A couple of light snows and sub-freezing weather here in Washington make me realize how far away from home I am. At the same time, the annual State of the Union message of the President, which was delivered to a joint session of the Senate and House of Representatives, jolts me back into the realization that it really isn’t far to any place in the whole world. The interests of this Government extend to every family in this country and to all the nations of the Free World.

I regret that the President took occasion in his message to urge the passage of legislation which tends to divide our people at home while we are striving to maintain a solid front in our foreign relations.

I refer to his proposals for the enactment of so-called civil rights bills and also to his plan for federal aid to school construction. Both of these proposals would further centralize government in Washington. Such laws would invade fields rightfully belonging to the States. I shall exert all my efforts toward the protection of States Rights.

Three other points in the President’s message deeply concern me as to whether legislation proposed should be enacted. Careful study must be made of any bill to provide for increased immigration and we should not let the emotional appeal of the Hungarian tragedy out-weigh considerations of national security.

He urged that the United States become a member of the Organization for Trade Cooperation. This is the group which negotiates tariff reductions at international conferences. I want to give this plan a close going-over to determine if it is in the best interests of our country.

On his third question, it is my emphatic opinion that the United States should cut its foreign aid spending far below present levels, in spite of the President’s plea for funds. We must insure the economy of this nation before we try to guarantee prosperity to the entire world. Our foreign aid programs should be carefully selected. First, they should provide really needed help to friendly countries. Second, they should be designed to help in fields that will not be in competition with our own productive enterprises.

I do concur with the President in the idea that some action should be taken by the Congress to make clear to the world that we intend to stand by our friends in foreign countries. The world has grown so small that isolationism cannot prevail. Either we must lead in world affairs or some other country will do so. The only other country able to lead is Russia. I hope a resolution will finally be formulated which I can support.

One of the things the President left out of his speech and
promised to present in his Budget Message is proposals to improve the agricultural situation. I am especially anxious to have legislation enacted to protect the interests of the family-type farmer. If the Administration does not offer adequate proposals, then the Committees of the Congress should.

As legislation progresses in the Senate, I shall keep you informed from time to time on these and other subjects of interest to many of our people.

BILLS INTRODUCED BY SENATOR THURMOND

The first day of the Senate session on which bills were introduced, I offered seven.

One of them would prevent the serving of alcoholic drinks on commercial passenger airplanes and on military airplanes.

Another important bill would prevent Government agencies from allocating procurement contracts for various purchases to so-called "depressed areas." I see no reason why the New England States, or any other area, should profit by having failed in the past.

A third bill would prevent contractors working on Federal projects from avoiding payment of local taxes, such as the South Carolina sales tax, which other contractors not working for the Federal Government have to pay.

A fourth bill would provide for the establishment and operation of a laboratory for a study of the utilization of the soil and water resources of the country.

Another would deny tax-exempt status to any organization which promotes litigation to which it is not a party. This would keep so-called non-profit organizations from accepting contributions and using them to stir up strife without having to pay income taxes like other organizations.

I was joined by Senator Johnston in introducing a bill to amend the Soil Bank Act so as to provide for the participation by tobacco producers in the acreage reserve program on the basis of 1956 tobacco acreage allotments.

Also, I introduced a bill to permit the City of Rock Hill to buy a section of the Catawba Indian Reservation. This is needed to increase the capacity of the city's waste disposal plant when the Bowater Paper Mill goes into operation.

COSPONSOR OF STATES RIGHTS BILL

A bill to protect the rights of the States to pass laws in any field, unless specifically excluded by action of the Congress in that field, was introduced by Senator McClellan of Arkansas, and I joined him as a co-sponsor of this important piece of legislation. Had this law been in effect last year, the Supreme Court could not have thrown out the Pennsylvania sedition case involving a Communist. In view of the many invasions of the rights of the States by the Supreme Court, I am hopeful that this bill will be approved during this session.

- end -
PROBE GASOLINE PRICE JUMP

If there is any one price increase which touches almost as many people as does an increase in the price of food, I believe it is the cost of gasoline to run their automobiles.

All of us have become accustomed to the convenient transportation of our own cars on good roads. We are used to going about our business and recreation in economical and time-saving vehicles which can be driven from our own doors to our businesses or wherever else we wish to go.

The announcement of another one-cent per gallon increase in the price of gasoline is something about which I believe the American people have a right to an explanation. The basic transportation system of the nation is the individual American automobile. Without them all business and industry, as well as government, would be halted because our people could not substitute any other transportation to meet the schedules they now meet daily.

I have asked the chairman of the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to start an immediate investigation of the gasoline price increases. Others have also raised their objections to the increases and I am hopeful that early action will be taken. It seems to me that gasoline prices have about reached a peak and I want to find out why the oil companies have forced this additional cost on the American people.

FHA AGREES TO SURVEY

On January 18, the Farmers Home Administration agreed at my urging to send a representative to South Carolina from Washington to survey drought disaster needs of the farmers for FHA emergency loans.

Earlier the FHA made a survey in the State and announced that its findings did not justify designation of South Carolina as a disaster area, eligible for emergency loans.

Administrator K. H. Hansen of FHA conferred with me in my office last Friday and acceded to my request for a further examination of the situation in South Carolina. Administrator Hansen said that an FHA representative would be dispatched from Washington within 10 days.

I want to urge farmers needing loans and unable to secure them through conventional sources to apply at once to their local FHA offices so the FHA will be fully aware of their needs.
EASIER LOANS FOR VETERANS

As a co-sponsor with Senator Lyndon Johnson (D-Texas), I have introduced a bill to make it easier for veterans to secure home loans. If private financing is not offered to a veteran within 20 days after he applies to the Veterans Administration for a loan, then the VA would be authorized to make a direct loan out of a special fund to be set up for that purpose.

Thus, private enterprise would have the first opportunity to provide the loan to the veteran. If private enterprise did not accept his application, the veteran would still have the opportunity to secure the loan from the VA.

EQUAL RIGHTS AMENDMENT

Again this year, I have joined with other Senators in introducing a resolution calling for an amendment to the United States Constitution to provide for equal rights for women. I firmly believe this provision to insure equal rights should be written into the Constitution.

- end -
When I came to Washington, one of my promises was that I would do my best to have Fort Jackson at Columbia designated as a permanent Army installation.

Shortly before my resignation from the Senate last spring, I was notified that Fort Jackson had finally been given designation as a permanent fort. Now the importance of this is beginning to be clear with the announcement during the past week that approximately $2,200,000 is being spent in improving the fort's housing facilities this fiscal year and the further revelation by the Army that perhaps as much as $2,000,000 will be spent in the next fiscal year for further improvements at Fort Jackson.

Also, during the past week I have been having several discussions with officials in the Defense Department and the Department of the Army about the construction of a permanent hospital at Fort Jackson.

An appropriation of $5,000,000 was made last year by the Congress for a hospital at the fort, but the Department of Defense wants to build one large enough to take care of future expansion. It is estimated that about $11,000,000 will be needed instead of the $5,000,000 already appropriated.

I have been urging the Secretary of the Army, Wilber Brucker, and the Deputy Secretary of Defense, Reuben Robertson, to agree to go ahead with engineering and design plans for the larger hospital and then to present their request to Congress for the larger appropriation needed.

The $5,000,000 would take care of a 250-bed hospital but the present need is for at least a 500-bed hospital. The Department of Defense also would like to construct a 500-bed hospital which was designed to be expanded to 1,000 beds later. If provision is made only for 250 beds now, it will mean that the old hospital will have to be continued in use along with the new building.

The general renovation program about to get underway at the fort will greatly improve the housing facilities for the soldiers. Included in the work is the lining and painting of the interior of buildings, providing latrines and showers on the second floors, improving heating, lighting and hot-water systems, and the installation of suitable floor covering in the barracks.

GASOLINE GAS PRICE PROBE

My efforts to have an investigation made of the recent one-cent per gallon increase in the price of gasoline moved forward a step this week. The Senate Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee voted in favor of my motion at the organizational meeting of the committee to ask the Senate to approve a resolution providing for the investigation.
NEWSPRINT PRICE INVESTIGATION

Another price increase which the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee is going ahead with immediately is of the recent $4 per ton jump in the cost of newsprint.

The first hearing has been scheduled in Washington on February 26. I shall urge the committee to make a full survey of the reasons for this price rise. I do not want to see our newspapers and other newsprint users subjected to any unnecessary hardship because of profiteering -- if that is what has been going on.

SPONSORING NEW BILLS

I have joined Senator Potter of Michigan in the introduction of a resolution to establish a new Senate Committee on Veterans Affairs. At the present time all bills and resolutions on veterans affairs are handled by the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee. My view is that veterans affairs are too important not to be considered by a committee dealing entirely with that subject.

Again this year I am co-sponsoring with Senator Long of Louisiana a bill which would permit veterans to reinstate national service life insurance policies which have lapsed. We tried to secure passage of this bill last year, but only a weaker version was tacked onto another bill. I hope we will be able to get the bill we want this time.

Also, I am co-sponsoring with other Senators a bill to transfer the safety functions of the Government from the Commerce Department to the Labor Department. This was one of the recommendations of the Hoover Commission for the purpose of improving the present safety operations in the Government.

Well, everything is speeding up in the Senate now as the various committees start their meetings and as the many matters which must be studied are brought before the committees. As much as I miss South Carolina, it's pretty hard to get away from Washington from now till the end of the session in July. All of you good South Carolinians who come to Washington be sure to come by my office to see me while you are in the city.

Sincerely,

Strom Thurmond

- end -
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Since I reported to you last week, there have been several developments here in Washington which I believe will be in your best interests.

SENATE OKAYS GAS PROBE

The Senate Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, of which I am a member and in which I asked for a resolution last week to investigate the increased price of gasoline, is now ready to go forward with this investigation. The Senate has approved an appropriation of $50,000 to carry out the probe on why the price of gasoline was increased by one cent per gallon.

The Committee is authorized to "investigate and make a complete study of any and all matters pertaining to the production for sale or use in interstate commerce" of petroleum products. In the resolution approved by the Senate, four purposes are stated for the investigation:

1. To prevent serious economic dislocation.
2. To provide for the proper conservation and most effective use of petroleum products.
3. To protect commerce among the States in petroleum products.
4. And to me the most important -- To protect the consumers of petroleum products from the burdens and harmful effects brought about as a result of the operations of companies engaged in the petroleum business.

I believe this investigation will enable us to find out whether there have been any activities going on which are not in the public interest and whether there have been undue and unreasonable increases in the price of gasoline which you, as purchasers, have had to bear.

CIVIL RIGHTS FIGHT

Another matter of importance to our people took place on Wednesday in a subcommittee of the Senate Judiciary Committee. I refer to the efforts of Senator Hennings of Missouri, chairman of the subcommittee, to get approval of a motion to give a favorable report on some so-called civil rights bills. By a vote of 5 to 2, the subcommittee defeated this effort to report the bills to the full Judiciary Committee. The subcommittee then voted 4 to 3 against limiting hearings on the civil rights bills to two weeks duration.

The result of all this activity is that the chairman could schedule a time to begin the hearings, but he could not fix in advance a time when the subcommittee would have to stop and vote on the bills.
As of now, that is another victory on the side of real constitutional government and over the efforts of federal civil rights advocates to impose new laws on our people which would make it possible for the Federal Government to interfere with the rights of the States to police their own affairs. We will have to expect many more battles on this subject.

FORT JACKSON HOSPITAL

Since my last report, I am happy to say progress has been made toward securing a permanent 500-bed hospital for Fort Jackson at Columbia. The Secretary of the Army has now endorsed the larger hospital and the Department of Defense has informed me that it will also approve the plan.

This means that an additional appropriation of $6,000,000 will be needed to add to the $5,000,000 which was appropriated last year for a smaller 250-bed hospital. I am quite hopeful that action will be taken by the Congress this year to provide the additional funds for this worthy project.

PLAN VA HOSPITAL WORK

Veterans in the area will also be glad to learn of a program to renovate and improve the Veterans Administration Hospital near Columbia. The VA has informed me that it will submit a request to the Bureau of the Budget, and with approval of that agency, to the Congress for an appropriation of $510,000 to do the work.

Improvements would include: expansion of laboratory, x-ray and clinic facilities; provision of a group of surgical recovery beds; modernization of the operating suite; dining room and kitchen renovations; a new emergency room entrance; expansion of space for oxygen storage, sterile supplies and storage of patients' clothes and hospital records.

I hope it will be possible to push through this program at this session of the Congress.

