

STATEMENT BY SENATOR STROM THURMOND (D-SC) RECORDED FOR HIS WEEKLY RADIO BROADCAST, AUGUST 14, 1958.

MY FRIENDS AND FELLOW CITIZENS:

As the time for the adjournment of Congress draws near, the chances for the enactment of bills still pending on the calendar grow slimmer. It is necessary for a Senator or a Representative to be alert and aggressive if he is to bring to a vote those measures in which he is most interested.

This past week, I met with the Senate majority leader, who is also chairman of the Democratic policy committee in the Senate, and told him flatly that I would be extremely dissatisfied if Congress adjourns before the Senate considers ^a the States' Rights Bill, ~~recently passed by the House.~~ I also informed the majority leader that I would object to the adjournment of Congress prior to the enactment of suitable farm legislation. A new farm law is needed to forestall cutbacks in the acreage allotments for cotton and rice.

During the closing days of the session, much of the work of the Senate is accomplished under unanimous consent agreements, which limit debate and otherwise expedite the consideration of bills. I ^{think} told the majority leader ^{understood} that I would object to all such agreements unless ~~he would give me~~ ^{I had} firm assurances that a meaningful States' Rights Bill would be considered by the Senate.

After considerable discussion, we were able to reach an agreement ^{that}. One of several pending States' Rights bills will be

brought to the floor. Once a bill is on the floor, it can be amended to make it a broad and meaningful measure.

Some of the pending measures take the piece-meal approach to the problem, by dealing with specific instances in which the Federal government has infringed on areas/in which the States should exercise jurisdiction. It would be preferable for the Senate to vote on more general legislation, such as a bill to provide that no Act of Congress/shall be construed to imply that Congress intends to occupy that field of legislation/to the exclusion of the States, unless the Act so stipulates, or unless there is a direct and positive conflict with a State law.

The chances of passing a meaningful States' Rights measure in the Senate will be improved/if the issue can be presented in a way attractive to Senators from Northern and Western States.

I have conferred with Senator Russell and Senator McClellan on this matter, and we believe it will be best to have a Northern Senator present the desired legislation to the Senate; *but if this is not done, one or more Southerners will present it.*

There will be strong opposition. A number of the so-called liberal Senators from the North/have let it be known that they will engage in a lengthy debate/if meaningful States' Rights legislation reaches the Senate floor. I hope they debate as long as their breath holds out, for two reasons.

First, I believe that the cause of States' Rights will be bolstered/by a full and free discussion in the Senate.

Second, some of the Senators who now threaten to try to talk the States' Rights Bill to death/are among those who plan to

wage a fight next January/to change the rules of the Senate,
particularly the rule regarding limitation of debate.

If these so-called liberals talk at long length during this
session/to achieve their own purposes, they will cut a ridiculous
figure in January/when they return to Washington to argue for
a gag rule.

So the battle lines are drawn. I have never hesitated to
fight for the cause of local self-government, and for the rights
and powers of the States. I welcome this opportunity/to have
the Members of the Senate stand up and be counted/on the issue of
States' Rights.

I wish to thank this station for granting me this time each
week, and thank you for listening.

This is Strom Thurmond in Washington.

END