You have been hearing much in the past few days about the division among Senators on two subjects: (1) whether or not the United States Senate is a continuing body as is the Supreme Court and not as is the House of Representatives and (2) whether or not unlimited debate should be permitted in the Senate subject only to restrictions applied by a two-thirds majority of the members. This latter is usually referred to as Rule 22.

There was never any question about these matters in the minds of our Founding Fathers when they wrote the Constitution, and the Constitution is reasonably explicit on both points. From 1789, when the first session of the United States Senate convened, until 1953 -- a period of 164 years -- no one ever seriously contested the continuity nature of the Senate, which, unlike the House of Representatives, does not require all of its members to stump for reelection every two years. Quite to the contrary, two-thirds of the experienced Senate members are always available to assume their responsibilities as a result of the planning of our Founding Fathers who created the Senate as a stabilizing legislative body in which all issues could be debated uninterruptedly.

Had not a Senate, in which all states, regardless of population, been promised in the Constitution, the 13 Original Colonies which won their independence from England in 1783, would never have merged into the United States of America. For, only in the Senate are all States, regardless of population, given equal treatment. The Senate is clearly a guarantee to the minority that the majority of the nation will not impose its every wish on them.

The theory that the Senate is not a continuing body is called the "Reuther theory" for union boss Walther Reuther. He advanced it previously in 1953, when the Senate defeated it 71-20, and again in 1957, when it was defeated 55-38. In view of Mr. Reuther's success in picking winners this fall, he feels that he might have his theory accepted by the new Senate, thereby defying 170 years of precedents and ignoring the intent and interpretations of most of this nation's greatest statesmen -- Jefferson, Hamilton, Madison, Buchanan, Wilson, etc.

If Mr. Reuther's theory is accepted, then his chances are greatly improved for turning the Senate into a "majority rule" forum where a majority of the members, rather than two-thirds, can refuse to hear all the arguments of a minority.

To many of you, all of this must sound foolish and wasteful. "Don't our Senators have anything better to do than to argue about the Senate rules after 170 years of history?" you might ask yourself. And the question is well put.

I, for one, regret any time wasted on such clear-cut points, for the Senate has more than it can do already on issues of great national and international importance; yet some of us must stand firm against the ever-present menace of socialism, so contrary to this nation's heritage. You at home can help by trying to understand the issues before the Congress, by discussing these issues with your friends and by making a genuine effort to encourage good government and clean politics on the precincts or grass roots level.

Sincerely,

Strom Thurmond
The 86th Congress, which convened January 7, promises a difficult and trying two years to those of us who insist on adhering to Constitutional principles and a sound fiscal policy.

On Friday, the President delivered his State of the Union message to Congress. I was encouraged by his proposal of a balanced budget for the coming fiscal year, but I am far from convinced that a balanced budget would result even if the President's proposals were followed. He anticipated higher spending in the fields of assistance to education and urban renewal. This will only serve to encourage the Congressional bloc which is devoted to the cause of deficit spending. This bloc has already announced its intention to press vigorously for such legislation as the Area Redevelopment Bill, which the President vetoed last year, and the Omnibus Housing and Community Facilities Bills which failed of passage last year.

Additionally, it appears that the President's proposal for a balanced budget is based on the hope of increased revenues to the tune of approximately nine billion dollars. I hope that the revenue is forthcoming, but it would be far better to attempt a balanced budget by reducing expenditures, and applying any increased revenue to our massive national debt. This would offset to some extent last year's deficit of more than $12 billion and put some check on continuing inflation.

Civil Rights to be Pushed

The most dastardly note in the President's message was his promise to propose to Congress at an early date so-called civil rights legislation, not only with respect to education and voting, but also with respect to what he called "access to jobs", but which is known and despised by us in the South as F.E.P.C.

It would appear that both the Administration and the radical "civil rights" zealots in Congress would have realized how much harm they have already caused to peaceful race relations, not only in the South, but in the country as a whole. We must step up our attempts to bring the public opinion of the entire country to bear against this subversive influence, while at the same time fighting so-called civil rights legislation with every means at our disposal, as I certainly intend to continue doing.

