it is

important to repeat.

Following World War II, President Truman gave us what is known as the Truman Directive which did give a helping hand to those oppressed by the tyrant.

Then you'll remember 1948, the first Displaced Persons Act, which carried within some discriminatory features and then it was amended and revised in 1950 and 1951. This was the good. This was the positive. We at least had almost seven years of forward progress and I would have thought that out of those seven years we would have received such a sense of inspiration and that we would have moved on in this way shocks me.

I come from the great State of Minnesota and in that state we have all religious faiths. We have a little United Nations in my office in Washington. I have a map in the front office that shows the ethnic groups -- that shows the cultural groups of our state and it's just like the U.N. We're a cosmopolitan people. We have a variety of people, cultures, faiths and nationalities and we live together in peace and harmony; and, I would have thought that out of experience in 48 such states that we have would have received the interrogation that we needed, not to give us restricted legislation, but to have given us liberalized

legislation. I would have thought that we would refer to some of these wonderful quotations that we see in this very splendidly prepared booklet that all of you have received tonight. And, how I wish we would have paid attentions to the bipartisan philosophy that is there and that universal philosophy the spirit of George Washington and Abraham Lincoln and I just love that Lincoln statement. What a wonderful man -- truly magnificent. I saw one of his portraits -- I think I should tell you that early this morning, Mrs. Humphrey, the children and myself and my administrative assistant, his wife and children went over to pay a visit to President Truman and then the President was kind enough to see that we shown around the more or less secluded parts of the White House and we had a wonderful, wonderful visit with the great President with a great philosophy. But here was a great President too and I saw his portrait, the one that Todd Lincoln said looked the most like his father. Abraham Lincoln saw an immigration which in the past had added so much to the wealth, resources and increase of power to this nation -- the asylum of the oppressed. All nations should be fostered and encouraged by a liberal and just policy. If we had just had that on the walls of the Senate, if it had been on every desk and if it had been literally

burned into the minds and hearts of each one of us we wouldn't have been here tonight, discussing what we're going to discuss -- what we're going to discuss and what you are going to talk about tomorrow.

I say, how paradoxical it seems that after seven years of wonderful experience, seven years of enriching american life, seven years of displaced persons coming to the United States, seven years of refugees coming here and finding a home and making a home and contributing to our health and our wealth and our cultural advances.

What happens in the Congress when we let it happen. It didn't just happen in Congress, people let it happen. Congress is a representative institution. Despite these great advances we saw retrogression. We turned back a page -- a chapter -- several chapters. We went into darkness rather than into light.

It was in May, then, of last year when the United States Senate was debating the McCarran Immigration Bill, that I received a very interesting letter that I want to talk to you about tonight, from some very wonderful old Americans out my way. Who supported my stand against the Bill? They wanted to know -- wanted me to know that in opposing Senator McCarran's Bill -- they had no personal axe to grind. Now,

here is what my old friends had to say to me:

" . . . We are not immediately threatened by laws to stop immigration and to deport men and women born abroad." They said, "some times we wish we had established such a law in 1492." The letter was signed by five American Indian leaders (laughter).

Now, I think that these words can be a good reminder to all of us who can trace our ancestry to the Mayflower -- whether we are sons or daughters of the American Revolution, or whether we stepped ashore in 1900, in 1925 or in 1945. That in the historical perspective of this nation we are all new Americans. I can talk like this and I don't say this with any bursting pride but with just a matter of fact. I can talk like this because American -- my fathers folks came to this Country in 1689 -- they were in the revolution. I could say that I was a Son of the Revolution; but my mothers folks and my mother came to this land in about 1894. She came here from Norway and I visited her native home just last year, Christenson, Norway and yet I'm sorry to say if I had to wait until now for my mother I doubt if she's ever made it. Not only that, but knowing my grandfather and how freedom loving he was and how downright individualistic he was, I'm sure he would never have tolerated, for a moment, the

questionnaires, the crossexaminations, the personal inquiries to which he would have been put and I say with some justifiable family pride that had not grandfather come to America, America would have been the poorer off because of his failure not to arrive.

So you see, all of us came as refugees from the old world, seeing a new opportunity, a new land in America and, I hope and trust that all of us have made our contribution to the development of this Country.

Now, you know ever since the creation of this wonderful Republic there have been some people whose position on immigration can be summed up like this: "thank God we are here but now let's bolt the door." Now, you in this room who have dedicated yourselves to that task of helping the newest Americans intergrade themselves in our communities, have fortunately taken a different stand. You haven't wanted to bolt the door. You've wanted to keep the door open. Let me philosophize with you a moment. Whenever a nation closes its doors, it starts to close its heart and when a nation closes its heart it closes its mind then Hitler destroys its life. At least a free nation and I think it can be applied universally to all nations. And, I regret to say that in America we are seeing these strange

sequences, the logical development of some of our old weaknesses and sicknesses -- sicknesses that bring us here tonight. We have started to close the doors of America and have started to close the heart of America and by the simple logic of the Trinity we are closing the mind of America and attached young, free thinking, freedom of thought and even attached upon freedom to worship. These are the bi-products of closing the gates of this great political refuge -- this great America that has stood with outstretched arms and open heart to the world.

When the McCarran Bill was before the Judiciary Committee you authorized Judge Rifkin to testify on your behalf against it. I might say that his statement and analysis was of great help to those of us having had no previous experience with the intricacies of the immigration law. It was a great help when we were suddenly faced with the job of studying Senator McCarran's 302 page bill.

Now if you want to know one of the reasons, just listen to that arithmetic, 302 pages of the most intricate kind of legislative language, cross references, piece-meal language and referring to the code. It was impossible to read it and understand it without weeks of very careful study.