HIGH COTTON SUPPORTS URGED

Our cotton farmers will be interested to know that Agriculture Secretary Benson plans to announce the price support levels for the 1957 cotton crop in the near future. I have urged that the Secretary increase the support price from 82$ to 90 percent of parity. He has authority to set the support level between 90 and 75 percent of parity.

Sincerely,

Strom Thurmond

- end -
SOIL BANK PROBLEMS

During the past week, I was greatly disturbed to hear reports from South Carolina that some farmers were being told they could not enter their farms in the soil bank program because acreage allocations in certain counties had been used up before they made their applications.

The policy of the Department of Agriculture is to operate on a first-come, first-served basis in taking applications. Thus, if a farmer failed to get in line early enough, he was told that no funds or acreage was available after he had waited long hours in line.

I sent a telegram to the Secretary of Agriculture urging him to investigate the situation in South Carolina immediately.

Also, I told him he should request Congress to appropriate sufficient funds to take care of all the farmers, not just the first ones in line to sign up for the soil bank.

Meanwhile, I urged that he divide the available acreage and funds among all applicants for the soil bank benefits. Such pro-rating of funds and acreage allocated to each county would be a fair and an equitable way to take care of everybody until additional funds are made available.

Senator Ellender, chairman of the Senate Agriculture Committee, questioned Secretary Benson at my request when the Secretary appeared before the Senate Committee. The Secretary did not indicate that he plans to change the present procedures of the Agriculture Department in connection with the soil bank program. However, he did say that he believed the situation might be adjusted satisfactorily by the transfer of allotments not used up in certain areas to areas where larger acreage and fund allotments are needed. I shall continue to work toward the objective of every farmer being permitted to enter as much of his land as necessary in the soil bank.

VOTED FOR ECONOMY

As an advocate of economy in Government, I voted against the bill approved by the Senate to provide an extravagant retirement fund for ex-Presidents of the United States. I do feel that former Presidents should receive an adequate retirement, but I could not agree with the bill presented to the Senate. This bill provided for a $25,000 per year retirement, plus $90,000 per year salaries for a staff, plus office space and free postage. I simply could not agree there is any necessity for a former President to receive $90,000 a year for a staff. Senators Byrd of Virginia and Lausche of Ohio and I were the only Senators who spoke out against this appropriation.
TRYING TO AID BLIND AND NEEDY

On Thursday, Governor Timmerman and Arthur B. Rivers, State Director of Public Welfare, appealed to me to do what I could to restore funds for the blind and needy which had been cut out of a deficiency appropriations bill by the House of Representatives. I immediately wrote to the Chairman of the Senate Appropriations Committee urging him to ask his Committee to restore the reduction in funds when the House bill is considered.

I do not feel that our blind and needy old people should be the target of an economy move. I feel there are many other places where greater economy should be practiced -- such as in bills for foreign aid and to provide huge retirements for former Presidents. I hope the Senate will restore the House reduction in this welfare appropriation and I hope the advocates of the reduction will be as ardent in their efforts to find other places to reduce really non-essential expenditures.

ASSIGNED TO SUBCOMMITTEES

I have now been assigned to the subcommittees on the principal Committees of which I am a member in the Senate.

On the Labor and Public Welfare Committee, I am chairman of the Veterans subcommittee and a member of the Railroad Retirement subcommittee.

On the Senate Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, I am a member of the Communications subcommittee and of the special subcommittee on Automobile Marketing Practices on which I served in 1955 and 1956.

My third principal Committee is Government Operations, and I am on the Reorganization subcommittee. This subcommittee deals with the Hoover Commission recommendations and all matters relating to reorganizing for economy and efficiency. I am well pleased with these assignments. Each one is important and offers fine opportunities for service.

Sincerely,

Strom Thurmond

- END -
BALANCED BUDGET DESIRED

In my opinion, millions of Americans greatly desire to see some provision requiring the Federal Government to operate on a balanced budget. I so stated on the floor of the Senate on Thursday.

The public debt now totals $275,906,294,121.74.

I pointed out the requirement in the South Carolina Constitution that the General Assembly "shall provide for an annual tax sufficient to defray the estimated expenses of the State for each year," and that when estimates prove to be too small and a deficit occurs, the General Assembly is required the next year to levy sufficient taxes to pay off the deficit and to defray the expenses for that year as well.

While I was Governor, I refused to sign appropriations bills until the financial officers of the State certified to me that the appropriations would not exceed the revenue.

I told the Senate that the South Carolina Constitutional provision keeps our State in excellent financial condition and that the same requirement would do the same for the Federal Government.

Senator Bridges of New Hampshire immediately requested the Senate’s approval to permit me to join him and Senator Byrd of Virginia as co-sponsor of an amendment to the Constitution which would require a balanced federal budget every year.

NEW INTEGRATION THREAT

Federal District Judge Walter Hoffman has set a deadline for the Norfolk School Board to integrate the schools in that city. He implied that he would take action to prevent the Governor and the Virginia Legislature from cutting off funds to integrated schools.

I do not know what was in the mind of Judge Hoffman when he declared that the Federal Court would give "complete protection" to the Norfolk School Board if it defies the Governor of Virginia and the Legislature to carry out the integration order issued by the Judge.

Regardless of what he had in mind, his statement is a threat and an attempt to intimidate the Governor and the Legislature. Any effort on the part of Judge Hoffman, or any other Judge, to carry out such a threat would be in violation of the Constitution.

Nowhere in the Constitution is any authority delegated over the public schools. In fact, the subject of education is not even mentioned in the Constitution. Furthermore, the people have not delegated or yielded the power of their legislatures to make or not to make appropriations, whether for the public schools or for any other proper function of the States.
The people of the sovereign States have not delegated to any Federal Judge the power to direct how State funds shall be spent.

ADDITIONAL BLOWS AT STATES RIGHTS

Here in Washington other attempts are being made to invade the legal territory of the States. Both in the Senate and the House of Representatives hearings are being held in the Judiciary Committees on the so-called civil rights bills.

I requested the Chairman of the House Judiciary Committee to schedule me to testify against the bill on February 26. He has notified me that I will be heard that day at 10 o'clock in the morning. I also plan to testify before the Senate Judiciary subcommittee which is handling this proposed legislation.

It is difficult to tell what the outcome will be, but I shall do everything in my power to prevent the passage of these so-called civil rights bills.

Sincerely,

Strom Thurmond

- END -
MR. PRESIDENT, I ask unanimous consent to place in the Record two editorials from newspapers in South Carolina. The first is entitled "Senator Bridges Offers A Solution," and was published in the Charleston Evening Post on February 4, 1957. The second is entitled "Legion Head Challenge To Speak Up Fearlessly Against Increasing Government Control," and was published in The Edgefield Advertiser on February 6, 1957.

I wish also to comment briefly on the proposal made by Senators Bridges and Byrd for a constitutional amendment to require the President and the Congress to balance the budget each year. That is the subject of the editorial in the Charleston Evening Post. I want to make it clear that the editorial approves the idea of a balanced budget.

In my opinion, millions of Americans all over this country also approve -- and not only approve, but greatly desire and seek -- a balanced budget as a required method of operating the Federal Government. I know that the proposed budget this year is said to be within the revenue anticipated, but there have been too many years in which spending far exceeded revenues.

The public debt totals $275,906,294,121.74. Even if we maintain a balanced budget, we should also make greater efforts to reduce the public debt at a faster rate.

At the present rate, it will take generations to pay off the debt, even if no additional indebtedness is incurred, and none can foretell what emergencies might arise.

The Federal Government would do well to follow the example of some of the States with reference to the handling of revenues and appropriations. I shall not attempt to go into the details at this time, but the facts show that the States are in much better financial condition than the Federal Government.

However, I call to the attention of the Senate the provisions for a balanced budget in my own State of South Carolina.

Article 10, Section 2 of the State Constitution provides that:

"The General Assembly shall provide for an annual tax sufficient to defray the estimated expenses of the State for each year, and whenever it shall happen that the ordinary expenses of the State for any year shall exceed the income of the State for such year the General Assembly shall provide for levying a tax for the ensuing year sufficient, with other sources of income to pay the deficiency of the preceding year together with the estimated expenses for the ensuing year."

That means, first, that the General Assembly is obligated to secure estimates from the financial officers of the State to insure that appropriations for any year do not exceed anticipated revenue. Second, it means, that if an error is made in estimating revenue for one year, it is the obligation of the General Assembly to provide for the deficiency to be paid off during the succeeding year.

As Governor of South Carolina from 1947 to 1951, I required the financial officers of the State to give me a statement when the single-package appropriations bill was sent to me for my signature, certifying that the bill was in balance.
I recommend this procedure as highly satisfactory. It keeps the State of South Carolina in excellent financial condition. It would do the same for the Federal Government.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous consent request of the Senator from South Carolina?

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the Record.

MR. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

MR. THURMOND. I yield.

MR. GOLDWATER. I wish to compliment the distinguished Senator from South Carolina on his remarks, and comment that the junior Senator from Arizona should like to join in full support of the Bridges-Byrd amendment.

I should like to ask the distinguished Senator if he realizes two facts. Does the Senator know that the United States today has a greater national debt than the combined debts of all of the other countries in the world?

MR. THURMOND. That is my understanding. Our debt is larger than that of all of the other nations of the world put together.

MR. GOLDWATER. Does the Senator realize also that every baby born today has a $1,675 first mortgage hanging around his neck?

MR. THURMOND. I have not calculated the exact amount, but I should say it is at least that.

MR. BRIDGES. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield to me for a moment on this particular subject — I should like to have the floor in my own right after the Senator from Georgia (Mr. Russell) addresses the Senate — I want to thank him for the statement and to say that I know how the very courageous Senator from South Carolina stands on this matter, and we all appreciate it.

I want to say very sincerely that in the 21 years I have been a part of the Senate — and I know the Senator from Virginia (Mr. Byrd), who has co-sponsored this proposal, has been in the Senate longer than I have — it seems to us the only practical way that we shall be able to obtain any assurance of a balanced budget over a period of time is by a constitutional method such as is proposed.

While there may be flaws in the proposal to have a constitutional amendment such as we propose, it is the most practical approach to this problem, and I think it is at least a partial answer to the long-range problem. I feel that if the Congress will pass the joint resolution, it can be ratified by the States in the course of the next two or three years, because there is a growing feeling in favor of such a move.

MR. BRIDGES. Mr. President, at this time I ask unanimous consent to have the names of the distinguished Senator from South Carolina (Mr. Thurmond) and the distinguished Senator from Arizona (Mr. Goldwater) added to the list of co-sponsors of the joint resolution.

-end-
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One of the things that bothers me most in trying to arrive at the right answer when considering legislation is: Where should the role of the Federal Government start and stop?

In a great many cases it is necessary to decide whether the Federal Government has the responsibility for initiating and carrying on a certain program. Sometimes the lines are clear-cut and it is evident that the States have full power and responsibility to look after certain functions of government and services to the people. At other times, it is more difficult to decide just where the role of the Federal Government should begin and end.

Especially troublesome is the matter of whether an existing program should be expanded or maintained at the same level of activity.

In each instance I try to take into account the right and responsibility of the States, first of all.

Then I seek to determine if the proposal is necessary, if it should be started or continued, and if continued, if it should be expanded as is so often proposed.

I realize that once a federal program is put into operation, it is almost impossible to persuade a majority of the Congress that it should ever come to an end.

This is being written on Washington's Birthday, and I wish the truth of the necessity for each program were as evident as the truth was whenever Washington himself spoke. Once the truth of the merit of each proposal is found, it becomes easy for me to vote my conscience. I don't know any other way of acting on the many problems that come to a Senator.

SMALL BUSINESS TAX AID

Through the months since I was elected to the Senate in 1954, I have constantly been thinking of the problems of the small businessman.

I am now working on a plan which I hope to introduce as legislation in the Senate within a few days to give some relief to small businessmen. This relief would be in the form of a standard deduction from the federal income tax on their businesses.

This standard business deduction would work the same way the present standard deduction applies to personal income taxes. Instead of having to list each deduction allowed by the law, a small businessman choosing to take a standard deduction would then be relieved of keeping detailed records now essential to the listing of all business expenses.
In some instances this system might result in a lower tax than now being paid by the small businessman. In most cases it probably would amount to about the same payment.

However, the time and trouble and expense which so many small businessmen now complain of in connection with the record-keeping and reporting of their affairs to meet federal laws and regulations would be alleviated to some extent.

PLYWOOD IMPORTS DAMAGING

In connection with still another problem besetting a Southern industry, I am working on a bill to introduce in the Senate which would give needed relief to the plywood industry against the inroads of plywood imported from Japan.