Court Bill Re-introduced

While our fight on the issues of so-called "civil rights" and fiscal policy will, on the whole, be defensive, I intend to fight offensively for legislation which will advance the cause of Constitutional Government. Foremost among our offensive weapons will be the Federal anti-pre-emption bill, of which I am a co-sponsor. This bill would prevent the Supreme Court from striking down State statutes by misconstruing Congressional intent in Federal legislation. The anti-pre-emption bill, also known as the "States Rights Bill", has already been introduced in both the House and the Senate and is numbered H. R. 3 in the House and S. 3 in the Senate. Since this bill passed the House last year by a substantial majority, and was defeated by the narrow margin of 41-40 in the Senate, I consider it our most formidable offensive weapon.

In facing the difficult period ahead, I have resolved to continue to fight vigorously for the sound governmental principles which have made this country so great and which are so cherished by South Carolinians.

Sincerely,

Strom Thurmond
CORRECTING INJUSTICES

It has always been my feeling that one of the principal concerns of a United States Senator should be the correction of injustices to the people of his State and Nation. This can best be done by working hard for the passage of legislation which will provide the necessary relief.

The Supreme Court's radical trend of recent years has disturbed all advocates of Constitutional Government, including the great majority of high court justices of the 49 States. The action of the Court's nine justices, who are largely political appointees, can only be corrected, however, by Congressional action.

In addition to the States Rights Bill, which missed becoming law last year by only one vote, I am a co-sponsor of two other bills designed to correct disturbing judicial precedents set by the present Court. I have also introduced a bill requiring all Federal judges to take an oath to support the Constitution as is required in Article VI of the Constitution.

PROPOSED OATH

The present oath taken by the Federal judiciary says nothing about supporting the Constitution. It merely requires that the judge or justice faithfully perform all his duties "according to the best of my abilities and understanding, agreeably to the Constitution and laws of the United States."

This existing oath gives the members of the judiciary too much latitude for writing into the law their own beliefs and ideologies. Perhaps this is one reason why the Supreme Court has been so free in rewriting the law without regard to the expressed will of the Founding Fathers and the Congress.

FIGHTING COMMUNISM

One of the bills I am co-sponsoring would clearly make Communism illegal. It was thought that Communism had been outlawed by the Smith Anti-Subversive Act, but the Supreme Court, in the notorious "Yates Case", ruled that it was not a crime to theoretically preach the overthrow of the United States government.

An "overt action" must be committed, the Court said, and in making this ruling the Court permitted Communists to be released from prison to continue their advocacy of Communism in the United States.

MALLORY BILL

I am co-sponsoring the so-called "Mallory Bill", which was filibustered by the Senate "Liberals" in the closing days of the Session last year.

Mallory, a negro with a long criminal record, was released by the Supreme Court after his conviction for his confessed rape of a white woman in Washington. The Court based its decision on the fact that the confession was made after Mallory's arrest and before his arraignment. This decision must be corrected to prevent confessed criminals from continually being set free by the Court.

Sincerely,
Strom Thurmond
CIVIL RIGHTS

So-called civil rights bills are beginning to make their appearance in the Senate. Almost without exception these bills are politically inspired and serve only to cause further deterioration in race relations. It is my firm conviction now, as it has always been, that the greatest safeguard for civil rights lies in the Constitution as written. The minority pressure groups inspiring these new bills would bypass the Constitution by leaning on Supreme Court decisions, Executive Department decrees or Federal legislation in a field where the Congress has no right to act.

GAMBLING LOSSES

A bill co-sponsored by me would make losses and expenses of illegal gambling non-deductible on Federal income tax returns. Of course, winnings would still be reported.

This bill is designed to clarify the inconsistency of rewarding with income tax deductions those persons who are violating gambling laws.

ARMED SERVICES

You have probably read and heard criticism directed at closed-door committee meetings in the Congress. Almost all hearings are open to the public, but as a general rule, sessions in which legislative action is taken are closed to the public. I would personally favor opening more committee sessions to public attendance because there is much merit in Woodrow Wilson's principle of "open covenants openly arrived at."

There are some committee meetings and hearings, however, that of necessity must be closed to everyone except the witnesses and the committee members. As a member of the Senate Armed Services Committee, I have been attending executive sessions of a series of top secret briefings on our defense posture. During the past week we have received testimony from the Honorable Neil McElroy, Secretary of Defense; General Nathan Twining, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff; the Honorable Wilber Brucker, Secretary of the Army; and General Maxwell Taylor, Army Chief of Staff.

These hearings will continue for the next few weeks. It is necessary that the committee members be fully briefed on every phase of our national defense program before we begin consideration of defense legislation and defense spending, which is estimated in the proposed Federal budget to be approximately $40 billion.