More recently the President's Immigration Commission --

I have the report with me, I didn't just carry in the briefcase. I have been reading it and studying it. That Immigration Commission held its hearings and it was our own National President, my friend here, Mr. Walter Bieringer, who presented a courageous forward looking program to the Commission which was excellently supplemented by the statement of Judge Leventhal. These great men left no doubt that the United Services for New Americans was not in favor of bolting the door! They made it perfectly clear that they wanted the door of America to be opened and they indicated by that very thought that they wanted the heart of America to be opened.

Now there is one further observation which I would like to make in this connection. I know that in your activity in behalf of more democratic and humane immigration legislation you're acting very selfishly and not thinking primarily of your own. And, I say this because you know and I know there are relatively few Jewish people left in Europe desiring to come to these shores. I am well aware, of course, of the unfortunate fact that most of the people to whom you would have wanted to extend a helping hand. People kept out of this country in the 30s by the "National ~~Origins~~ ^{Origins} principal are not dead-- the victims of the most

horrible crime against humanity. The whispering campaign of the bigots that the fight against the McCarran Bill is a jewish fight, designed to bring in more jews is therefore, unpatently true and unjustifiably as are all similar smear campaigns. I was very sorry and I say tonight in the spirit of apology for the Congress of the United States, sorry and shocked to see such a campaign reach the floor of the Congress in recent days.

Now most of the people of Europe who survived the Hitlerism are resettled either in Israel or elsewhere. There are still some jewish displaced persons left in Europe and there are some in the 30s who found refuge in the near east or in the far east. There is always the ever present danger to jewish community in Arabic Countries. Yet, as the analysis for Mr. Bieringer pointed out, as he submitted it to the presidential commission: the world populations problems are of much more gigantic proportion. They involve many other ethnic and religious groups. From Mr. Bieringer's analysis I would gather that at the time he prepared his table not more than three persons of the people who studied the major population problems which he listed, were of jewish origin. Until a few weeks ago all of us had thought that the problem of resettling jewish survivors was

on the way to a solution. Your participation in the fight for better immigration legislation was, thus, unquestionably motivated by the broadest altruistic consideration. Now, what hardly any of us clearly anticipated during the fight against the McCarran Bill was the sudden stepping up of officially sponsored antisemitism in the Soviet Sphere.

This is a fact. It's a fact which should have been known for better than a year, which some of us knew even two years ago.

I was relating tonight to my dinner partners an experience that I had not long ago at Atlantic City, when the Israeli Foreign Minister was in this country. I had received information at the beginning of the antisemitic movement in the iron curtain countries and it was inevitable tyranny must find scape goats. Tyrants must brutalize some people. They brutalized millions upon millions of those of their so called "own ethnic group." Now they turn to others. That evening that I spent in Atlantic City, the Israeli Foreign Minister got a hold of me and literally begged me not to give the speech that I had prepared to give because that night I was charging the Soviet Union with outright antisemitic programs in an effort to again bolster up their vicious regime. If you recall, the State of Israel

has been trying to obtain from the iron curtain countries such as Romania, Bulgaria, Albania and Hungary, hundreds of thousands of people of jewish background to take them to Israel and they were afraid the doors would be slammed tight and just make that much more difficult. So, as a Senator and as a friend of the people of Israel, I said I shall through that speech in the wastepaper basket; and, before the eyes of the Foreign Minister of Israel I tore it up and all copies thereto and proceeded to talk about something else even though that was what I wanted to talk about that evening.

So I go back to what is now a fact. As of today, we know, there is a new movement -- a tragic one because the means of escape, believe me, are limited. We still don't know how far this ruthless group in the kremlin will go. But, we must face the brutal fact that if it will serve their purposes the men responsible for ^{Katyn} ~~Katyn~~ will not bat an eyelash at creating another ^{Auschwitz} ~~Auschwitz~~ or another mass massacre. It is not inconceivable, therefore, that the number of jews among escapees from beyond the iron curtain will suddenly increase in the near future. Now it is to enable us to cope with sudden emergencies of this nature -- and we are going to be faced with these emergencies. We

are living in that kind of a world and to help us make our contribution to the solution of world problems that we oppose and the present commission oppose and I speak for myself, I oppose the rigid, discriminating, "National or Gains" Principal.

We know, of course, that the United States standing alone can not solve all of the world ills. As good and as kind as we want to be, as friendly and compassionate as we would like to be. Let's face it! We alone cannot save all of humanity nor can we take care of all of the ills of the world. We know, however, that in order to preserve the stability of our complex economic system we must limit immigration in accordance with our ability to absorb. But, we know, much more can be done.

Now I place this qualifying phrase in my remarks tonight because I am well aware of the capacity of some to misinterpret, not in this room but elsewhere. I am not here saying unlimited immigration. I'm not here saying the gates open to any and all, regardless of background. I'm saying, however, that much more can be done.

I have heard the Senior Senator from Nevada, at least a dozen times, accuse those of us who opposed his bill of trying to raise the flood gates of America. He accused us

of many things. He accused us of being communists, pinks, socialists and every other thing that you could think of. That's not unusual, I have become quite accustomed to that. As happens so very often, the Senator was here again carried away by the sound of his favorite voice. If he had ever read our Bill and I refer now to the so called Lehman-Humphrey or Humphrey-Lehman Bill. I'd rather put Senator Lehman ahead because he is far ahead of me. He would have found that aside from placing parents of citizens and a few other special groups in the known quota category we would have raised quota immigration by the amount from 150,000 to 250,000 annually.

To express it differently, we would increase the immigration ratio from one immigrant per year for one thousand Americans to one immigrant for every six hundred Americans. Now I have a great deal of difficulty, ladies and gentlemen, trying to visualize how one alien immigrant can inundate six hundred Americans -- well fed may I say too well established Americans.