Foreign imports of plywood, from all countries, have increased 1,000 per cent since 1951 when the tariff on plywood was reduced. From Japan alone, the increase during the same period has been 4,120 per cent. Of all the plywood and veneers now used in this country, 46.6 per cent of it now comes from foreign lands.

My feeling is that some protection is necessary for our own plywood manufacturers against such severe loss of markets to the foreign manufacturers.

COTTON PARITY SITUATION

On February 1 and again on February 9 I protested to Mr. Benson, the Secretary of Agriculture, against a reduction in the support price of cotton from 82 1/2 per cent of parity to 77 per cent.

The answer I have received is that the reduction was in line with the Department's policy "that price floors should be reduced in times of surpluses to discourage overproduction and increased in times of shortages to encourage greater production."

On a slightly more optimistic note, the letter from Assistant Secretary Marvin McClain, also stated that "in the event market prospects improve or supplies are reduced at the beginning of the marketing year...more than is expected at this time, the announced level of support will be increased....".

I hope the Congress will approve my permanent 90 per cent parity bill instead of depending on mere possibilities.

Sincerely,

Strom Thurmond

- END -
Advocates of the so-called civil rights bills, which are now pending in congressional committees, have tried to make it appear that these bills are necessary to protect the rights of Negroes in the South.

That is not true. The administration of laws protecting the civil rights of citizens is being carried out much more intelligently at the local levels of government than could ever be possible through edicts handed down from Washington.

State officials and county officials know the people and know the problems of the people. Most officials in Washington in the Federal Government know much less about local problems than do the public officials in the States and in the counties.

For many years, I have been deeply troubled by what is happening to constitutional government in this country. I am fighting for the preservation of constitutional government in the appearances I have made during the past week before the subcommittees of the House and Senate Judiciary Committees that have been holding hearings on the so-called civil rights bills.

There are approximately a dozen different proposals embodied in the many bills which have been introduced. A great many bills duplicate others in one way or another.

The principal proposals are as follows:

1. To create a civil rights commission which would report its findings and make recommendations to the President after investigating the status of civil rights law enforcement over the country.

2. To establish a civil rights division in the Justice Department under an additional Assistant Attorney General, instead of the present smaller civil rights section in the Criminal Division.

3. To give the Federal Government, through the Justice Department, authority to enter into civil actions against persons charged with violations of civil rights laws.

4. To give the Federal Government authority to enter into the policing of elections.

5. To establish a Joint Congressional Committee on civil rights.


7. Enactment of a new law against involuntary servitude, peonage, etc.

8. Enactment of a specific statute against segregation in interstate transportation.

10. Enactment of a federal anti-poll tax law.

11. Enactment of a law to require that all cases of persons charged with attacking members of the armed forces be heard in federal court instead of either in federal or state court.

I told the House and Senate Committees that "tyranny by any other name is just as bad," and that I did not want to see tyranny foisted on the American people under the alias of civil rights.

Real civil rights and so-called civil rights should not be confused. Everybody favors human rights. But it is a fraud on the American people to pretend that human rights can long endure without constitutional restraint on the power of government.

The actual power of the Federal Government should not be confused with power longed-for by those who would destroy the States as sovereign governments.

We must not lose sight of the fact that the States created the Federal Union; the Federal Government did not create the States.

Officials in the Federal Government, whether in the Executive, Legislative, or Judicial Branch, should not forget to whom they owe their allegiance. Each of us owes his allegiance to the Constitution and to the people. We have taken an oath to support and defend the Constitution.

The unconstitutional proposals contained in the so-called civil rights bills should be defeated. I shall continue to fight these bills in every way possible.

Sincerely,

Strom Thurmond
LONG STUDY OF RESOLUTION

For many weeks I gave a great deal of consideration to the resolution approving military and economic cooperation with nations in the Middle East at the President's discretion.

I voted for the resolution when it was approved by a vote of 72 - 19. I was opposed to the provision specifically authorizing use of $200,000,000 for economic aid to Middle Eastern nations. I voted for the Russell amendment which would have removed that authorization because I believe we should try to reduce foreign economic aid instead of increasing it.

Nevertheless, when we were defeated in our efforts to remove that provision, I felt the resolution was too important to our country to vote against it. I want to tell you the reasons which brought me to that viewpoint.

PEACE MOST VITAL ISSUE

I believe every citizen of this country -- particularly every mother and father -- is more interested in continued peace than in any other matter.

Regardless of our preference to leave other nations to work out their own problems, I am convinced that circumstances force the United States to recognize the practical situation which exists in the Middle East. If we fail to take steps to halt the infiltration of Middle Eastern nations by the Communists, I believe it is most likely we shall soon find ourselves faced with another situation such as the one which developed in Korea in June 1950.

KOREA A TRAGIC EXAMPLE

In my opinion the Korean War developed largely as a result of our failure to let it be known that we were interested in maintaining the integrity of South Korea. Instead of letting our interest be known, Dean Acheson, the Secretary of State at that time, had made a speech in January 1950 in which he did not mention Korea as being one of the areas in which we were interested.

Korea was a tragic and costly experience to the United States, both in human lives and in our resources. We cannot charge the Secretary of State with causing the Communist attack on South Korea, but we must remember the lesson of Korea when we consider our vital interests in trying to maintain peace in the Middle East.

FORMOSA RESOLUTION EFFECTIVE

Another instance in our foreign relations should also be remembered. In 1955 the President requested the Congress to approve a resolution expressing our interest in Formosa and certain of the off-shore islands of China. At that time the Chinese Communists were giving every indication of launching attacks on the islands and on Formosa. When the Congress approved the resolution with an overwhelming show of unity, the Chinese Communists immediately became more conciliatory toward the United States.
The lessons of Korea and Formosa show rather clearly that the nations of the world respect the United States when we take a positive position in any matter.

DEMONSTRATION OF UNITY NEEDED

The most important point in approving the resolution was to demonstrate the unity and determination of America against the aggression of the Communists. I am firmly convinced the resolution has had that effect and will help restrain the Reds in the Middle East.

CONFIDENCE IN RICHARDS

I am greatly pleased that a South Carolinian has been selected by the President as his Special Ambassador to the Middle East. I refer to former Congressman James P. Richards of Lancaster. Ambassador Richards retired from Congress as Chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House of Representatives.

His vast experience over nearly a quarter of a century in the House of Representatives, as well as his experience in 1953 as a member of the United States Delegation to the United Nations, give him the highly important background needed to take a practical approach to international problems. The fact that Dick Richards is to lead our efforts to maintain peace in the Middle East gives me added confidence in the program.

ADDITIONAL FHA EMERGENCY LOANS PROMISED

Since returning to Washington in January, I have held a number of conferences with Farmers Home Administration officials urging them to make it easier for the small farmer to secure emergency loans.

Administrator K. H. Hanson of FHA has now promised me that additional emergency loans will be made available to farmers in South Carolina. He issued instructions on March 5 to FHA officials in South Carolina. Details of the loan requirements can be obtained from local FHA offices.

CO-SPONSOR OF FARM LABOR BILL

I have joined Senator Stennis of Mississippi in sponsoring a bill to give the farmer greater protection than he now has under definitions of the Fair Labor Standards Act.

Because of a Supreme Court decision and application of the law by the Secretary of Labor, farmers have been subjected to undue hardships in connection with the "first processing" of commodities. This bill clarifies the definitions of "agriculture," "the area of production," and "first processing." The result should be a fairer application of the law to farmers.

ANTI-DUMPING BILL CO-SPONSOR

Another bill I am co-sponsoring with Senator Magnuson of Washington, is to prevent the "dumping" of foreign goods in this country by price-cutting devices. The bill will tighten up loopholes in the present anti-dumping law and simplify definitions to make enforcement easier, thus protecting American employees and employers from floods of foreign-made goods.

Sincerely,

Strom Thurmond
BUSY TIME FOR SENATORS

This is one of the busiest times of the year for the Senate. During the past week I have been attending a great number of meetings of committees and subcommittees of which I am a member.

Since appearing with the group of special representatives of the State of South Carolina before the Senate Judiciary subcommittee in opposition to the so-called civil rights bills, I have been attending meetings of the Senate Commerce Committee on several subjects, including television service to the public.

During the past week several hearings have been held by the Railroad Retirement subcommittee of the Senate Labor Committee, of which I am also a member.

VETERANS SUBCOMMITTEE MEETS

As chairman of the Labor Committee's Veterans Affairs subcommittee, I am now presiding over hearings on a number of bills of great importance to veterans. These bills include amendments or extensions of the provisions of the Veterans Readjustment Assistance Act. This is usually called the Korean G. I. Bill of Rights.

AUTO MARKETING STUDY

Another subcommittee of which I am a member has also started new hearings on automobile financing and marketing practices. This is the Automobile Marketing Practices subcommittee of the Senate Commerce Committee.

Since it is impossible for all committees to schedule their meetings and hearings to avoid conflicts with other committee meetings, we Senators simply have to divide our time between the committees of which we are members. Of course, in a case such as my being Chairman of the Veterans Affairs subcommittee, I shall devote every minute possible to it.

LONG WORK SCHEDULE DAILY

In addition to the regular schedule of committee and subcommittee meetings, the Senate, itself, also meets long hours. Perhaps there are people who have heard that the Senate usually meets at noon and perhaps they wonder what Senators do all the morning.

Actually, committees start early in the day and sometimes continue meeting while the Senate is in session. This means that when roll-call votes are taken a Senator must run back and forth from his committees to the floor of the Senate.

So the average Senator's work-day runs from early to late. Then his home-work runs just as long as he can hold his eyes open. There is seldom enough time to do all the things I would like to get done.
INTRODUCED SEVERAL BILLS

During the past week I have introduced several bills and co-sponsored several others.

One of my bills would permit small businessmen, including farmers, to take a standard federal income tax deduction on their business operations instead of having to keep books and itemize deductions. The trade, business or farm involved would not be eligible to take this standard deduction if it employed more than 10 persons.

The main purpose of the bill is to relieve small businessmen and farmers from the necessity of keeping detailed records for tax purposes alone. The Federal Government already allows this standard deduction on the payment of personal income taxes. My bill would simply extend the right to taxes on business income.

PROTECTION FOR PLYWOOD MAKERS

Another bill of mine would give some relief and protection to the plywood and veneer manufacturers, and the farmers who supply them with logs, against the plywood imported from foreign countries.

There are approximately 375 plywood and veneer plants in the United States, scattered over some 30 States. From 1954 through 1956, 65 plants were forced to shut-down or to cut-back production as a result of plywood imports, principally from Japan. While the use of plywood in this country was increasing by 74 per cent during the past five years, United States plywood plants gained only six-tenths of one per cent of that total. The rest of the gain was in the sale of imported plywood.

My bill would prohibit the importation of more than 15 per cent of the total plywood used in this country in any year. I believe the American plywood maker and the farmers who supply him with logs deserve this much protection against the low-wage countries which have seriously damaged our own industry.

Sincerely,

Strom Thurmond

-end-
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WRITES EASTLAND ON FORCE BILLS

The action of the Constitutional Rights subcommittee of the Senate Judiciary Committee in approving a so-called civil rights bill has caused me great concern.

I have written a letter to Senator Eastland of Mississippi, chairman of the Senate Judiciary Committee, urging him to call new hearings on the bills by the full Committee. I pointed out that the bill reported favorably by the subcommittee would severely restrict the rights of individuals and the States.

In my opinion, the holding of further hearings on the bills is essential and necessary. The vote in the subcommittee to approve the proposals was only 4 to 2.

SPLIT ON TRIAL BY JURY

On the question of making it possible to deny the right of trial by jury in civil rights cases when the United States Department of Justice enters the case, the vote was 3 to 3. Actually, therefore, the subcommittee was split exactly in half on this vital question.

I do not believe the American people want to see the Senate of the United States -- or even its Judiciary Committee -- approve a law to deny the right of trial by jury. This is a fundamental right, guaranteed to every American by the Constitution.

OBJECTS TO ALL PROVISIONS

All of the provisions of the civil rights bill approved by the subcommittee are objectionable and obnoxious to me. I am strongly opposing the denial of the right to trial by jury because I consider it to be a blow at a basic principle on which this nation was founded.

I am confident that Senator Eastland will not lightly pass over the objections which have been voiced to the so-called civil rights bills. But I wanted him to know how South Carolinians feel about the bills.

Also, I would like for the full Senate Judiciary Committee to have the opportunity to hear the views of some South Carolinians. Those who appeared before the subcommittee did a magnificent job.

FDIC RECOGNIZES RIGHT OF STATE

During the past week, the Senate has been considering a bill dealing with banking laws.