LUNCHEONS

Senator Johnston and I are having Mrs. David R. Coker of Hartsville, American Mother of the Year, as our luncheon guest in the Senate this week. All the members of the South Carolina delegation, their wives, and a few others have been invited. Arrangements have also been made to have Mrs. Coker received at the White House by President Eisenhower. We are very proud of the high honor which Mrs. Coker has brought to our State and also the able representation which she has given our country both abroad and at home while holding this title.

I am giving a luncheon later in the week to introduce the new national president of the Reserve Officers Association, Rear Admiral Leon J. Jacobi, to Congressional leaders in the field of national defense.

Sincerely,

Strom Thurmond
SUPREME COURT STANDARDS

It is my firm belief that we must not only take action to curb the abuses of the present Supreme Court, but we must also move to protect the people from any future decisions of the Court which are in derogation of the Constitution and the law. This can be accomplished somewhat by raising the standards for selection to the Supreme Court so as to exclude men from the high Court who lack sufficient legal training and background.

A bill I introduced last week would establish as a prerequisite for appointment as Chief Justice or Associate Justice of the Supreme Court, a minimum of five years judicial experience on the District Court or Circuit Court of Appeals of the United States, or on an Appellate Court or Court of general jurisdiction of one of the several States. It would provide further for a rotation of these appointments among the several judicial circuits of the United States.

STATE SALES TAXES

I have re-introduced in the Senate a bill which, if the House had approved it in 1958, would have added approximately $2.8 million to our State treasury. It would require contractors executing contracts with the Federal government to pay local sales taxes on materials purchased for the project. Under a 5 - 4 Supreme Court decision such contractors maintain that they should be given immunity from the sales taxes because the work is being done for the Federal government. This decision has served to dry up another of the dwindling sources of State revenue.

COMPETITIVE CONTRACTS

Another bill of mine, which got to the Senate floor last year, though it was not acted upon, would prevent the channeling of Federal contracts to unemployment areas without accepting the lowest approved bid. It is my belief that Federal contracts should be awarded on the basis of competitive bidding and that other factors such as labor surplus or economic depression in areas should not control the decisions. Such action in the past has penalized low-bidding South Carolina firms and has cost the Federal government millions of extra procurement dollars.

CONSERVATION RESERVE

President Eisenhower's recommendations on agriculture were presented to the Congress Thursday. There was little of real substance in his message except for his proposal to extend the authority for the Conservation Reserve Program for another three years.

This program has been of great benefit to many South Carolina farmers, and it has helped to relieve the surplus problem. So many of our farmers applied for this long-term program last year that a large number had to defer their plans for contracting with the government to plant parts of their farms in trees and grasses.

Sincerely,
Strom Thurmond
FIRST SPENDING TESTS

The United States Senate faced its first spending tests during the past week, and advocates of free government spending prevailed. I voted for reductions in both the omnibus housing and airport federal aid bills. When most of these proposed reductions were defeated, I then voted against final passage of both bills.

Extravagance was my principal objection to the airport bill. The deputy administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency told the Senate his agency did not need, nor could it program, the $100 million annually which the bill proposed. I favored a continuation of the present program of airport construction, which is approximately $63 million annually. The additional money proposed in the bill is to be spent principally on five per cent of the nation's airports, none of which are in South Carolina.

HOUSING BILL

I vigorously opposed the public housing and urban renewal provisions of the housing bill. Since integration is being pushed so vigorously in public housing, I believe this program is dangerous to the South. For this reason, most of this low-rent housing, which costs $17,000 per unit, is being constructed in the North. The rent subsidy is being enjoyed by many with adequate incomes, while the subsidy cost is being borne by all taxpayers. Besides being socialistic in nature, the public housing program puts the government in competition with private enterprise, which is constructing housing at less than $17,000 per unit at a record rate.

Approximately $1,350,000,000 is already authorized and unspent for the urban renewal program. Little, if any, of this money will be spent in South Carolina, but we will help pay the tax burden to clear up the slums of prosperous New York and other large cities.

INTEGRATION BY INFILTRATION

For the second year in a row, integrationists have attempted to sneak through the Senate a provision which would permit housing integration by a method of infiltration. Last year I had this provision removed from the omnibus housing bill by an amendment. This year I found a similar provision well hidden in the policy section of the title on Public Housing and got it eliminated again. It would have permitted integration by making it possible for Public Housing officials to condemn privately-owned family dwelling units for conversion to public housing units, where integration is decreed.