I was happy to note that our position was vindicated, recently, in the testimony before the President's Commission. Your own organization suggested an increase in quota immigration to 300,000 annually. The Secretary of Labor declared

that according to studies undertaken by his department, we can absorb several hundred thousand immigrants every year without placing any burden on our economy. The Secretary of Agriculture, a former Acting Director of the Bureau of Census, and I give you others: the late Philip Murray of the C.I.O., Boris Suzhkin of the A.F.L., and many others took a similar position and I would remind this audience that this is one of the first times that organized labor have ever taken the position of greatly expanded immigration. And yet, they did, before the President's Commission and in support of our bill the Humphrey-Lehman or Lehman-Humphrey Bill in the Senate.

Now the Commission's recommendation was an increase in quota immigration to 250,000. So may I say for my dearly beloved colleague, that great man from this State, Senator Lehman, that if we did what Senator McGarran said we did, just pull that figure out of the air, the thin air -- it wasn't so thin in the Senate, it was getting a little thick at about that time-- if we pulled that figure out of that thin or thick air, we surely were lucky because we pulled out the same figure which the President's Commission came up with after weeks and months of study of this problem all over the United States of America. Now we didn't pull any

figure out of thin air. We were trying to be moderate and conservative in our estimates and yet, at the same time, be reasonable and compassionate.

You may wonder just how far the other side -- just how the other side of this question justifies its stand against this weight of authority and they still do. Look, don't think you have changed their minds. Not at all. The answer can be found in September Report 1515 in the 81st Congress which Senator McGarran had printed back in 1950. That report which expresses many of the ideas upon which the Senator's Bill was founded, cited, with approval, the view "the economy optimum population of the United States is at least several million less than the present population and may be as low as one hundred million."

So you see that the philosophy of Senator McGarran and his followers just seems to go back 150 years to the teaching of Malthus and Ricardo. Good grief, I use to teach those courses. I taught the economy of Malthus and Ricardo, not as a matter of fact but as a matter of economic theory; and yet, this philosophy goes back to the economies and political economies -- Malthus and Ricardo, to the idea of fixed number of jobs and the suggestion that the population must be limited if available economic resources are to satisfy

everyone. With all due respect to the distinguished economic theory, it has been somewhat disproved in the age of technology and science of which you and I are a part of.

I used to have my office in the fourth floor of the United States Senate Office Building -- got down to the first floor. I don't know how but I got down there. It has no reference to your ability or to your seniority; and I remember that fourth floor office because in one corner up there they put in a temporary office and in that temporary office I use to see a beehive of activity. Many, Many clerks working day and night-- mail bag after mail bag of Senate reports, documents and hearings going out. And, one day I couldn't resist any longer so I just sort of sneaked back around there and I went in to see what was there and I'll tell you what I saw. I saw hundreds of thousands of copies of the report that I am talking to you about tonight, that were being sent out all over the United States of America. Hundreds of thousands of copies of hearings and summaries of hearings being sent out all over the United States of America and I'll tell this audience, tonight, that what happened in May and June of 1952, in the passage of the McCarran-Walter Immigration Act was not something that happened overnight. It was the result of 2,3,4 years of

concerted drive and effort. Just as of this very hour hundreds of pamphlets have gone out to every legion, every Veterans of Foreign War, every patriotic group in America. Undergo the flanking privileges of the Congress and may I say, tonight, and I hope I am quoted "in violation of the law of this land -- in open violation of the flanking privileges of the United States Senator. Hundreds upon thousands of them -- carloads of reprinted material from the magazine of questionable value and philosophy carrying the message that the only people that are against the McCarran Immigration Act are the communists, the "Daily Worker", Senator Lehman and Senator Humphrey. Well, I'm here to protest as I shall all over this land because my patriotism is not to be contested by any colleague of mine in or out of the Senate; and, believe me, the loyalty and patriotism of the distinguished Senator from this State is not to be contested. And I'm proud of the fact that I have found myself, at times, the recipient of the abuse of the totalitarianism, both of the right and of the left. I welcome that kind of abuse and I welcome that kind of criticism.

Now, let me go back to this population problem. Against the pessimism of Senator McCarran's neo-malthusian, we asserted and when I say we I mean those of us in this room,

those of us who fought against this bill -- we assert our faith in the limitless opportunities of our great democracy -- democratic society.

You know, I have come across a lot of people who say, "Oh, the birthrate is too high." Well, there's nothing better than a little family and some of these old folks that have got dispeptic attitudes on life would be a whole lot better off if they had a few little ones around making them unhappy once in a while in a good sense.

I was out aiding a group of folks in my part of the country and they were telling me that they read some statistics that the population of America would go up to 170 or 175 million Americans in the next 5 years and they said what are we going to do. I said, what are we going to do -- I said every time there is a new baby that comes into this world there's new goods, new services, new demands and new challenges. I talk that way because we've got four of them in our family and I like everyone of them and I'm proud of them. So, I'm not one of those who goes around feeling that if the population grows a little bit in this great, rich, resourceful America that some how or another I am going to be denied food and clothing. Don't worry, friends, this is the only nation on the face of the earth that goes on a diet,

voluntarily (laughter). There's lots of room left in this beloved America of ours. Our problem is not undereating, it's overeating.

So, I say against this pessimism -- against these neo-malthusians -- I have faith in the abounding limitless resources of our country and its people. We do not believe that there are already 60 million too many of us. We believe with our American spirit of enterprise and through intelligent management of our physical and human resources, we can attain even greater heights of economic and cultural and spiritual development for a long time to come.

Now as you know, since 1924 we have had a quota on immigration and it's been limited to 150,000 annually.