One of the problems that came up in connection with this legislation was whether federal authorities, such as the Comptroller of the Currency, the Federal Reserve Board, or the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, should have authority over mergers of purely State banks.
I was able to secure a letter from the General Counsel of the FDIC.

"I wish to assure you on behalf of the Corporation," he said, "that it will not consent to any transaction, under this section of the law, involving a State bank, without the prior approval of the State banking authority, if such approval is required by State law." I am including this letter in the Congressional Record as proof of this recognition of the right of the States.

VETERANS HEARINGS CONTINUE

This past week I have been holding hearings as chairman of the Veterans Affairs subcommittee. The bills under consideration propose to extend to veterans of peace-time service various benefits now received under the G. I. Bill of Rights by Korean War veterans.

Those who have testified include: Veterans Administration officials, Defense Department officials, General Hershey of Selective Service, Senator Case of South Dakota and Senator Morse of Oregon.

The hearings will probably continue for another month before the subcommittee begins to consider whether legislation is needed.

STUDIES AUTO MARKET PRACTICES

I have also been busy with the Auto Marketing Practices subcommittee hearings. We are continuing to study financing practices of the credit companies to determine if legislation is needed to protect the public more adequately on credit and insurance charges.

Sincerely,
Strom Thurmond
During the past two years, and especially this year, we have heard a great deal of noise from liberal elements in this country advocating the enactment of stronger so-called civil rights laws.

**TRIAL BY JURY CAN BE DENIED**

But in all this furor, neither you nor I have heard any of the liberals calling for greater protection of the fundamental right of Americans to trial by jury. It may surprise some of you to know that in certain instances, under present laws, you might be denied the right of trial by jury. Nevertheless, that is the situation.

Article III, Section 2, of the Constitution guarantees that:

"The trial of all crimes, except in cases of impeachment, shall be by jury..."

Further on in the Constitution, the right of trial by jury is spelled out in the Sixth Amendment. It states:

"In all criminal prosecutions, the accused shall enjoy the right to a speedy and public trial, by an impartial jury of the State and district wherein the crime shall have been committed..."

In spite of these constitutional provisions, our federal laws do not provide the protection of trial by jury in all cases.

**RIGHT DENIED INJUNCTION VIOLATOR**

The accused person, under present law, is not entitled to trial by jury in contempt cases when he is charged with violation of a court order or injunction.

However, there is a special provision of the present law which guarantees trial by jury to persons charged with violation of court orders in labor dispute cases.

Also, under present law, the accused does not have the right of trial by jury if the United States is a party to the case.

Thus, in effect, the Attorney General of the United States could instruct a District Attorney to prosecute all cases involving school matters, or any other matter, and thus deny the defendants their right of trial by jury.

**INTRODUCES BILL TO PROTECT RIGHT**

Because of these denials of the right of trial by jury, I have introduced a bill in the Senate with Senators Eastland and Byrd to protect the constitutional right of trial by jury.
This bill would do two things. It would give every citizen the right now enjoyed by persons in labor disputes who violate injunctions. It would also give everybody the right of trial by jury in cases even when the United States was a party in the case.

The time has not come in this country when the end justifies the means in courts of justice -- and I do not believe such a time will ever come. I can not visualize any situation under which it could be claimed that justice is best served by denial of jury trial, if the accused desires a jury to hear his case.

The bill I am co-sponsoring would extend the same right to every citizen. That is what the liberals claim they want in other matters.

FINDS AUTO INSURANCE OVER-CHARGES

During the past week at hearings of the Auto Marketing Practices subcommittee, I learned that certain automobile insurance companies operating in South Carolina have over-charged policy holders. I wrote to State Insurance Commissioner R. Lee Kelly and called this matter to his attention.

If you are now, or have been, insuring your automobile with the Calvert Fire Insurance Company, the Emmco Insurance Company, or the Service Fire Insurance Company, you should write the company and ask if you have made any over-payment on your premiums. These companies have written more than $15.5 million dollars in direct premiums in South Carolina in the past six years.

SOME REFUNDS MADE

The subcommittee of which I am a member learned that over-charges for auto insurance on a three-year term of financing could have amounted to as much as $125, in some instances. Some refunds have been made by the companies, but the letters they sent out were so vague that you might not have understood you were due a refund. I urge you to check up on whether you are due to receive money back.

Sincerely,

Strom Thurmond
PEOPLE WANT BUDGET CUT

On several previous occasions I have mentioned my serious concern over the Federal Budget. Every day I am hearing from people, by mail and in personal conversations, on this subject.

The views which have been expressed to me convince me that the people of this country want to see Congress reduce the proposed budget for 1958. I am further convinced that the people want to see a start made toward reduction of the public debt.

STUDENTS REQUEST ACTION

I was greatly impressed by a letter I received during the past week from the students of St. Johns High School in Charleston County. They declared that, in their opinion, the "budget must be drastically cut."

But the thing that impressed me most with this fine letter was that the young people of this country are becoming more aware of the vital import this budget has for them in the future.

They are looking to Congress collectively and to the members individually to do something to bring about greater economy in the Federal Government. These young people realize that excessive spending today by the Federal Government means they will have to pay the bills tomorrow. We know this is true because today we are paying the debts of the post-war days of World War II, as well as the costs of the war itself.

SAY THEIR FAITH SHAKEN

The students who wrote the letter stated that their faith, with reference to Congress, is being quite shaken. I can well understand that view if Congress fails to reduce the budget.

I am going to do everything in my power to restore the faith of these young people in their government by trying to chop-off and chop-out of the budget as much non-essential spending as possible.

When the one and a half billion dollar rivers and harbors authorization bill came up in the Senate, nearly 400 million dollars were for projects which had not been approved by the Army Engineers or by the Bureau of the Budget. I voted first to send the bill back to the Public Works Committee until recommendations could be received as to whether the projects were essential or not. But the Senate voted against sending the bill back to committee, so then I voted against the bill.

NO JUSTIFICATION FOR SOME FUNDS

I could not see any justification for authorizing the spending of 400 million dollars which had not been recommended by the appropriate agencies of the Government. There is no need to have those agencies if we do not take the time to receive their advice on such matters.
Dollars today will only be worth dimes tomorrow if we do not stop spending more each year in times of prosperity and thus adding to the spiral of inflation.

I am confident the American system of government cannot be destroyed from outside. I do not want to see it destroyed from within by prodigal spending.

NEW STEP TOWARD BUDGET CONTROL

The Senate has now passed a bill which I co-sponsored to provide for a Joint House-Senate Committee on the Budget so as to give the Congress better information on the annual budget and a greater control over it.

Three times previously, in other years, the Senate has approved a similar bill, but on neither occasion has the House also approved the bill. In view of the fact that about 70 members of the Senate joined in sponsoring the bill this year, I am hopeful it will be approved by the House.

EQUAL RIGHTS SOUGHT FOR WOMEN

I have joined as co-sponsor of a resolution which would submit to the States a proposal to amend the Constitution so as to provide for equal rights under law for the women of this country.

Women outnumber men by 1,030,000 in the United States, according to the 1950 census. Women have attained many positions of responsibility and prominence by their ability, courage, and hard work.

I feel that the time is over-due for them to be recognized in our Constitution, by legal amendment, as having all and equal rights under the law with men. There are a number of co-sponsors of this resolution and I hope that it will be approved.

CONSERVATION RESERVE DEADLINE APRIL 15

Now let me say a word to farmers. The deadline for signing contracts to enter land in the conservation reserve division of the Soil Bank Program is April 15. If you know anybody with land eligible for the conservation reserve, remind them of the April 15 deadline.

Sincerely,
Strom Thurmond
This week I want to discuss with you several matters about legislation pending in the Congress.

Every year the members of Congress have to face and pass in some form the appropriations bills to provide the funds necessary to operate the Government and to carry on the various functions established under our laws. Each year, of course, many other kinds of bills are introduced in the Senate and the House. Most of them never get out of the Committees to which they are referred.

MUST FACE APPROPRIATIONS EACH YEAR

But regardless of other bills and their fates, the members of Congress know that each year will bring them face to face with the problem of approving appropriations to meet the budget.

I believe it has been a long time since so many people all over the nation have taken as much interest as now in the appropriations bills and the budget. This year it is quite evident that members of the Congress are hearing from the folks back home about the need for greater economy in Government.

INTEREST OF THE PEOPLE HEALTHY SIGN

I think this is a healthy sign because when the people take an interest in government economy, it forces members of Congress, who might be inclined to spend more and more, to stop and take a second look at the size of the budget proposals. It will also make them less eager to continue wasteful spending overseas and in setting up ambitious new programs.

In my opinion, cutting the budget is the chief interest of people generally over the country.

NO APPROPRIATIONS YET APPROVED BY SENATE

As yet, the Senate has not passed any of the appropriations bills. It will be possible to reduce something from each bill, if a majority of the Senate and House vote to do so.

INTENDS TO VOTE FOR REDUCTIONS WHEREVER POSSIBLE

I fully intend to vote for reductions wherever I believe it possible to do so without endangering our national defense and without hampering necessary programs of the Government. I do not believe this is the time to approve new programs and consequent new spending.

Sometimes I consider it more important that certain legislation be stopped than for any legislation to be passed. The best legislation in some cases is no legislation.

PREVENTING LEGISLATION IMPORTANT

Certainly, it is more important to prevent the passage of the so-called civil rights bills, the federal aid to education bill, and some phases of
the immigration bill than to pass any bills at all. Several times previously I have mentioned all of these bills and I shall not go into detail about them at this time.

However, the budget -- the appropriations bills -- and the undesirable bills I mentioned are the most important matters pending in Congress. Of course, there are many other important matters to be considered, but none compares with the civil rights, aid to education, and immigration bills.

My main goal at this time is to do everything in my power to cut the budget of almost 72 billion dollars and to prevent the passage of those other bills.

CALHOUN WINS NEW HONOR

South Carolina and the entire South should be proud of the fact that John C. Calhoun was chosen by the Special Senate Committee as one of five outstanding Senators whose portraits will be placed in the Senate reception room.

I nominated Calhoun because of his great contributions to this nation and for the force of character which he always exercised.

He was author of the resolution declaring war on England in 1812. As a result, this country forever threw off the yoke of foreign control of commerce on the high seas.

As Secretary of War, he reorganized the War Department and made it effective.

LOYAL TO SOUTH AS VICE PRESIDENT

As Vice President, Calhoun unhesitatingly took his position on the side of the South against the ruinous tariffs. He also wrote his Exposition of the Constitution while Vice President, placing himself squarely on the side of States Rights, in spite of his nation-wide popularity and the possibility that he might be elected President.

As Secretary of State, he brought about the annexation of Texas, saving this territory for the United States when there was much opposition to the annexation.

WARNED OF RESULTS OF ABOLITION

Finally, in the Senate during his last years, Calhoun tilted with Webster and Clay, trying with all his power to save the Union and protect the South at the same time. Even when he was dying, he issued a final warning in the Senate as to the sure results of abolition.

Had Calhoun placed public approval above personal purity he most likely would have been President.

Sincerely,

Strom Thurmond
SUPREME COURT ACTIONS ADVERSE

During the past few years, the United States Supreme Court has handed down several decisions adversely affecting vital matters of great concern to the American people.

The first of the cases to which I refer was the notorious decision of May 17, 1954, in which it was decreed that separate but equal public schools would no longer meet the legal test, that segregation could not be enforced in the public schools.

Another case arose in Pennsylvania. The Supreme Court decided in Pennsylvania v. Steve Nelson that because there was a federal sedition law, a State had no authority to legislate in that field.

A third case arose in New York City. In this instance the Supreme Court ruled that the City did not have the power to dismiss a teacher who, when questioned by duly constituted authority, refused to state whether he was a communist.

LATEST CASE INVOLVES PRIVATE SCHOOL

On April 29 of this year, the Supreme Court handed down another verdict in a case involving a private school. The decision reversed the decision of the Pennsylvania Supreme Court, as also had happened in the Steve Nelson case.

This latest usurpation of power by the United States Supreme Court involved the question of whether Stephen Girard, who died in 1831, could will his estate to be used for the operation of a private school exclusively for poor white orphan boys. After 126 years, the Supreme Court has decreed that Girard could not provide in his will for such use of his funds, that the school in Philadelphia will have to be opened to Negroes.

PUBLIC FUNDS NOT INVOLVED

This case does not involve the question of using public funds to operate the Girard school. The only public connection with the school was the fact that Girard provided in his will that the Board of Directors of City Trusts be trustee for the school established by Girard's will.

The plaintiffs in the case decided by the Supreme Court contended that Negro children should not be excluded from the school because such exclusion would violate the Fourteenth Amendment to the Constitution.