TEXTILE PROSPERITY SEEN

If the Congress and the Executive Branch act favorably on the ten recommenda-
tions of our Special Textile Subcommittee, I foresee a new and prosperous era for the textile industry which is so important to our State. Included in these recom-
mandations was one calling for import quotas on foreign-manufactured textiles. Getting this recommendation into the official Subcommittee report was of much
personal satisfaction since I have been asking for quotas on low-wage imports from Japan and other countries for years.

Also at my request, the Office of Defense Mobilization made a study of the

textile industry to determine its importance to our national security. Its report showed the textile industry to be very vital to defense, a fact that should enable us to gain much support for the acceptance of our Subcommittee recommendations.

Sincerely,

Strom Thurmond
Every day I am becoming more and more impressed with the need to curb the extravagant spending policies of the Federal Government. Deficit spending is the result of extravagance, and inflation is the result of deficit spending. Everyone is hurt by higher prices, the principal evil of inflation. Some groups are affected more than others. One of these groups, our farmers, particularly feel the pinch of inflation on their pocketbooks because for several years now they have been having to pay more for their implements and supplies while they have been receiving less and less for their products. This is the vicious price-cost squeeze which must be stopped if we are going to preserve our farm population, which serves as the backbone of our national economy.

The price-cost squeeze must be attacked from two directions. First, we must conquer the inflationary spiral, and secondly, we must take action both legislatively and administratively to insure our farmers their rightful share of the national income. I have been fighting extravagant and wasteful government spending since coming to the Senate, and I shall continue to do so against the cries for more and more Federal domestic and foreign handouts. All extravagance and waste must be eliminated, and some projects, although they may seem worthy, must be postponed or reduced to the bare essentials in order to stave off inflation and to restore some semblance of fiscal sanity to our government.

PEOPLE MUST ACT

I have received many communications from South Carolinians -- one group being the State Farm Bureau -- expressing approval of my votes against the extravagance in the housing and airport bills. If inflation is to be checked, then more of the people must make their wishes known through their elected representatives.

Thus far this year there has not been adequate time for the Agriculture Committees to consider the various proposals for making it possible for our farmers to earn their share of the national income. It is my hope that some realistic, helpful legislation will be approved by the Congress as soon as possible I shall study all these proposals most carefully with a view toward vigorously supporting those which take a sensible and realistic approach toward raising the income of our farmers.

ECONOMY RESOLUTION

A resolution I am drafting, if adopted, will be a step in the direction of Federal fiscal responsibility and ultimate economy. This resolution would require all legislative bills which authorize either contract commitment of Government funds or direct borrowings from the United States Treasury to have the approval of the Appropriations Committee of the Senate, regardless of which other committee of the Senate has jurisdiction over the subject matter of the bill.

The appropriations procedure of Congress is by-passed increasingly more often by legislative proposals. Many billions of dollars each year are being spent without the approval of the Appropriations Committee, which has the necessary knowledge of the overall fiscal picture to realize the value of economy.

Sincerely,

Strom Thurmond
FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE

Washington, February -- The Special Senate Textile Subcommittee's report, which was written by Senators Thurmond (D-SC), Pastore (D-RI), and Cotton (R-NH), has been credited by textile industry spokesmen as generating the confidence which resulted in the recent round of wage increases for South Carolina textile employees. After the wage increases were announced, Senator Thurmond urged the Congress and the Administration to take early action to implement the recommendations for improving the welfare of the textile industry and its more than a million employees. The South Carolina Democrat expressed his personal gratification over the pay raises for "our hard-working and faithful textile employees." In his address to the Senate, he told his colleagues that action must be taken promptly on the recommendations so that the confidence of the textile industry in the report can be merited.

Soon after the textile report was filed in the Senate, a spokesman for the J. P. Stevens Company, which has 21 plants in South Carolina, made the following statement:

"This inspiring expression from high legislative channels encourages us to go ahead with upward wage adjustments in our various plants, even in the face of constantly increasing threats to the cotton, synthetic and woolen industries from overseas. The Pastore subcommittee report leads us to believe that something affirmative will be done to arrest the decline of U. S. textile manufacturing in recent years."