I hope you'll bear with me through some of the sections of this bill that I want to discuss with you because there is no use in me just coming up here and reading these nice thoughts to you unless we can document it. I have learned that when you go to battle you better have not only your artillery ready but you better have a few hand grenades -- good grief you've got to be full equipped. And, one of the real limits of limitation upon those of liberalization in America is that they are filled with the good philosophy but short on facts; and, let's have the facts because we've got them. And, you'd be surprised what facts

will do to disarm the opposition -- they stand dumbfounded.

Now this 150,000 annual quota, that has actually been cut further by the operation of the "National ^{ORIGIN'S} ~~ex-acta~~" Principal, ^{IS} under which we can expect not more than about 70,000 to enter the country annually. The 150,000 quota numbers are divided into nationality quotas and any number not used in one quota, which cannot be assigned to another quota, is forfeited at the end of the year.

When Senator McCarran introduced his first immigration bill, he included a device to make a substantial further cut in immigration. Each quota was to be split into a number of preferences category for the people of special skills, parents of citizens, etc. Not only could there be no reassignment of the numbers from one quota to another but there wouldn't have been any reassignment from one preference category to another within the same quota. This proposal would well of cut American Immigration down to 20,000 a year or even less. Now, in view of the sharp criticism directed against this provision it was finally dropped from the bill. I mention it only to illustrate the basic attitude which underlines the McCarran approach to immigration.

But, one provision which the Senator and the

followers hung on to through all the turmoil and trouble was the "National or Gains" Principal. "If immigrants must be" was the thought, "let them be members of the so called superior race."

Now I might mention here that during the Senate debate on the McCarran Bill I was approached by one of my good friends and colleague who was seriously troubled. "In spite of all of the other defects of this immigration bill", he told me, "he would have to vote for it if it included a liberalization of the 'National ^{ORIGIN} ~~or Gains~~' Principal." I took him aside immediately and I assured him that that was one dilemma that he would not have to get into. For, if the Senator from Nevada and his followers were to compromise on every other item in the bill there would not be any compromise on the "National ^{ORIGIN} or Gains" Principal.

The National Origin ~~insurance~~ quota system under which about 70% of all quota numbers are allocated to Great Britain, Germany and Ireland was first place on our statute books in 1924. You know that background. Its background was, at that time, freely admitted and the House Majority Report at that time we find the following frank language. Now listen to this: "With full recognition of the material progress which we owe to the races of the South-

eastern and Eastern Europe, we are conscious that the continued arrival of great numbers tend to upset our balance of population, to depress our living standard and to unduly change our institution for the care of the socially inadequate. If immigration from the Southern and Eastern Europe may enter the United States on a basis of substantial equality with that admitted with the older sources of supply, it's clearer than if any appreciable number of immigrants are allowed to land upon our shores. The balance or ratio prepondrence must in time pass to those elements of the population who reproduce more aptly on the lower standard of living than those possessing other ideals."

Beautiful thought, beautiful thought. Mighty gracious. I want to tell you something. If I were to read that passage, which I may do someday, on the Range, those people would organize a posse to find out who the men are who are responsible for putting that language in a report. There are no finer people in my State than those who work the mines, who work the ports -- docks at Duluth -- who work the forests and I'm here to say tonight that we are proud in the State of Minnesota of the largest group of young men and women who attend our universities -- and one of the greatest universities in this land and they come from the

and from the families who are Croats, Servians, Yougoslavs, Checks, Albanians, Bulgarians, Italians -- every conceivable nationality group that you could think of. Protestant, Jew and Catholic. They pour by the hundreds into the great university and into the great colleges of our State and even as I came today to this city I picked up the paper to see a great scientist, one of the greatest scientist of America Mr. Brunetti, who came from Stanford University -- a graduate of Virginia High School in Minnesota -- is now to be the Chief Research Director of General Mills Inc., but under that language Mr. Brunetti would never have made it.

This is what drove John Pastore, our distinguished Senator from Rhode Island into one of the greatest speeches I have ever heard on the floor of the Senate. A man of Italian background who had a right to resent language like this. After all, Joe DiMaggio wasn't so bad. He seemed to know how to hit the ball and there are a few others that have done quite well too. This language would have restricted men like Mr. Fermi of Italy, Mr. Einstein and in view of the low quota on Denmark I doubt if Dr. Doreuge would have been able to get over here and we would have been going around with choir practice instead of the Atomic Bomb. We needed these men and they came to us and helped us.

One of the Congressmen who supported the Bill in 1924 stated this point of view and he stated it very bluntly, you'll have to admire his frankness. Here's what he said: "Where the immigrants now flooding our shores possessed of the same traits, characteristics of our forefathers I would have no concern upon the problem confronting us because in the main they belong to the same branch of the Aryan Race." "But the new immigrants", he declared, "were of a different kind and they couldn't be assimilated."

I'd like to have that Congressman come out to my State. He'd see some assimilation and he'd see some mighty good forefathers, too.

Since this statement, we have fought a Moody war against the people who wanted to subjugate the world in the name of Aryan supremacy and when Senator McCarran submitted his report on the theory underlined in the "National Origins" Principal, it had to be sugar coated.

As a result, we find that in the following piece of double talk, starting out with an apology and here's the recent language of 1952: "Without giving credence to any theory of Nordic supremacy -- superiority," which sounds like, well, of course, some of my best friends are jews, or something like that, "the sub-committee believes that the

adoption of the National Origin Formula was a racial and logical method of numerically restricting immigration in such a manner as to best preserve the sociological and cultural balance of the United States. There's no doubt that it favored the peoples of the countries of the North and West over the countries of the South and Eastern Europe. But, the sub-committee holds that the peoples who have made the greatest contribution to the development of this Country were fully justified in determining that the country was no longer a field for further colonization and henceforth, further colonization would not only be restricted but directed to admit immigrants considered more readily assimilable because of the similarity of their cultural background to those of the principal continents of our population."