Pennsylvania Court Opinion

But the Pennsylvania Supreme Court declared that:

"No such question could possibly arise in the case of a private charitable trust for the Fourteenth Amendment applies only to agencies of the State or of a municipality within the State; it is directed solely against State, not individual, action ..."
SUPREME COURT DIFFERS

However, in spite of this distinction made by the Pennsylvania Court in denying the application of the plaintiffs, the United States Supreme Court said:

"The Board which operates Girard College is an agency of the State of Pennsylvania. Therefore, even though the Board was acting as a trustee, its refusal to admit (the plaintiffs) ...because they were Negroes was discrimina­tion by the State. Such discrimination is forbidden by the Fourteenth Amendment..."

Thus the citizens of the United States now are faced with a new law "written" by the Supreme Court. They cannot will their estates to be used for specific purposes with any assurance their intent will be carried out, unless it meets with the approval of the Supreme Court.

SUPREME COURT FAILS TO DISTINGUISH

Apparently the Supreme Court could not distinguish between the Philadelphia Board of Trusts acting in the capacity of trustee for Girard and acting in an official capacity for the State. This decision, unless reversed, means that the sovereign States will have to take additional measures to strengthen the legal bulwarks which have been established to prevent usurpation of power by the Supreme Court.

I intend to give careful attention to this question to determine if any action can be taken in the Congress against such usurpation by the Supreme Court.

MADE PROGRESS ON THREE BILLS

During the past week, I have been greatly encouraged by action taken or promised on three bills now pending in the Senate Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee.

First, I succeeded in blocking action for another two weeks on S. 1490, a bill which would require farmers and other small truckers to register their vehicles with the Interstate Commerce Commission. As I stated several weeks ago, I see no need for this additional red tape and federal control over a farmer who might cross a State line only once a year. Under the bill as now written, he would have to register if he made just one trip into another State. When this bill is brought up again, I hope it can be amended if not defeated.

Second, at the Commerce Committee meeting, I secured the promise of Senator Monroney (D-Okla), chairman of the Aviation Subcommittee, to hold early hearings on S. 4 which I introduced to prohibit the serving or con­sumption of liquor on airplanes.

Third, Senator Smathers (D-Fla), chairman of the Surface Transportation Subcommittee, to hold hearings on S. 1226, my bill to require the labeling of cigarette packages as to contents.

I am confident that favorable action in all these matters would be in the best public interest and I believe that hearings will point up the need for the actions I have suggested.

Sincerely,
Strom Thurmond

END
Several times since January, I have mentioned the subject of economy in
government -- especially with reference to cutting the budget proposals for
1958. Now I want to discuss the budget and the financial situation of the
United States with you in greater detail.

PRESIDENT’S BUDGET TOTALS $71.8 BILLION

The President has proposed expenditures of $71.8 billion for the year
beginning July 1. Of that amount approximately $45.3 billion is allocated for
national security purposes.

Of course it is essential that we maintain a strong defense force
because the Soviet Union forces us to do so by its own excessive armament
program. Nevertheless, I believe that every effort should be made to reduce
spending where possible in the defense establishment, but not to the detriment
of national security.

But the cost of national security is not the only reason our budget is
so high. Another reason is that too many people in the Congress and too many
people in the Executive Departments want to spend when we should be saving.

PUBLIC DEBT MULTIPLIED 17 TIMES IN 25 YEARS

In 1932 the public debt of the Federal Government totaled $16 billion.
Now it has risen to the astronomical sum of $275 billion.

What that means is simply this: That the entire national debt incurred
from the founding of the republic until 1932 -- a period of 145 years -- has
multiplied 17 times in the past 25 years. In the process of incurring this
tremendous national debt, we have obligated ourselves to pay an almost unbe­
lievable amount of interest.

TENTH OF BUDGET IS INTEREST ON DEBT

More than one-tenth of the entire budget, as proposed by the President,
consists of funds to pay the interest on the debt. It will take $7.4 billion
to meet this obligation. That is part of the cost of having borrowed and
borrowed in years past. Ten cents out of every dollar spent next year by the
Federal Government will go toward paying the interest on the debt, while only
two cents out of every dollar will go toward paying off the debt itself --
reduction of the principal.

If we started reducing the national debt by paying $5 billion per year
for that purpose, it would take 55 years to pay off our present obligations,
even if we did not have some national emergency which required additional
borrowing.

Actually, however, the prospects are that there will be only a small
margin between the cost of the proposed budget for next year and the revenue
from taxes to pay those costs.
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CERTAIN PAYMENTS ESTABLISHED UNDER LAW

Where the law requires certain payments for social security, for veterans, for retirement benefits, etc., we cannot cut without going back on the promises made by the enactment of the laws which established those programs. But where American dollars are being sent overseas to raise the economic level of foreign nations, we can cut appropriations and we must do so.

Also, we must start practicing greater economy in the operation of the Federal Government and its various departments.

MUST CUT BUDGET AND NATIONAL DEBT

I advocate cutting the budget now so we can make a start on reduction of the national debt and then try to reduce taxes. I do not see how taxes can be cut until we face up to the problem and cut spending, both overseas and at home.

But evidently the voice of the people has been heard by some of my "borrowing and spending" colleagues because the Senate has voted to cut the appropriations requested by the first four departments whose bills have come before us. These were appropriations for the Post Office, Treasury, Justice and State departments.

VOTED FOR ALL REDUCTIONS

I voted for reductions in each instance. I respect the views of the President, but I cannot agree with him that all the expenditures he advocated for the 1958 budget are necessary. One of his requests was for increased appropriations to the United States Information Service.

The Senate, by a roll-call vote of 61 to 15, cut the request for the information service by $14.9 million. The fact that this reduction was approved by such a great majority indicates to me that the largest peace-time budget in the history of the nation is going to be trimmed down considerably before it is finally approved.

I am happy to note that some of the former spenders are beginning to listen to the people who have been crying for relief from wasteful federal spending.

Sincerely,

Strom Thurmond

END
SMALL FARMERS PROTECTED FROM RED TAPE

During the past week in the Senate Commerce Committee, I was successful in securing an indefinite postponement of a bill which would have wrapped red tape around small farmers operating their trucks across State lines even once a year.

This bill was S. 1490 and had it been approved and then passed by the Senate and House, it would have required every trucker to register with the Interstate Commerce Commission and to comply with complicated regulations of the ICC. Since many farmers, hauling their own products, find it necessary to cross State lines, I started opposing the bill in the Committee as soon as it came up about a month ago.

ICC POLICE CONTROL KILLED

In effect, had the bill passed, it would have given the ICC police control over farmers in their trucking activities, even though they were handling their own goods in small trucks -- in no way to be considered commercial trucking.

The question of safety on the highways is one which our own State Highway Department and the highway departments of other States are completely capable of enforcing. They do not need the help of a Federal Agency to police the roads.

FEARED FUTURE EFFECTS

When these facts were made clear to members of the Committee, I was able to secure more than half the members to support my opposition to the bill when I explained the red tape. Once the farmers had been forced to register, I fear that future efforts would have been made to bring about complete economic control through licensing and levying of fees for licenses. Also, the harassment of filling out and filing forms with the ICC every year, which the big trucking companies are required to do, would have greatly complicated small farming activities.

Since the bill has been indefinitely postponed, I do not expect it to be taken up again this year.

BUDGET CONTINUING PROBLEM

As this session of Congress moves along, the continuing chief topic of consideration and conversation is the size of the proposed budget.

Perhaps the budget is generally a dry subject to you. The reason I have been discussing it is that I believe you should know what is happening to your tax dollars.

Sometimes the actual expenditures for a budget year -- from July 1 of one year through June 30 of the next -- are far greater than the total appropriations approved by the Congress for that particular year.
DEFICIENCY BILLS ADD TO BUDGET

This comes about as a result of several situations, two of which I want to point out. First, is the matter of deficiency or supplemental appropriations bills. These are bills which each year provide certain departments with additional funds to spend that same fiscal year above the amount originally appropriated in the preceding session of Congress.

For example, let's consider deficiency and supplemental appropriations approved at the session of the Congress held last year. In 1955 Congress had appropriated about $64.5 billion for 1956. But when the 1956 session of Congress met, deficiency and supplemental appropriations were requested by the departments, and Congress appropriated an additional $857,414,000 for use in fiscal 1956. This, in effect, increased the total appropriations for 1956.

Thus, the appropriation made for each fiscal year of the Federal Government is not final until all the deficiency and supplemental appropriations bills are counted in the total.

$5 BILLION IN DEFICIENCIES FOR 1956

Budget requests in 1956 totaled $73.3 billion. Total appropriations were slightly less than that amount but nearly $5 billion of the $73 billion was for deficiency and supplemental appropriations to be used before July 1 of last year -- actually in the budget year of 1956.

Already in this session of Congress, the Senate has considered and approved five deficiency and supplemental appropriations bills. The funds approved in these bills total more than half a billion dollars in money which should be charged against the 1957 budget and added to the total appropriations for 1957 which were approved last year by Congress.

In as far as possible, I believe deficiency and supplemental appropriations bills should be eliminated. Deficiency and supplemental funds should be limited to real emergencies or the occurrence of uncontrollable situations.

I intend to do all I can to bring about some readjustment of this present method of appropriating additional funds for so-called deficiencies when they often are simply expansions or extensions of departmental activities.

CARRY-OVER SPENDING GREAT

A second budget matter which concerns me greatly is the fact that certain funds appropriated during any given fiscal year are permitted to be carried over for use in future years.

Although we are complaining about the size of the $71.8 billion budget proposed for 1958, that amount is only about one-half of the total expenditures the Federal Government will make during the year beginning July 1.

Funds carried over from prior years, which will be spent in 1958, now total more than the 1958 budget itself.

ACTUAL SPENDING IN 1958 NEAR $143 BILLION

More than $143 billion will be spent if the proposed budget is added to the funds available from prior years. Highway trust fund appropriations and balances might raise the total above $150 billion.

I have already voted to reduce the budget requests this year by nearly half a billion dollars in the regular appropriations bills which have been considered in the Senate. Before the year is out, I hope we can trim billions more and make a start toward better regulation of the matters I have discussed.

Sincerely,

Strom Thurmond
This week I want to talk with you about several matters. As this session of the Senate moves along the legislative activity is speeding up toward eventual adjournment, probably by the first of August.

HOUSING BILL PASSED

During the past week the Senate considered the housing bill for 1958. I voted for the provisions which I considered to be moderate and reasonable.

In some phases of housing it is not possible or feasible for private enterprise to assume the entire responsibility. On the other hand, there are members of the Senate who appear to want to put private industry completely out of house-building.

GOVERNMENT SHOULD NOT DOMINATE

My own position is that the Government should only supplement the efforts of private enterprise in the construction of adequate housing for the nation. Government should never become the dominant force in this field.

I tried to take these things into consideration as each issue was raised in the Senate during debate on the housing bill. I voted for the provisions which I believed to be best for all the people of the nation — taking into account home-ownership as well as the cost of taxation to support federal programs.

HEARINGS TO BE HELD ON MY BILLS

The Government Operations Committee of the Senate, of which I am a member, has taken action on three bills of importance, two of which I introduced.

Three members of the Committee were named to a special subcommittee to hold hearings on my two bills. I was appointed chairman and Senators Yarborough of Texas and Revercomb of West Virginia as members of the subcommittee.

One of the bills on which hearings will be held is S. 5, a bill to prevent the allocation of procurement contracts of the departments and agencies of the Federal Government to so-called distressed areas of the country. The present law permits agencies of the Federal Government to channel contracts, such as in the buying of textile products, to areas where there are labor surpluses or where disasters have occurred.

SOUTH DISCRIMINATED AGAINST

What I want to do is to protect the Southern States from such discrimination. Most of the channeling of contracts has been to so-called distressed areas in States outside the South. I recall one instance where a manufacturer in South Carolina was informed that his bid for a contract would not be considered unless he was located in an area where there was a labor surplus or where a disaster had occurred.
I believe the Government should let contracts to the highest bidder who can qualify to perform the job.

I hope anybody who has had experience with this kind of discrimination will write me so that I can provide the committee with as many examples as possible of this unfair practice.

WOULD PROTECT STATES

The second of my bills on which the subcommittee will hold hearings is S. 6. This bill would help the States to regain sales tax revenue now being lost because Federal Government agencies, such as the Atomic Energy Commission, can designate contractors to represent them and thus escape the sales tax which other citizens have to pay.

The Federal Government has invaded so many fields of taxation that it is difficult for the States to find sufficient revenue to operate State governments. I believe they should have authority to collect taxes from everybody alike and not have the Federal Government helping some to escape payment.