The only Southerner on the special subcommittee, Senator Thurmond attended all the textile hearings last fall. They were conducted in several States, stretching from Massachusetts to South Carolina.
COMMUNISTS GET PREFERRED TREATMENT

It will be both a sad and ironical day in the history of America when Communists who advocate the overthrow of our government are given preferred consideration over loyal and patriotic citizens who are prepared to support and defend the Constitution. Close study of the Administration's so-called civil rights bills reveals that such will be the case if one of the Administration's proposals is enacted into law. This particular bill, S. 955, would make a criminal offense of uttering threats or communications which interfere with Court orders on the subject of school integration, even in the absence of overt acts.

In one of a number of pro-Communist decisions, the Supreme Court in 1957 released 14 Communist leaders who had been convicted of sedition on two counts: (1) organizing groups to overthrow the government of the United States and (2) conspiring to teach and advocate the overthrow of the government. They were freed by the Court on the ground that they had committed no overt acts.

SPEECHES COULD PROVE COSTLY

If the Administration's so-called civil rights bills are approved, the Federal courts, and ultimately the Supreme Court, will have the authority to decide whether a speech by anyone on the subject of school integration constitutes a violation of this criminal provision. Should the Court so decide -- and the Justices are getting a bit thin-skinned over the continuous criticism directed at their school decisions -- the person making the speech could be subjected to a prison term of two years or a fine of $10,000, or both. This penalty could be imposed in the absence of any overt act on the part of the person making the speech.

This "discriminatory" feature of the bill concerns me because of the favored treatment it would make possible for Communists to receive over loyal Americans. I am even more fearful, however, of the danger it poses for the Bill of Rights. With the Administration whittling away at one end (Article I guaranteeing free speech) and the Court gnawing at the other end (Article X securing the rights of the States), I fear for the survival of this great document. The assaults on the Bill of Rights will probably be halted, however, when Article V is reached, for it is under this Amendment to the Constitution that so many Communists, criminals, and unscrupulous union leaders find their most protective shelter.

FISCAL SANITY NEEDED

The subject of the financial condition of the Federal Government has come in for much Congressional talk and little action during recent weeks. Last week I introduced in the Senate a resolution which will give the Senate an opportunity to take action toward restoring to our government some semblance of fiscal sanity. Congressman Howard Smith of Virginia has introduced a similar resolution in the House. Our resolutions would require legislative bills authorizing either contract commitment of Government funds or direct borrowings from the Treasury to have the approval of the Appropriations Committees.

Sincerely,
STROM THURMOND
DRAFT LAW NEEDED

In recent weeks I have been receiving a number of letters urging me to oppose legislation extending until July 1, 1963, the Universal Military Training and Service Act. Though I sincerely wish the world situation was such that the drafting of young men into the armed forces was unnecessary, daily evidences show the contrary.

Recent verbal outbursts by Soviet Premier Nikita Krushchev have been alarming. His threats, which are backed up by a tremendous war machine and scientific advancement, provide a challenge which must not go unanswered. We must maintain our defenses, which are equal or superior to the Russian threats today but which could fall behind in a short time through neglect.

Without exception, the leaders of our Armed Services state in unequivocal terms that in order to maintain the required military strength for our country, it is necessary to continue the conscription law.

CITIZENSHIP IS PRIVILEGE

Ideally, the manpower needs of the Armed Services should be filled by volunteers. The draft serves as a stimulant to young men to volunteer, and without this "stimulant" a critical manpower shortage would soon be felt by the Armed Services.

That inconveniences are suffered by many required to serve against their will is unquestionable; however, the privileges of living in a free and democratic society are balanced by certain responsibilities, one of which is service in uniform.

The training received by members of the Armed Services will be an asset to the recipients for the rest of their lives. I do not believe that such service will handicap these young men from a long-range standpoint.

MEMORIAL TO CALHOUN

The unveiling of John C. Calhoun's portrait in the Senate Reception Room will take place on March 12. It was my pleasure to nominate this distinguished South Carolinian for selection as one of the nation's five outstanding United States Senators of all time. He, together with Daniel Webster, Henry Clay, Robert LaFollette and Robert Taft, were selected in 1957 for the distinct honor of having their pictures displayed in the Senate Reception Room.

Plans are being made to have a kinsman of each of the Senators on hand for the March 12 unveiling. Mr. Allston D. Calhoun of Greenwood will be present for the ceremony. He has recently purchased the birthplace of John C. Calhoun and is having it restored.