That's the §64 statement. The difference between that statement and the one of 1924 is the difference, my dear friends, of 28 years of double talk, of being able to coat it.

So, the sub-committee recommended that the National Origin Principal be retained. It was made a part, a fundamental part of the McCarran-Walter Bill and was re-framed by Congress when the Bill was passed over President Truman's veto.

Now let me read you a statement of one of the supporters of the McCarran-Walter Bill -- a Congressman, since been retired from Idaho and he made a speech from the House floor which will long be remembered. The grammatical structure may not be the best but the thought is plain: "It seems to me that the question of racial origins, though I am not a follower of Hitler, there's something to it. We cannot drop a stone -- we cannot tie a stone around its neck and drop it into the middle of the Atlantic just because it worked to the contrary in Germany. I believe, that possibly statistics would show that West European races have made the best citizens in America and are more easily made into Americans. In time of trouble and stress such as we are going through now, it seems to me it's an important time to increase entry into our country of material that's questionable when we have a very large population of people that we have not yet digested and who have not yet learned the first principals of American citizenship. If there was some law that could take these people that even wish to bring here and put them out on the praries of the West I maintain they would make good Americans in a considerably shorter time."

Now, of course, I don't know what the atmosphere

of the praries of the West is. It's a little dryer out there. Maybe that's what he means, they will preserve a little longer. It goes on "I maintain they would make good Americans in a considerably shorter time then if you leave them pinned up among the people of their own kind, in the large eastern cities, where they do not learn to talk English, readily. They read their own newspapers. It has been my impression in the short space of time spent in these eastern cities" -- I want to repeat that. "It has been my impression in the short space of time spent in these eastern cities that it takes almost 3 generations to make a good American citizen."

I'm sure that was not the going away that he read to the men that were selected for Selective Service for World War II or Korea. I submit that the national groups that are called the questionable ones and the undesirable ones did right well. There are a number of heroes in proportion to their popular national group, in the total military population was singularly great and I go on to quote: "I am opposed to quota pooling because I am of the opinion that it will tend to bring in many aliens." Now, there's a profound statement (laughter), "whose general characteristics seem to show that they do not readily make

the best American citizens."

Well now, friends, I know this is humorous, but I want to tell you in equal candid that its humor is second rate to the fact that it was adopted as the prevailing philosophy and this is what we're battling against.

I think there is no need for me to try to demonstrate to you that various theories are fallacious and devoid of any scientific information or foundation. But, let us stop for a moment to analyze the argument which is current --- more the favorite --- the argument that new immigrants would change our social bracket or alter our cultural heritage. As I have said before, the proposal embodied in the Humphrey-Lehman Bill, which is now also espoused by the President's Commission is that we permit the entry of 250,000 immigrants annually. One for every 600 of our population in 1950. In one generation, in 30 years, we will have admitted 30 aliens for every 600 Americans. The 600 will have, of course, grown to 700 or 800. It seems to be the view of these pessimists that our democratic structure and social fabrics are so weak that from 600 to 800 Americans will give way to the 30 immigrants who will trickle in from all parts of the globe in 30 years. These people sure don't have much faith in some of

us Norwegians. I for one believe in the structure of our social structure as I believe in the strength of our economic system. I'm sorry to find that my faith in the inherent strength of America is not shared by men who always readily designate themselves as patriots.

Now when Senator Lehman and I and some of our other colleagues first drafted our own immigration bills, we included a compromise formula which was to be substituted for the "National Origins" Principal. I first proposed this plan in a bill I introduced in 1949 and under this formula known as the "Quota Pooling Plan", quota numbers not used in any year by the Nationality to which they are assigned would become generally available in the following year. However, on the basis of the recommendation of the President's Commission I am prepared to state that the time is now at hand when the National ~~or~~ Origins Principal¹⁵ must be abolished altogether and legislation will be so introduced (applause).

There is, of course, more to the McCarran Immigration Act than the mere reparation of the National ^{Origins} ~~or~~ ^{Principals} Principal. What was originally passed off as a mere codification of existing law actually involved numerous changes in the provision regulating exclusion, deportation, naturalization and denaturalization and I can

tell you, tonight, that I have on my desk cases, right now of fine folks back in my State who are going to be deported.

I have a case on my desk of a gentleman who has been here 42 years from Finland and those Fins are sturdy folks. He has a fine family. He is a noted citizen in our State. In 1904 the Finnish people were fighting for their lives against Russian domination. You remember the Revolution of 1905 in your history. This man, in self defense in 1905 is accused of having killed someone. I don't doubt that maybe he did. Some secret police that was moving in on his family. It was a political charge and I had to introduce a private bill last week in order to save this poor man from being deported and he may even be deported, despite the private bill. A charge that was dug up on him.

There is, of course, as I said, much more than just deportation. When objections were first raised against, excruciation, deportation, naturalization and denaturalization, Senator McCarran tried to wave them away with a few more metaphors. Boy we really got the metaphors. The more I talk about it the madder I'm getting, I'll tell you! I'll never forget those days. I'll not forget for a long time the fact that there were only a handful of us that stood there, day after day, literally week after week, trying to

to get an audience, trying to get a hearing, trying, even to get a colleague to listen. And, in the midst of the debate the Chairman of the Judiciary Committee would proceed to walk out of the chamber and not even give us the courteous courtesy of listening to the argument. "This new law", he claimed, "tightened the security provisions and prevented the pollution of the blood stream of America with alien criminals." Now that's the biggest bunch of double talk and hog-wash I have ever heard in my life.