BUDGET ACCOUNTING SHOULD BE CHANGED

The third bill to which I referred earlier was S. 434, introduced by Senator Kennedy. The Government Operations Committee reported this bill favorably to the Senate. It would provide for a new system of accounting in the Federal Government so as to show clearly how much of the taxpayers money was being spent each year -- not just how much was being appropriated that year. There is a difference because great amounts of funds are carried over from year to year. As I mentioned last week, the Federal Government is expected to spend between $143 and $150 billion in the year beginning July 1-- not just the $71.8 billion included in the budget.

I hope the Senate and the House will approve this bill so the people of the United States can find out exactly how much tax money is being spent each year.

Sincerely,

Strom Thurmond
Debate in the House of Representatives has again focused attention on the so-called civil rights bill. I opposed this bill before the House Committee and before the Senate Committee which held hearings on the proposals.

At this point, we cannot determine just what the outcome will be of efforts to have the bill approved in the House. However, I am glad that the Senate Judiciary Committee, which has not reported the bill out, has approved an amendment to guarantee trial by jury in the bill.

This was done by a vote of 7 to 3. In so doing the Committee recognized the need for legislation to assure citizens of the right to trial by jury. Even some of the backers of the so-called civil rights bill voted for the trial by jury amendment in the Senate Committee.

However, I want to make one point entirely clear. This amendment to the so-called civil rights bill still does not make the bill acceptable to me. The other provisions of the bill which would give the Federal Government greater authority to meddle in elections and to secure so-called "preventive injunctions" make the bill absolutely obnoxious.

The important thing about the vote in the Senate Committee is that it gives me hope for approval of a bill I introduced with Senators Byrd and Eastland. My bill would guarantee the right of trial by jury in contempt cases for all citizens, just as persons involved in labor disputes now have trial by jury, if they so desire.

Since the Committee has recognized the principle of trial by jury in amending the civil rights bills, I hope the Committee will approve my bill which is completely separate from and independent of the civil rights proposals. Additional protection should be given to the right of trial by jury regardless of the so-called civil rights bills.

Now let me talk with you about the question that has arisen since Great Britain recognized Red China for trade purposes.

I regret that England took this step without co-ordination with the United States. It is another action comparable to that taken by England and France in attacking Egypt at the Suez Canal.

The United States should not enter into trade with communist China, even though Britain has approved such action. Approval of trading with the Reds of China is to me the placing of economic considerations above moral principle.
This country should continue to prohibit trading with Red China until the communists of that country release every prisoner of the United Nations, and until a peace treaty is secured in Korea. Our representative in Geneva has met with China communist representatives almost 70 times in the past two years, trying to reach a settlement for peace in Korea.

MANY PRISONERS STILL UNREPORTED

I have checked with the State and Defense Departments as to how many American prisoners are still being held by the communists in China. There are eight civilians. Also, 450 members of the armed forces are still unaccounted for after being reported prisoners during the Korean War.

The civilians -- including four Catholic missionaries, two businessmen, and two employees of the Army -- have been in jails for as long as four years. The Reds have consistently avoided answering our State Department as to whether the 450 members of the Armed Forces are alive and being held as prisoners of war.

Under such circumstances, I do not see how we can agree to consider trading with Red China until a full accounting is given by the communists and until all United Nations prisoners are released.

DECISION COULD BE MADE LATER ON TRADE

After that a peace treaty should be arrived at quickly. Then a decision could be made as to whether the United States should trade with China in goods which could not be converted to military uses against us. Until these things take place, we should stand firm.

HEARINGS SCHEDULED ON TWO BILLS

As chairman of a special subcommittee, I have scheduled hearings on two bills which I have mentioned previously. The first hearing will be June 11 and 12 on S. 6, a bill to help the States collect taxes now being lost as a result of contractors who work for the Federal Government being excepted from such levies as the sales tax in South Carolina.

Also slated for a hearing on June 18 is S. 5, which would require the Federal Government to let contracts to the lowest bidder instead of channeling contracts to so-called depressed areas. The lowest bidder should receive the contract regardless of where he is located if he can fully comply with the specifications of the contract.

Sincerely,
Strom Thurmond
During the past week, the Senate has largely taken up its time with the consideration of four appropriations bills and the foreign aid authorization bill.

SENATE HAS CUT EACH BUDGET REQUEST

I am happy to report that in each instance the appropriations bills have been reduced below the budget request. I shall not attempt to describe the details of these bills, but let me tell you how much each one was cut.

The Department of Labor and Health-Education-Welfare were included in one bill and the Administration request was cut more than $96 million. The bill for the Independent Offices -- those not under any department -- was cut almost $546 million. The funds for the operation of the District of Columbia were reduced nearly $13 million.

Finally, the request for the Department of Agriculture was cut by $296 million.

SOIL BANK PROGRAM RETAINED

As you may have heard, the soil bank program was retained for another year in spite of the great amount of dissatisfaction with the program. I voted for retaining the soil bank because no proposal has been proposed yet as an improvement or substitute for it. I did not feel that we should wipe out the soil bank unless we had a new program to help the farmers immediately.

FAIR COTTON SUPPORT BILLS PENDING

There are now pending in the Agriculture Committee of the Senate several proposals to amend the cotton price support program. I want to mention them at this time and I will be glad to hear the opinion of any of you who are interested in the bills.

Senator Stennis has introduced a bill proposing that cotton production on farm acreage allotments be divided into a domestic portion and an export portion. Seventy-five per cent of parity would be paid on both portions. In addition, a direct subsidy would be paid on the domestic portion to raise the price to 95 per cent of parity.

Another bill, by Senator Symington, also would divide the allotment into domestic and export portions. His bill would guarantee 90 per cent of parity on the domestic portion and guarantee 95 per cent of the world price on the export portion of the crop.

RUSSELL BILL WOULD ABOLISH ALLOTMENTS

A third bill introduced by Senator Russell would abolish acreage allotments. Certificates would be issued to farmers for their share of the domestic consumption quota. Certified cotton would receive full parity price support, which means such support as would offset the high costs of production in the United States.

Finally, a bill by Senator Eastland would provide for increasing the cotton allotment by 20 per cent and the payment of 75 per cent of parity.
There appears to be a good deal of sentiment for separating domestic and export allotments and applying different price supports. I doubt that these bills will be taken up at this session of Congress, but I would like to have the views of farmers and others interested in these plans.

HEARINGS HELD ON BILL TO RECAPTURE STATES' REVENUE

During the past week, as chairman of a special subcommittee of the Senate Government Operations Committee, I have held hearings on a bill I introduced to protect the States from the loss of certain taxes. My bill would make contractors working under contract to the Federal Government liable to payment of such taxes to the States as South Carolina's sales tax. Contractors on federal projects now enjoy special exemption and the States lose millions of dollars in revenue each year.

Strong support was given my bill by the witnesses who appeared, including Chairman Otis W. Livingston of the South Carolina Tax Commission, who is also President of the National Association of Tax Administrators.

INTRODUCES BILL TO PROHIBIT PAY TELEVISION

I have introduced a bill, S. 2268, in the Senate to prohibit the charging of a fee to view television in the home. The public should not have to pay any additional expense for programs after having purchased their television receivers.

There is no proof that pay television would provide the public with better programs. The one sure thing about it is that the public would have to pay more than television now costs. I am afraid the real effect would be to deprive people of the best programs they are now seeing free.

My interest is the public interest and I do not want to see anybody paying to view television which is now free. That would amount to imposing a new tax which would go to private speculators.

Sincerely,

ST:pl

Strom Thurmond

END
June 24, 1957

SERIOUS EVENTS IN NATION'S CAPITAL

During the past week, we have seen very serious events taking place in two branches of the Federal Government.

I refer to the action of the House of Representatives in its passage of the so-called civil rights bill -- without a jury trial amendment -- and to the decisions rendered by the Supreme Court in the Communist cases.

Failure of the House of Representatives to provide in the civil rights bill for trial by jury in contempt cases probably will make it more difficult for the amendment to be approved in the Senate. Those of us who believe in constitutional government now face the most difficult legislative task of our lives in trying to preserve what we have regarded as guarantees in the Constitution.

OUTCOME OF BATTLE OVER BILL UNCERTAIN

I would not attempt to predict the outcome of the battle to prevent the passage of the civil rights bill in the Senate. What I can say is that I shall do everything in my power to fight against this insidious legislation.

As to the decisions of the Supreme Court, I want to discuss two of them briefly.

COURT STRIKES AT COMMITTEE INVESTIGATIONS

In the Watkins case the Court practically destroyed the effectiveness of the Committees of the Congress to fight Communism in this country through the power of investigation.

The Court has decreed that in such hearings as those which caused Alger Hiss to be sent to jail that "no witness can be compelled" to make disclosures on matters which might not be specifically authorized in the resolution which established the investigating committee. If a witness decides that a question is not directly pertinent to the work of the committee, he is protected by this decision of the Court from having to answer the question.

Many facts about Communism and law-breaking, which have helped to protect this country from Communists and outlaws, would never have been learned in previous investigations if this new decision of the Court had been in effect earlier. More important, it means that many facts we should know about the enemies of the people cannot be ferreted out in the future if the Supreme Court imposes its own restrictions on the Congress.

REDS FREED ON FLIMSY REASONS

Another decision handed down by the Court caused the freeing or retrial of 14 Communist leaders who had been convicted by a California jury of advocating the violent overthrow of the Government. The Supreme Court freed five of the Communists and ordered a retrial for the other nine. This order was issued on what I consider to be extremely flimsy reasons.

First, the Court said the Smith Act does not define what is meant by
the word "organize" when it uses it with reference to organizing a group which advocates violent overthrow of the Government.

In prosecuting the case, the District Attorney contended that "organize" means the formation of new cells or new units and that the Communists were engaged in such efforts. But the Court held to the narrow view that "organize" means original formation, such as the original creation of the Communist Party in this country.

Second, the Court ruled that the District Judge failed to charge the jury properly in that he did not make a clear distinction between advocating violent overthrow of the Government as an abstract principle and advocating it as in the sense of taking action in that direction.

MEASURES TO PROTECT NATION WEAKENED

These decisions greatly narrow the grounds on which action can be taken to protect the Nation. It seems that the Court is just as determined to protect what it says are the rights of Communists as some members of the Congress are determined to deny the right of trial by jury to some citizens by passage of the civil rights bill.

I still hope it will be possible to save ourselves from both these dangers. Perhaps the recent decisions of the Court will cause the Congress finally to take action to curb the power of the Court.

Sincerely,

Strom Thurmond

END
SUPREME COURT PROVIDES HELP FOR CRIMINALS

The Supreme Court -- which has recently handed down several decisions to give greater protection to Communists and criminals -- has now issued an edict which will make it even harder to arrest and convict rapists and murderers.

A man named Mallory was arrested here in Washington on a charge of rape. He confessed to the crime and received a death sentence. That was about three years ago. His lawyers carried an appeal to the Supreme Court and the Court has overturned his conviction.

Apparently the Court was more concerned about the undefined rights of a confessed rapist than about the suffering of his innocent victim. I say the "undefined rights" of the rapist because neither the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure nor the Court has provided a definition of whether "unnecessary delay" in the arraignment of a prisoner involves any specific length of time. The Court overturned the conviction of Mallory because it considered his being held from 2 o'clock one afternoon to the next morning as "unnecessary delay" before his arraignment. This was in spite of his confession given after taking a lie-detector test voluntarily, and the fact that the police had tried to find an official to arraign the prisoner.

JUSTICE DEPARTMENT WORRIED

The chief of the Justice Department's Criminal Division issued a statement declaring that the Court's decision "clearly demonstrates that a great many very serious crimes will go unpunished."

The United States Attorney who prosecuted the case had the indictment against Mallory dismissed because of the Court's decision. He stated that the victim of the crime had already suffered great physical and psychological damage and that he would not again subject her to the suffering of testifying when, under the Court's verdict ruling out the confession, there would be little hope of securing a conviction.

I regret that the Supreme Court has more concern for the rights of Communists and criminals than it does for the protection of innocent American citizens.

A special Senate Judiciary Subcommittee is now engaged in drafting improvements to the Federal Code. I urged in an address to the Senate that this subcommittee recommend legislation to close this loop-hole through which criminals can crawl with the help of the Supreme Court.

INTRODUCED BILL TO CURB POWER OF THE COURT

Even before the Mallory decision, I had already introduced a bill in the Senate which would curb the power of the Court. My bill would not permit the Supreme Court to hear appeals in cases involving the public schools. Also, the bill would provide that States could enforce their own laws against Communists and other subversives, just as the Federal Government can do under authority of the Smith Act.