Sincerely,

Strom Thurmond
FOREIGN AID WASTE

Foreign aid is under discussion on Capitol Hill and in the nation's newspapers again. This year, the Eisenhower administration is asking for almost $4 billion to be appropriated by Congress for distribution among the non-hostile-to-the-United States nations of the world.

There are two new developments in connection with foreign aid. First, hearings in the House of Representatives are revealing gross inefficiency and waste in the administration of this aid, and second, a special committee appointed by the President is recommending again that private enterprise be encouraged to play a more important role in the development of foreign economies.

INEFFICIENCY ENCOURAGED

While it is to be expected that inefficiency will prevail in any business (or government bureau) handling billions of dollars, the very nature of the foreign aid programs of the past has encouraged waste, such as the following: Blank checks given to despotic leaders of so-called democracies, economic assistance provided to nations practicing socialism, military assistance delivered to nations who may be on the other side in the event of war. A nation does not have to be friendly to the United States to receive assistance -- merely non-hostile.

For these reasons, and the lack of clarity which engulfs the program, I have voted against every foreign aid appropriation bill sent to Congress for approval. My sympathies are with many of the nations we are helping, and I realize that we must face up to those problems which come with world leadership; but, we cannot continue to spend billions of dollars foolishly.

QUALIFICATIONS FOR AID

The kind of foreign assistance bill I would be willing to support would deal more in specifics and less in generalities. It would be limited almost entirely to loans and military assistance under mutual defense pacts, and to qualify for this kind of aid, a nation should: 1. have a government which is reliable, 2. have a record and appearance of stability and 3. be friendly to the United States. Unless a nation meets all of these qualifications, we should not invest millions of dollars in that nation.

Private enterprise can do more to help our foreign friends than government handouts. I am convinced that intelligent planning along these lines will enable us to save billions of government dollars annually.

FOREIGN AID FIGURES

The United States government has spent approximately $66 billion (net after crediting repayment of loans and obligations) assisting foreign nations in the 13 years following World War II. Add to this the $50 billion in foreign aid given by the United States during the five war years -- 1940-45 -- and our people have spent $116 billion helping foreign nations during the past 18 years. This is as much money as we (the U.S. government) spent on everything during the 18 years immediately preceding World War II -- 1922-39.

Sincerely,

Strom Thurmond
MAJOR LEGISLATION PASSED

It was an eventful week in the Senate. Three pieces of major legislation—the extension of the draft bill, the space research appropriation bill and the Hawaiian Statehood bill—were all debated and passed by large majority votes. I supported the draft and space research legislation, since both are needed without delay if we are to stay prepared to meet threats from the Communist conspiracy. I could not support the Hawaiian Statehood Bill.

LITTLE IN COMMON WITH HAWAII

My opposition to the Hawaiian Statehood Bill was based on a number of factors, but largely on the observation that the people of Hawaii and the United States have little in common and should not therefore be bedmates. Statehood, like marriage, is the most intimate of relationships between two people or two groups of people. In the case of a bad marriage, a divorce is possible; in the case of dissatisfaction with a State or a State's dissatisfaction with the United States, there's no escape.

More than 70 per cent of the Hawaiian people are of Asiatic origin. Only about one per cent of the present United States population is of Asiatic background. It is doubtful that more than five per cent of the Hawaiian people will ever set foot on the American continent because of its location more than 2,000 miles from the North American continent. The Communist influence is already felt on the Islands through the Longshoremen's Union.

DEFENSE, CIVIL RIGHTS, ETC...

A very important controversy has developed in recent weeks between President Eisenhower and Defense Secretary McElroy, on one hand, and Members of the House and Senate and leaders of some of the services, on the other, as to whether the President has requested sufficient funds to provide an adequate defense program. I feel that the President has requested the bare minimum and that this should be augmented by increased expenditures in specific categories to provide a margin of safety. In a recent speech, I advocated more money to be spent (1) to keep the Strategic Air Command on an air alert to prevent our retaliatory striking force from being destroyed on the ground; (2) a speedup in our second generation missile program with particular emphasis on the anti-missile missile; and (3) increased personnel and modernization of weapons and equipment for our ground forces. I pointed out in my speech that this margin of safety in our defense program could be provided within the limitations of a balanced budget by cutting or eliminating certain non-defense program.