I am familiar with the law of this land. I am familiar with the law of America that screens out undesirables and there isn't one change made in the proposed Bill by Senator Lehman and myself to weaken our laws against subversives. In fact, we strengthened them. So, let's set the record straight so that you can tell friends about it. We're just as much opposed to the immigration of subversives and criminals as Senator McGarran or anyone else. If you put the McGarran Act and Humphrey-Lehman Bill side by side you'll find that when it comes to excluding subversives and criminals the Humphrey-Lehman Bill does just as much or more than the McGarran but, our bill was drafted with care, designed to hit only those people against whom it was actually directed. The McGarran Act, on the other

hand is a blunderbuss with a crooked barrel too, with broad language and loose phrases which hit many innocent people who don't really deserve to be hit or should not be hit under any circumstances. During the debate of the McCarran Act my colleagues and I went through the Bill section by section. I forget how many sections there were -- it seems like there were 140 or 120 or so -- sub-sections, and we analyzed the most important parts of that bill on the floor of the Senate. Senator Douglas, Senator Kefauver, of course, Senator Lehman, who is the tower of strength. I hope he lives to be a hundred and is all the time in the Senate, even if I am just up in the galleries, just looking down. There was also Senator Pastore.

I don't want to repeat this performance here, tonight, of going through this section by section because as tolerant a folk as you are and as good a friend as you are you wouldn't want to listen to that; but, just to give you a bit of the flavor of what transpired I will mention a few examples and also show that even though we lost in the final vote we were able to make some dent in the law and immoderate some of the most harsh provisions.

One of these provisions, which was in the original McCarran Bill would have made it possible for

an alien to be deported for a simple traffic violation, if the Attorney General found him undesirable. That language was too strong for even Congressman Walter and he dropped the clause from the House Bill. When we presented our criticism in the Senate, Senator McCarran simply replied that it wasn't so. He told us we had never read the bill. He said, "you never read the bill," even though we had been debating the bill section by section. He didn't try to explain the provision or to argue with us, he simply said, we had never read the bill and were wrong. But, we made enough noise about this provision to get some other Senators to look at it. Senators who Mr. McCarran counted on his side and when they looked at it they came to the conclusion that our interrogation was right and Senator McCarran's was wrong.

To give you an example, Senator Welkin of Idaho rose on the floor of the Senate to express his doubts about this provision and at this point Senator McCarran made a hasty retreat and the clause was stricken from the bill.

One Senator just rose to express doubts -- we had been there with competent lawyers on our side as colleagues who documented the case and we were told that we were wrong, hadn't read the bill.

Now, let me give you another example. Under the old law aliens could be kept out of the United States if they had committed crimes involving moral turpitude. That gave our immigration officer a chance to see whether the alien had committed an act that was a crime by our standards and not by the standard of some foreign dictatorship. But, the new law requires exclusion whether or not moral turpitude is involved. Now mark this, under this new provision, a man like Cardinal Minzentsky would be excluded from the United States if he were ever released by the Communists and that was not denied.

Now, I know, of course, that Senator McCarran had no intention of keeping Cardinal Minzentsky or anyone else in a similar position out of this country but here was just another example of the looseness of the language of the law. The blunderbuss technique of law making by which innocent persons are hit while the law tries to aim at the guilty. I might say that once again we didn't get an adequate response from Senator McCarran. I'm glad to say, however, that the State Department is drafting the regulation under the act, followed the lead of the conference report and corrected the wrong. They took the cases which I described in my speeches, which Senator Lehman

and others described of people being convicted in totalatarium countries -- on trumped up charges and drafted regulations to take care of the problem. Imagine, the Congress of the United States permitting the trumped up charges of a dictator, of a tyrant, in courts that are as rigged as anything can be, to exclude people from coming into the United States. Every freedom loving person is the victim of trumped up charges -- of secret police, of politically controlled courts, in the totalatarium countries and, particularly those God loving and God fearing men who are willing to stand up for their faith and die for it! And yet, the law of America, the law of America, so help me, would have denied these great souls, these great spiritual leaders, entrance to our country had it not been for the debate and the fight that was put up on the floor of the Senate and the fact that out of the conference committee, between the House and the Senate we were able to get some language which gave the State Department the powers to draw up regulations which would make exceptions in the case of these great spiritual leaders.

Here you have two instances in which we were able to smoke out the authority of the new immigration act and get the law changed thereby. But, these are, unfortu-

nately isolated incidents. By in large the law went into effect in the form in which it was presented to the Senate.

One of the greatest assets of our country, of which it is justly proud is our Anglo-Saxon use of Juris-Prudence which are bent to do equity to be compassionate with its human consideration of its human rights. Law makers have, in the past, been aware of what was at stake when they enacted a statute providing for deportation of aliens. They knew that this involved a matter almost as important as the question of life and death; and, believe me it does in this day and age, not only for the alien but often for his American family. They, therefore, made the provision for clemency in deserving cases -- in which the infraction of the immigration laws was an important or minor one and deportation laws caused serious hardship. In such cases, they authorized the Attorney General to suspend deportation.

Our courts have, fortunately, given further expression to this liberal outlook and in deserving cases have interpreted the law leniently. Few administrative agencies have lost as many cases in the courts as the immigration and naturalization service on this issue. This attitude has been abruptly changed by the McCarran Act. The people who drafted the law went painstakingly through all

the cases which the immigration services have lost and made the necessary change as to make it possible for the alien to be deported if that kind of a case came up again. Now, beyond that the McCarran Act restricted the existing authority of the Attorney General to exert leniency. At the same time they have expanded the Attorney General's authority to be harsher and let me tell you the power of the American Counselor abroad is as unlimited as the power of a dictator, when it comes to gaining visas and passports. On the last point, experts believe that the McCarran Act stepped over the bounds of the constitution in a number of instances and, therefore, I won't be surprised if we had cases before the Supreme Court declaring portions of the law unconstitutional.