In Pennsylvania v. Nelson, the Supreme Court ruled that because there was an existing federal law to regulate Communists the State of Pennsylvania could not enforce a State law in that field.
There are many other instances of the Supreme Court having usurped powers which constitutionally belong to the States, the Congress, or the President. In introducing my bill, I spoke out against the tyranny which the Supreme Court is trying to impose on the citizens of this country.

CHOICE OF LIMITING COURT OR TYRANNY

The choice we face is judicial limitation or judicial tyranny. Judicial tyranny will destroy Constitutional government just as surely as any other type of tyranny would. Judicial limitation will strengthen the ramparts over which patriots have watched through the generations since 1776.

Our Federal Government was established as a government of limited powers. Only by Constitutional processes can the limitations be removed legally. Any other method of acquiring power is illegal and unconstitutional.

The Supreme Court must be curbed. If it continues in the direction it is headed, we shall all become the victims of judicial tyranny.

ANOTHER APPROPRIATIONS BILL REDUCED

During the past week, the Senate approved an appropriations bill of $457 million for the Department of the Interior. This was a reduction of about $58 million from the budget request. I am happy that, so far this year, the Senate has been able to cut every appropriations bill below the amount sought by the department involved.

SUBCOMMITTEE APPROVE TWO OF MY BILLS

The Senate Government Operations Committee's special subcommittee of which I am chairman has approved my bills, S. 5 and S. 6. S. 5 is the bill to prevent the channeling of government contracts to so-called depressed areas or labor surplus areas. S. 6 would remove the exemption from State taxes, such as South Carolina's sales tax, for contractors working on federal projects and buying material for those projects. The full Government Operations Committee will now have to consider these bills and I am hopeful they will be approved.

Sincerely,

Strom Thurmond

END
SO-CALLED CIVIL RIGHTS FIGHT UNDERWAY

This is one of the most trying times in the history of our country for the Southern members of the Senate who must fight against the enactment of the so-called civil rights bills.

We have been holding caucuses to make plans for the extended debate which appears to be forced upon us by the liberals. Debate can start when a motion is made to take up the civil rights bill for consideration. Then, if it should actually be taken up, the bill itself can be debated at length. Each amendment also can be debated to some extent. The best strategy, however, might lead to different use of our time.

It would take a motion by 16 Senators to force the Senate to bring to a vote whether or not to cut off debate. Then the vote on limiting debate -- or cloture, as it is called -- requires the support of 64 Senators actually to cut off debate and limit speeches by each Senator to one hour.

BILL WILL BE FULLY DEBATED

It is my intention, and the intention of each Southern Senator who has participated in our meetings, to do everything possible to continue debate to the fullest extent. We do not intend to bow to the dictates of the liberals of both parties who want to force their form of so-called civil rights down our throats.

I hope -- but have little reason to believe -- that by the next time I write my report to the people, the civil rights issue will have been resolved in favor of the rights of the people and the principles of Constitutional Government.

RESOLUTION ON FOREIGN TRIALS INTRODUCED

I have introduced a resolution in the Senate to make known the views of the Congress and the people to officials of the Government who deal with problems of our Armed Forces overseas. In my opinion, the people want our men in service to be protected by having the right to be tried by our own courts-martial when they are charged with committing a crime while in the performance of their duty.

Under the so-called Status of Forces Treaties, when our men are sent to a country, where such agreements are in effect, our military authorities "have the primary right to exercise jurisdiction over" our men "...in relation to..."offences arising out of any act or omission done in the performance of official duty."

However, another provision of the treaties provides that:

"The authorities of the State having the primary right shall give sympathetic consideration to a request from the authorities of the other State for a waiver of its right in cases where that other State considers such waiver to be of particular importance."

GIRARD CASE IS EXAMPLE

That is the point which concerns me. The best illustration of what can happen when the United States waives the primary right to jurisdiction over a member of our Armed Forces is the Girard Case, which is now pending before the Supreme Court. I anticipate that, under the waiver provision, the Court will permit Girard to be turned over to the Japanese for trial.
When this country sends fighting men overseas, the least we can do is to protect the best interests of the men by providing them trial by our own courts-martial for acts done when they are on duty. When our officials waive the right actually held under the treaties to provide our men with such protection, I believe the Congress should take action to remedy the situation.

My resolution would make clear to the Executive Branch that the Congress expects all of its officials to exercise jurisdiction over our Armed Forces, when a right to such jurisdiction is held under the treaties.

DEFENSE BUDGET REDUCED

Finally, let me mention the reduction in the Defense Appropriations from the amount sought by the budget request. The Senate approved a bill of $34.5 billion, instead of the $36.1 billion requested, thus keeping our record consistent in having cut every request thus far this year.

Sincerely,

Strom Thurmond

END
Let me discuss with you the situation which has developed in the Senate during the debate on whether H. R. 6127, the so-called civil rights bill, shall be considered.

This particular bill is one which was passed by the House of Representatives and placed on the calendar of the Senate, as I have pointed out previously, by the highly unusual application of a rule not ordinarily used in such a manner. Then, when Senator Knowland, Republican leader in the Senate, moved to bring the bill up for consideration, the debate started.

UNNECESSARY AND UNCONSTITUTIONAL

Those of us on the Southern side of the legislative fight have pointed out that the bill should not have been placed on the calendar in the way it was, and that the bill is unnecessary in all respects and unconstitutional in many.

Senator Russell of Georgia, who has been in the Senate since January 12, 1933 -- longer than any Senator except Senator Hayden of Arizona who became a member in 1927 -- is the co-ordinator of all efforts and strategy of the Southern group. We have been meeting from time to time to plan the best course to be followed.

SENATOR RUSSELL SELECTED TO GO TO WHITE HOUSE

Prior to Senator Russell's meeting with the President, our group gave considerable thought to whether it would be best for a Committee to talk with the President or for Senator Russell to go alone. In the interest of trying to present our views to the President in the best way possible and with the least fanfare, it was decided that one representative of our group should go to the White House.

The President listened for nearly an hour and Senator Russell indicated that the President would be willing to accept a weaker bill than the one passed by the House. However, this has not given us much encouragement because the important thing is that the bill not be passed in any form.

As a matter of fact, I am not sure that the Senators advocating this vicious piece of legislation would be deterred in their desire to impose the provisions of this bill on the South -- even if the President were to decide that it should not be approved. While the views of the President might affect the actions of some conservative Republicans in the Senate, I am sure that what he has to say about the bill will not affect Northern Democratic Senators such as Douglas of Illinois and Humphrey of Minnesota.

NEITHER POLITICAL PARTY TO HELP SOUTH

What this boils down to is that the South cannot expect any assistance from either of the two national political parties.

The greatest encouragement we Southerners in the Senate have from any source -- other than our own determination to fight the bill to the bitter end -- is that a few Democrats and also a few Republicans, who would vote for passage of the bill, will vote with us for an amendment.
to guarantee trial by jury and to prevent the use of troops for enforce-
ment. But our hope is that we can prolong the debate until we convince
our opponents that it would be bad for the country or until we out-last
them.

LITTLE HOPE OF CONVINCING OPPONENTS

Since there is little hope that we can convince the advocates of
the bill that it would be bad -- not only for the South, but also for
the entire country -- we must rely on our stamina to debate longer than
they do.

Practically everything else has stopped in the Senate during
this debate over the so-called civil rights bill, except the meeting
of Committees. However, even the work being done in Committees has
slowed down as everybody is devoting themselves to preparation for the
continuing legislative battle.

At this stage of the debate, it is impossible to predict how
long the fight will last.

ADVOCATES WOULD IMPOSE HARSHER TERMS THAN COURT

I hope that every citizen of the South -- and of the Nation --
will realize the importance of this fight to the preservation of
constitutional government in the United States. This is a continua-
tion of the fight which started with the Supreme Court's decision in
the school segregation cases. The advocates of this bill want to
impose even harsher terms on the South than the decision of the Court
imposes.

I am doing my best to keep this from happening.

Sincerely,

Strom Thurmond

END
AIRLINE ALCOHOL BILL PENDING

I have a bill pending in the Senate Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee which has accounted for more of my mail this year than any other topic, including government economy and the so-called civil rights bill. It is S. 4, a bill to prohibit the service or consumption of alcoholic beverages aboard our commercial and military aircraft.

Offers of support for this legislation have come to me from every section of the country. These offers have come from both drinkers and non-drinkers who are concerned about the dangers which are inherent in the practice of serving cocktails while planes are in flight.

Here are my reasons for sponsoring this legislation:

1. The unregulated consumption of liquor by airline passengers is a compromise with safety which we can ill afford.

2. The serving of liquor to passengers places an unnecessary burden on the flight crews.

3. Drinking aboard airplanes creates a social problem, in that even though in some instances no safety hazard develops, the drinking passengers may offend or annoy other passengers. Drinking cannot be confined to club cars as on trains.

4. Alcohol and flying do not mix any more than drinking and driving. In fact, alcohol intoxicates in the air even more than it does on land or sea.

PILOTS AND STEWARDESSES SUPPORT BILL

This legislation also has the strong support of both the Airline Pilots Association and the Airline Stewards and Stewardesses Association. The stewardesses are tired of filling the role of barmaids, and the pilots feel that their duties require that they remain at the controls and not in the cabin helping stewardesses wrestle with intoxicated passengers.

A spokesman for the pilots has had this to say about the "flying saloons":

"We had cases of drunks pulling guns on pilots and drunks trying to force their way into cockpits. These incidents can occur again in spite of the airlines' code, and someday we may have a bad crash that you can blame directly on trying to mix alcohol and air.

"A 110-pound stewardess can't handle a 250-pound drunk. And pilots are too busy in these days of increasingly complex air traffic to become airborne bouncers."
After my bill was introduced in the 84th Congress, the airlines which serve drinks endeavored to beat Congress to the punch by setting up a voluntary "two-drinks-to-a-customer" plan. I have been receiving reports, however, that this code is not being enforced by the airlines. Besides, passengers can still bring their own drinks.

Rowland K. Quinn, Jr., president of the Stewardesses Association, has issued this statement on the voluntary plan:

"The airlines have failed completely to provide any relief through their proposed code. The airlines seem to have a tacit agreement to ignore the code, and we have had many reports of stewardesses being disciplined for failure to serve enough liquor to meet airline quotas."

I am a member of the committee to which this bill has been referred, and I have been assured by Aviation Subcommittee Chairman Mike Monroney that hearings will be held on S. 4 in the very near future.

Since the debate over the so-called civil rights bill began approximately two weeks ago, we have made rather remarkable progress in educating the people of the nation on the dangerous provisions contained in this obnoxious legislation. A number of large Northern dailies have now come out against some of the bill's provisions. Some are insisting on inclusion of the right to trial by jury and other amendments.

Many persons, including the President of the United States, evidently did not realize just what type bill the Attorney General and sponsors of the legislation were trying to foist on the people. This band of integrationists was masquerading its cunningly-drawn provisions under the guise of a "right to vote" bill. They were successful in shoving it through the House without any ameliorating amendments.

Since reaching the Senate, however, the fangs of this monstrous legislation have been exposed, and we have won new support from several quarters for the purpose of yanking its venomous teeth. Now that the President has been educated to a degree on this legislation, he has even stated publicly that he would not favor vesting some of the bill's tyrannical powers in the Attorney General.

There has been some talk in the press of compromise, but I do not favor any compromise. These issues are too vital to our people and to the principles of constitutional government to barter away any of them. The people of South Carolina can count on me to continue to fight this unconstitutional legislation to the full extent of my physical capacity.

It would be difficult to predict what success we will have in the Senate in amending and ultimately defeating the entire bill. Senator Russell, leader of our forces, expressed my sentiments exactly when he appeared on a TV program with me recently and said:

"Our numbers are few, our backs are to the wall, but we have no spirit of surrender. We will fight it out to the last."

Sincerely,
Strom Thurmond
SOUTH WINS HARD JURY TRIAL FIGHT

After four weeks of debate on the so-called civil rights bill, the South has won a hard-fought battle on the issue of trial by jury when a person is charged with criminal contempt of a court order involving a violation of a person's right to vote.

The vote on this vital issue came early on Friday morning -- about 15 minutes after midnight Thursday -- in an atmosphere of tense expectancy.

Twelve Republicans joined 39 Democrats for a total of 51 votes in favor of trial by jury. Nine Democrats joined 33 Republicans for a total of 42 votes against the right of trial by jury.