So-called civil rights legislation will be discussed in Senate hearings commencing on Wednesday, March 18. I shall be among the first to testify in opposition to any legislation directed at one section of the nation. The best, and only needed, civil rights guarantee is found in the Constitution and its Bill of Rights. It was a pleasure last week to witness the unveiling of a handsome painting of John C. Calhoun in the Senate Reception Room. The ceremony honored Calhoun, Clay, LaFollette, and Webster as the five greatest Senators in U.S. history. It was my honor to have nominated Calhoun for this unique distinction, and it was my pleasure to have as guests at the ceremony one of Calhoun's great grandsons, John C. Calhoun of Beaufort; one of his great granddaughters, Mrs. Mildred Calhoun Wick of Camden; and a great, great nephew, Allston Calhoun of Greenwood. Over the week end, I moved my office to the new Senate Office Building directly across the street from the old one. There is more room in which to work in this new office, and I shall be looking forward to having you come by when you get up to Washington. The room number is 6223.
In my speech opposing the Area Redevelopment bill, I have tried to point out to the Senate that we have never before made such a long stride toward socialism, and should not do so now. Area redevelopment is another term for Federal control of industry and Federal domination of population areas throughout the nation. Let me illustrate why this is so, in listing my reasons for opposing this bill:

1. It would permit government subsidies to industries if they agreed to move into areas which have been found unsuitable by industry itself.

2. It would permit non-trained government bureaucrats to determine those locations where industry might operate with the aid of subsidies.

3. It would discriminate not only between States with unemployment problems but also between towns and counties within a State. (The political implications here are tremendous).

4. It would create another agency, of which there are already far too many. Duties of this agency on area redevelopment would conflict with the present responsibilities of several agencies already in existence.

5. We all know that once a new bureau or agency is created that it will grow and strengthen its position -- all at the cost of taxpayers.

**TAX STATUS OF THE NAACP**

The Commissioner of Internal Revenue has finally agreed to investigate the income tax status of contributions made to the legal defense fund of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People. At the present time the IRS does not tax the fund, and contributions made to the fund by individual donors can be deducted from the donor's tax return. Other left-wing organizations which are doing more propagandizing and politicking than anything else, such as the Fund for the Republic, also enjoy one or both of these tax advantages. I am glad that Senator Harry Byrd, chairman of the Finance Committee which oversees the IRS, has been able to get this investigation started. It should prove most enlightening.

**CONSERVATION RESERVE PROGRAM**

Agriculture Secretary Ezra Taft Benson is considering an expansion of the soil bank's conservation reserve from approximately 23 million to 40 million acres of farm land. The National Agricultural Advisory Commission recommended this action to the Secretary in an effort to retire more land from production of surplus crops. The agriculture budget request now pending in the Congress provides for 28 million acres next year.

**CONQUERED PROVINCE LEGISLATION**

In my talk opposing all so-called civil rights proposals, I pointed out to a Senate Judiciary Subcommittee last week that the proposals before the Senate can be described in one word -- punitive. They would punish the South for not accepting the ideas and schemes of non-Southern minority groups and the politicians riding on their coattails.

These proposals would treat the South as a conquered province, in effect giving the Southern States far less consideration in guiding their destinies and private affairs than have been given such recently conquered nations as Germany, Italy and Japan. I cannot believe that the majority of Senators sincerely favor this conquered province type legislation.

Sincerely,

STROM THURMOND
With the Senate in recess this week, I would like to briefly review what has transpired in the Senate during the first three months of 1959. The Senate was actually in session on 38 days during this period. Of course, my office is open six days a week and there are committee and subcommittee meetings and special hearings in the Senate all week long. During the early months of the year, these committee meetings are time-consuming but most important in preparing bills to be presented to the entire membership of the Senate. The major bills which have been presented to the Senate to date, and my position on each, are as follows:

1. There were several motions to change the Senate rules, making it easier to limit debate in the Senate. I opposed all of these changes, which would enable groups hostile to the South to pass legislation without full discussion. The least-obnoxious of three motions, one which provides for end of debate by an affirmative vote of two-thirds of the Senators present and voting, was passed.

2. An omnibus housing bill, which will result in U.S. taxpayers assuming liability for approximately $84 billion over the next 40 years, passed the Senate in spite of my strong opposition. We cannot afford a wild spending spree for public housing, and even if we could, we do not need this much housing. The urban renewal feature of this bill is also bad, permitting the government to have a free hand in condemning areas, razing them and then selling these areas at a loss to private contractors. I did succeed in getting a provision taken from this bill which would have opened the door for integrated housing. The House has not voted on this bill yet, and I hope that either it will not pass this legislation or that the President will veto the bill.