Let me tell you something. This world is hungry tonight for compassion and leniency. People are tired of war. They are worried about armament and rearmament. They are sick of spirit and while I have stoutly and steadfastly worked for, voted for and will continue to vote for adequate national defense, military assistance — I supported the Marshall Plan all the way down the line. I'm here to tell you that America will be not loved or respected because of her brute strength. This is the shield that we must have

in this world of ours. The shield from behind which we can do the good works and good deeds that need to be done for God's good people. What the world wants tonight more than anything else is a spirit of compassion, is a spirit of service of friendship of the helping hand and we have got to properly interpret to this world of ours that our armament program our foreign policy is not a policy of militarism, it's not a policy of force and brute strength. It's only a shield to give us an opportunity to live so that from behind that shield the helping hand of America fellowship of democratic compassion can be extended to the needy people of the world. That's what needs to be done and any law which unduly restricts the spirit of American humanity, American compassion, is a law which does a straight disservice in the struggling in which we are now engaged.

We register no gain for our own welfare under these laws and we surely threaten other peoples. What does Senator McCarran have to say about some of these things? And, again I say when I say Senator McCarran I mean what do the people who support his program have to say about these things.

Let me give you some illustrations.

I hope I am not keeping you too long, I'm just

about through but I thought we were going to discuss this law and I am going to do it quite fully tonight.

One case which has recently come to my attention involves a woman against whom a deportation order has recently been issued. She would have been eligible for suspension of deportation under the old law. She is not eligible now, she will have to be sent to Italy. She will be accompanied by her husband a man of 52 years of age, born in the United States of parents born in the United States, who has never been outside this country, so that he can stay with his wife, his lifes companion. This man will have to break off all his ties and his country of his birth and start life anew in Italy, figuring out a way to earn a livelihood in that overcrowded and poverty stricken country. Here is a man who is a native born citizen of native born parents married to a lady of Italian extraction and through some technical flaw in her citizenship she is going to be deported. The husband, if he wants to be with the woman he loves -- if he wants to be with his beloved wife of his, the woman he has lived with faithfully and in love for years, must go to Italy and there is nothing that can be done about.

Now what does Senator McCarran have to say

about this kind of a situation? The answer can be found in the cold, heartless language in the Senate Report. Let me quote to you: "Hardship or even unusual hardship to the alien nor to his spouse, parent or child is not sufficient to justify suspension of deportation." This is the spirit of the McCarran Immigration Act.

Let's take another look at the situation after providing a clear cut fact for the exclusion and deportation of subversive aliens and I repeat -- we have got plenty of provisions for that, if we haven't we can get more. Nobody wants to keep a subversive around here -- all of which provisions were also included in our bill. The McCarran Act further allows the deportation of persons who may at any time, any time in the past engaged in activity prejudicial to the public interest and a government official is the blanket authority to decide this question. Now when the Senate discussion reached this point, the late Bryon McMahon who by the way gave his last speech in the Senate on the occasion of the McCarran Immigration Bill, got out of his sick bed, in fact his death bed, to come to the Senate chamber for this debate. He rose -- I sat right behind him, I remember that day. I remember the feeling that he had. He didn't have to come to the Senate, he

could have been up in the hospital. He could have ducked this issue if he wanted to duck it. He knew how sick he was. He was weak, he was aslant in color. Those of us who were his friends knew that he was terribly sick and here is what he did. He rose on the floor of the Senate in disbelief and asked to be shown the sections that I have just read to you. After he had studied it, he declared and I quote his words: "It seems almost unbelievable to me that anyone could seriously write such a provision into a bill. It's contrary to every concept I know of -- common law, in our own Juris-Prudence and I have never heard of such a provision in any statute in the United States." These words that are to be remembered were spoken by a man with broad experience in the field of law and law enforcement. A man who had been an Assistant Attorney General of the United States, in charge of the Criminal Division and I say, tonight, in memory and spirit of Bryon McMann that one of the most magnificent speeches he ever made was in that critical hour when he spoke out in the spirit of humanity and decency for the people that were knocking at our doors in the hope that they could live in the land of freedom and opportunity and for those who were here as naturalized citizens that they might remain here as good

citizens with their loved ones.

Now there is another deportation provision which is almost as unbelievable. In section 241C, under which an alien who has obtained a divorce from a citizen can, under certain circumstances be deported, "if it appears to the Attorney General that he or she has failed to fulfill his or her marital agreement." Well, I wouldn't want to tell you what we did with that one. It seems to me that this constitutes an unprecedented intrusion, by the Government, into a field which has heretofore been considered a matter of purely private concern.

Not equally ludicrous are the new provisions affecting alien seamen. How does anyone in his right mind think that we are going to catch a single communist by having immigration inspectors cruise the Atlantic and Pacific oceans, at the taxpayers' expense, asking foreign seamen a lot of questions? Can we expect that if the seaman is asked about his employer he'll reply: "Well, I work for the French Line but I have a part time job with Joe Stalin and I'm heading straight for Los Alamos." You think they are going to do that? I think it would be frolic to think that Senator McCarran's screening of seamen is really going to protect our security welfare. By the

way, if you are really going to protect your security welfare, get investigators that really know how to investigate. It takes, unless you get in Congress, then you're sitting there and all at once you get it quick. Ordinarily, this is a profession. All that we can really do in this field is exclude those on whom we have adverse information. Fingerprint those alien seamen that come in and we did this before -- could do it without any law -- and if anyone doesn't turn up when the ship is scheduled to leave, take appropriate action to apprehend him. The questioning provided by the McCarran Act accomplishes nothing except to heap scorn and ridicule upon the United States, Norway, Sweden, Denmark, Finland, Germany, France, Portugal, Spain, Italy and every country that you can think of. It is important for you to understand that you don't want to have roving ambassadors that are out trying to knife you. If you're going to have somebody against you be sure that he's one that's sort of confined to the house. Seamen get around the world and they can do us a lot of damage.