The vacancy in the Senate created by the death of Senator McCarthy meant that a total of 95 votes could have been cast. Actually, 93 Senators voted, the two not voting being Senator Neeley of West Virginia, a Democrat, and Senator Bridges of New Hampshire, a Republican.

RUSSELL'S EXPERIENCE, SKILL INVALUABLE

Foremost among the Senators who have debated so skillfully during the fight over the so-called civil rights bill is, of course, Senator Russell of Georgia. He has been the leader of plans and strategy of our group of Southerners who have battled at every turn of the legislative wheel. His previous experience in similar situations and his unexcelled knowledge of parliamentary procedure and the rules of the Senate have been invaluable to all of us.

In describing the bill in the Senate, Senator Russell declared:

"The bill has, perhaps, more multifarious and far-reaching provisions of a strange nature, unknown ordinarily to the American system of laws, than has any other bill that has ever been brought before the Senate. Its provisions were shrouded in secrecy. Members of the Senate, very frankly, do not now understand the detailed powers conferred by the bill.

"Only today," Senator Russell continued, "I developed in the course of my study, one new aspect of Part IV which has not come to my attention after the most exhaustive previous study."

Those are strong words of Senator Russell condemning the bill for its deviousness and for its far-reaching effects.

SENATORS ENGAGE IN FRIENDLY QUESTIONING

Another of the most active members of the Senate against the bill has been Senator Ervin of North Carolina. During my address on Wednesday against the bill, Senator Ervin engaged in asking me a series of questions to point up the dangers of the measure.

One of his questions was:
"In the judgment of the Senator from South Carolina, will not the constitutional liberty of Americans die at the precise moment when Congress passes a law which will enable a judge to prevent a jury from acquitting a defendant in any kind of case?"

And my answer was "I am certainly of that opinion...The right to trial by jury is one of the great bulwarks of the democracy of this Nation. The right to trial by jury is guaranteed in the Constitution. It is further assured in the Bill of Rights. It is a right which every American has heretofore held, and to which he is entitled. It would be a sad day in this country if that right were to be taken away from American citizens."

"MORTGAGE ON FREEDOM"

At the beginning of my address, I stated that denial of the right of trial by jury in election cases "would place a mortgage on the freedom of every citizen, marked payable on demand at election time to the Attorney General of the United States."

The friendly questions asked of me by Senators Ervin, Sparkman, Talmadge, Smathers, Gore and Yarborough all helped to bring out points of importance against the so-called civil rights bill.

All of these men have helped make it possible for the country to receive a full description of the bill's dangers.

SOUTHERNERS EFFECTIVE IN DEBATE

Senators who have scored very effectively in the debate, in addition to those I have just mentioned, include Senators Byrd, Hill, McCollan, and Stennis. In many ways and at all hours of the day and night, all of these men, and others too, have devoted themselves to a searching analysis of the bill.

I wish it were possible to describe all the work which has gone into the battle against this bill, but space will not permit.

Sincerely,

Strom Thurmond
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FINAL FATE OF CIVIL RIGHTS BILL UNDETERMINED

The final fate of the so-called civil rights bill has not yet been determined, but whatever happens now, the teeth have been pulled from the original bill which came to the Senate from the House of Representatives.

I stated in the Senate on August 6 in opposition to passage of the bill that:

"The so-called civil rights bill should have been entitled a bill to empower the Attorney General to deprive certain citizens of their right to trial by jury. Also, it should have been labelled as an implement intended to be used to force integration of the races in the public schools."

I am thankful there were enough members of the Senate who considered the facts, as we presented them in debate, and helped us Southerners to pull out the sharpest teeth.

AMENDMENTS CUT POWER OF BILL

The amendments which we enacted greatly reduced the power which would have been placed in the hands of the Attorney General. Authority was removed from the bill for the use of military forces in cases of alleged civil rights violations. The Commission to study civil rights matters was required to report to Congress as well as to the President. Members of the proposed Commission were made subject to confirmation by the Senate.

Other amendments narrowed and more adequately defined the powers of federal judges in contempt proceedings.

All of these amendments have vastly ameliorated the original obnoxiousness of H. R. 6127. However, nothing could entirely remove my objections to the bill except its defeat. The bill was submitted to the American people as a right-to-vote bill, when actually it was a force bill.

ONLY 18 VOTED AGAINST BILL

Eighteen of us voted against the bill when it was finally approved by the Senate. However, there were 72 Senators who voted for the bill in its watered-down form.

Now the bill, as passed by the Senate, must be taken up by the House of Representatives. Several courses might be followed by the House. If a majority of the House should vote to accept the bill as amended by the Senate, it would then be sent to the President for his consideration. Either he would have to sign the bill or veto it. Although there has been some talk that the President might veto the bill unless the jury trial amendment is weakened, I would be surprised if he did.

In the event the House of Representatives does not approve the bill passed by the Senate, it will ask for a conference with the Senate on the bill. Then members of both the House and Senate would be appointed to try to reach an agreement on it. They would be limited to making a report between the extreme bill passed by the House and the more moderate bill approved by the Senate. They could not make changes outside those limits.
CONFERENCE WOULD HAVE THREE CHOICES

Members of a conference committee could make one of three recommendations to the House and Senate: They could recommend that the House accept the Senate amendments; they could recommend that the Senate recede from its amendments and accept the House version; or they could recommend changes in the Senate amendments and that both houses accept a version different from the one they passed.

It is likely that a conference committee would recommend the third course I have described. Then the question in each house would be whether to accept the report of the conference committee.

AGREEMENT WOULD BE DIFFICULT

However, there is much discussion here as to whether a conference committee could ever agree on changes in the Senate amendments which would be acceptable to a majority of the members of both houses.

You will recall that 51 Senators voted for the jury trial amendment and 42 voted against it. Any change in this amendment would cause several members of the Senate to face a difficult decision. But the House passed its extreme version of the bill by a majority of two to one. Because of that, many House members might want to demand a much stronger bill than the Senate passed.

BILL "UNNECESSARY, UNWISE, UNACCEPTABLE"

I am proud to be one of the 18 Senators who voted against the bill. As moderate as it is compared with the House version, it is unnecessary, unwise, and unacceptable to me.

Sincerely,
Strom Thurmond
During the past week, hearings have been held by the Aviation Subcommittee of the Senate Commerce Committee on a bill I introduced to prevent the serving and drinking of alcoholic beverages on airplanes.

It is strange sometimes to see the extent to which people will go in an effort to continue a dangerous practice. One of the major airlines paid the expenses of a group of their hostesses and had them sign a petition in opposition to my bill, S-4. Those girls actually testified that they preferred to work on airplanes on which alcohol is served. Under questioning, it was brought out that some of the airlines give hostesses or stewardesses extra compensation for serving alcoholic drinks sold on their planes.

PILOTS, STEWARDESSES AGAINST ALCOHOL ON PLANES

The pilots and stewardesses associations, which testified against drinking on airplanes, exhibited courage in doing that because they knew their employers preferred for them to remain quiet.

The vice chairman of the Civil Aeronautics Board testified against my bill. When I asked him for any good reason why alcohol should be served on airplanes, he was unable to give one. To me this was sufficient evidence that the profit motive is the main reason any of the airlines want to serve alcohol.

There is no excuse why non-drinkers should be subjected to the possibility of unpleasantness on an airplane, much less the real dangers which might arise if an intoxicated person interferes, or attempts to interfere, with operation of a plane or disrupts the crew in performance of its duties.

CHILDREN ON PLANES MUST BE CONSIDERED

There is an additional objection to drinking on airplanes when children are among the passengers. In such restricted space as that on a plane, it is virtually impossible to prevent children from being in a flying bar, in effect, if alcohol is being served.

Children are prohibited from entering saloons on the ground. I see no reason why they should not be given the same protection in the air.

While I believe every person must make his own choice about drinking alcoholic beverages, I do not believe he should be permitted to do so if the lives or comfort of other persons are also involved. That's where the line should be drawn both by drinkers and non-drinkers.

AIRLINES SHOULD FIND OTHER WAYS OF MAKING MONEY

If the airlines need money so bad they have to serve alcohol to get greater profits, they should find other ways of securing more revenue or of cutting expenses. Financial profit should not be permitted to endanger or cause discomfort to innocent people.

I have many friends among the airline people, but the public interest and public safety out-weigh any other consideration with me. I hope my bill will be approved.

August 19, 1957
CIVIL RIGHTS BILL EXTENDS CONGRESSIONAL SESSION

This session of the Congress has already run longer than was expected because of the so-called civil rights bill. In view of the fact that Senate debate on that bill took approximately five weeks, it is understandable that the session has run longer than usual.

As of now it is still impossible to predict when the session will end because what the House of Representatives will do with the bill is still in doubt, since the House did not immediately agree to the Senate amendments.

Possibly some agreement will be worked out among House leaders which would be acceptable to a majority of the Senate. On the other hand, it is entirely possible that no agreement can be reached and the result is likely to be a long stalemate.

FOREIGN AID BILL TO BE FACED

In addition to the so-called civil rights bill, we still face the problem of the foreign aid appropriations bill. The President has stated he might call a special session of Congress if he does not consider the appropriations for foreign aid sufficient to meet the needs as he visualizes them.

So, with these two bills pending, one person's guess is as good as another's when it comes to predicting the date of adjournment of the Congress. Some members are optimistic and predict that everything will soon be worked out, but others still believe the session could run much longer.

Sincerely,

Strom Thurmond
During the past week, I spent a great deal of time talking with various officials of the Defense Department, the Army, and at the White House in an effort to protect the continued operation of Fort Jackson. Fort Jackson is one of the finest training centers in the United States and I was shocked to learn that it was one on a list of 16 installations in danger of being closed as a result of Defense Department cut-backs.

Camp Gordon at Augusta, Georgia, also was on the list and I also objected strongly against closing it.

The Army will have to follow whatever orders are issued by the Defense Department with reference to the military installations which are on the list.

DEFENSE DEPARTMENT PROMISES CAREFUL STUDY

The Defense Department informed me that careful study is being given to the entire program and that action would not be taken before giving interested parties an opportunity to be heard.

In talking with White House officials, I have emphasized the value of Fort Jackson and Camp Gordon. I urged that action be taken by the White House to alter the plans under consideration by the Defense Department.

I am hopeful that Fort Jackson and Camp Gordon will be taken off the list of installations which are in danger of being closed. I am continuing to keep in close touch with officials in the Defense and Army departments and at the White House about this matter.

CUTBACKS IN RESERVE PROGRAM UNWISE

Another matter which is causing me great concern is the present policy of cutting back the military reserve program.

When national defense is at stake, there is no economy in trying to save a few dollars on our own military programs when we have wasted so much money overseas in so-called economic aid to raise the living standards of foreign countries.

I am as anxious as anybody, and a great deal more anxious than some members of Congress, to take every action possible to bring about more real economy in the Federal Government. But I do not believe it is real economy to reduce our reserve forces. The United States has never been a country that depended on a large standing army to meet its defense needs.

"CIVILIAN SOLDIERS" VERY IMPORTANT

The United States has depended upon its civilian soldiers -- the reserve forces -- to bear the heaviest burden of warfare. In World War II, 98 per cent of our fighting forces were either civilians or members of the reserves.

The reserves are particularly valuable because they have the skills and experience both of the civilian and the military man.
I hope that the Defense Department will advise the Congress of its needs so as to be able to maintain our reserve forces at their present level. The appropriation of funds for this purpose is real economy because it has been estimated that four or five reserves can be maintained for the same amount of money it takes to maintain one member of the regular forces.

VOTED AGAINST EASING IMMIGRATION LAW

On several occasions I have discussed the dangers involved in efforts of some people in this country to let down the flood gates of immigration for aliens to enter the United States. It is so difficult to screen out communists and other undesirables that I believe it best not to lower our defenses.

However, this past week a bill was passed by the Senate to make it easier for certain immigrants to come into the country. I was one of only four Senators who voted against easing restrictions. I simply cannot agree to accepting unknown dangers when we are already faced with a constant fight against communism.

FATE OF CIVIL RIGHTS BILL STILL IN DOUBT

As I write this letter, there has been no indication in the House of Representatives as to what will finally be done with the Senate version of the so-called civil rights bill. Efforts of Republican leaders to reach a compromise have not impressed me favorably.

In my opinion almost any compromise will weaken the gains made in the Senate by approval of the jury-trial amendment. Even with the jury-trial provision, the bill is unsatisfactory to me. If it is returned to the Senate, I shall vote against it again just as I voted and fought against it when it was debated in the Senate. Until the civil rights bill is disposed of, there appears to be little hope of adjournment, although it is possible it could come quickly, perhaps by the time this is published.

Sincerely,
Strom Thurmond