Now, I do not want to be misinterpreted or misunderstood. We can protect ourselves against dangerous agents. Ladies and gentlemen we have a secret service and we have a counter intelligence system. We are not babs in

the woods. We have an F.B.I. and we have detectives. We have every kind of counter espionage service. If we haven't a big enough one, we can get a bigger one; but, I am of the opinion that filling out questionnaires and having people visit with us as to whether or not you're a communist is not really going to protect the security of this country. If he tells us that he's one ~~he~~ isn't going to be very dangerous. It's the guy that doesn't tell you that you want to watch out for.

There is another provision about which I would like to speak, tonight, and it deals with professors. Now, under the old law professors could enter the country as non-quota immigrants, once they meet all the other requirements of the immigration law. This provision which has enabled us to bring many of the great minds to this country has been abolished by the McCarran Act. No logical reason has ever been stated for this action. The defenders of the action have said that professors can still be brought in under the general preference provision for skilled persons. But, instead of the simplified procedure which was in effect previously, look now at what is required. If the University of California, University of Minnesota, Columbia University wishes to bring in an outstanding foreign scientist. And

by the way, these scientist some times are a bit sensitive. They don't go for all this. First the University has to file an application with the Immigration Service, attaching to it a clearance order from the United States Employment Service. I should preface this, of course, by saying that any one over 65 or 66 shouldn't do this, they'll never make it. This is for young scientists.

(When a recording was made of the speech three sentences were missed in the changing of reels)

You ladies and gentlemen of the United Service for New Americans did not end with President Truman's veto of the McCarran Act.

Now you wouldn't expect a man engaged in politics not to end up without saying something political. It is well and good for us to talk here, tonight. I love this meeting. I am in the presence of men and women, tonight, who have given a life of service. I am in the presence of great spiritual leaders and I realize the honor that has been mine, tonight, but I am going to say to you now in all candor that you can meet from now to all dooms day -- if you don't make up your minds that you are going to have public servants that are dedicated to certain basic principals, you'll have to meet a lot more than you ever planned

on meeting and you'll be meeting about the trouble that you let happen. The fight is a continuing fight and I am certain that as time goes on an even greater portion of the American voting public will become aware of the dangers involved in this present law, and I am happy to join with your organization in any necessary program for the purpose of political education; but, let us not think our task will not be easy.

It was, unfortunately, a very very small group of Senators that put up a fight against the McCarran Act last year. Sometimes, when we looked around, we felt awfully lonely. Now, three of our best fighters are gone. Senator Bryon McMahon is gone, he's dead. Senators Bill Benton and Blair Moody were defeated. The professional biggots have already invaded our own State of Minnesota, in preparing for the 1954 election and have started a whispering campaign against me for my fight on behalf of decent legislation. I'm here to tell you something, they are going to get the best fight they've ever had. They'll know they have been in a fight before I'm through.

But, I don't want to be misconstrued and misinterpreted. I'm not here to make an appeal on my behalf.

I would like to say something on behalf of the

Senator from North Dakota who was to have been your guest, tonight and I believe Senator Langlor is going to be an immeasurable help in revising or repealing this law and I ask you to give him the benefit of your counsel and advice.

I was delighted, tonight that Congressman Davis sent me his message. It is an honor to be associated with him but I want you to remember this one thing that I started to tell you. If you elect a man to the House of Representatives or the United States Senate whose mind is closed to the particular issue, your appeals to him after his election are not going to be of any value. I have seen many telegrams and appeals to Congressman saying do this and do that, sustain the President's veto, etc., and gentlemen I can tell you, you don't change very many minds like that if it's closed. The time to find out what you're going to have in Congress is before he gets there, that is the time to find out. When a labor question comes up they'll get wires, everybody vote for this amount to the Taft-Hartley Act and they don't vote for it. They said they were elected and they were going to vote as they saw fit. The man in Congress, believe it or not, is a principaled man. You may not like his principals but he stands by them. So, the time to do your good work is before they arrive.

I would like to say that no whispering campaign is going to frighten me and going to frighten you. I am going to fight for the things for which I believe in. Once in a while a person can lose faith , loses heart, because he takes so many defeats but your word of encouragement, your willingness to go out and be of service will keep them fighting for better legislation on the job. What I am asking you to do is make yourselves known in your community, broaden yourselves out.

I'm speaking to the wrong audience. The only good this will do is if I can get you aroused enough to get you to go out into the street and get 10 people stop them and say, "Look, how do you feel about the McCarran Immigration Bill? It's no good. I hope you're with us." You have got to become educators and leaders. Your speeches should be given to those who are opposed to us and I would welcome the opportunity to speak to some of the great patriotic organizations who, I think, have been misinformed and I should look forward to that privilege. And, I say to you if you have people in the Senate like Lehman, people who are willing to join you and participate in your battles and my battles that we are going to win in the end. It is up to you to do the job. May God bless you in your work and deeds.



Minnesota Historical Society

Copyright in this digital version belongs to the Minnesota Historical Society and its content may not be copied without the copyright holder's express written permission. Users may print, download, link to, or email content, however, for individual use.

To request permission for commercial or educational use, please contact the Minnesota Historical Society.



www.mnhs.org