3. The Federal Airport Act extension as passed by the Senate would give the Federal Aviation Agency $100 million per year for four years and a special fund of $63 million to spend in assisting States and communities in building airport facilities. This is $37 million a year more than General Quesada, chairman of the Aviation Agency, feels he needs or can use. As a result, I opposed this added extravagance, though it did pass the Senate.

4. Extension of the draft is declared imperative by all our military leaders. I supported a continuation of the Draft for another four years. This extension passed the Senate and the House.

5. Hawaiian statehood was favored by most Senators, but I opposed admitting Hawaii as a state for many reasons -- its location more than 2,000 miles from the American continent, a population which is 75 per cent Japanese, Chinese, Filipino and Polynesian, and which has traditions and culture very much different from those of the people in our other states. The glamour of Hawaii was too much, however, and statehood is assured for these South Pacific islands.

6. Area redevelopment, which will authorize government bureaucrats to subsidize industry in areas which have been found unprofitable by the leaders of industry, passed the Senate by a narrow margin, in spite of our strong opposition. This is a $389 million program which will not benefit the South in any way. In fact, it will help other sections of the nation to court industry away from the South, with the aid of Federal subsidies. I hope the President will veto this bill if it passes the House.

As you can tell from this brief summary, the spenders are having another field day in the Senate. After the recess many additional major issues will be brought before our group for discussion. I sincerely hope that more reason than has been shown to date will prevail.
BUSINESS BARONS AND LABOR BARONS

The next major bill scheduled to come before the Senate is the Labor Reform Bill. The bill which the Labor Committee has reported to the Senate floor may be aptly described as having rubber teeth. It is imperative that this bill be strengthened by amendments from the floor, and I shall support such efforts.

The big labor leaders are supporting the committee bill. It is common knowledge that they agreed to support this so-called reform package because it contains something they like -- weakening amendments to the Taft-Hartley Act. As a matter of fact, they are supporting something very much to their liking because the "reform" part of the bill is riddled with loopholes, and therefore they would be getting the Taft-Hartley Act weakened without any effective legislative curb on the abuses which should be abated. The committee rejected the reform proposal of Senator McClellan, who has spent so much time studying this matter.

Contrary to much of the propaganda on the subject, this legislation does not involve a controversy of "labor against management"; it presents an issue of whether or not Congress is going to take effective action to prevent exploitation of workers and the public by unscrupulous labor leaders.

In the latter part of the nineteenth century and the early part of the twentieth century, business barons captured control of economic and political power of the country. With this power they succeeded in exploiting working people and the public in general. This abusive situation was corrected by Congress after a long struggle by passage of anti-trust laws and such acts as the Corrupt Practices Act, and by the efforts of organized labor.

Of what difference is it to the working man and to the public that those by whom they are exploited are wealthy labor bosses rather than wealthy business barons? No one group, or combination of groups, regardless of their identity or association, must be permitted to serve themselves at the expense of the average citizen. Just as there were only a minority of businessmen whose actions made necessary the passage of anti-trust laws and the Corrupt Practices Act, there is only a minority of labor leaders whose actions necessitate an effective labor reform bill at this time. Similarly, just as the anti-trust laws did not keep business from operating successfully, an effective labor reform bill will not prevent organized labor from accomplishing the legitimate purposes of collective bargaining.

WAR AGAINST BOLL WEEVILS

The boll weevil has been a menace to farmers of the South for many years, and, in spite of considerable effort and expense to eliminate this menace, it is still with us -- costing the thousands of cotton farmers millions of dollars annually. It is my privilege at the present time to be working with Mr. Robert Coker of Hartsville to bring this information to the Congress together with a planned strategy to win the seemingly endless war with the boll weevil.

Mr. Coker testified before the House Appropriations Committee in March, asking that approximately $1 million be made available in 1960 for the purpose of stepping up research activities in an effort to eradicate the boll weevil. I plan to appear with him when he presents his request to the Senate Appropriations Committee next week.

In my communications to the chairmen of the Senate and House Appropriations Committees, I pointed out that a huge savings could be effected for our country by engaging in this vital research program. The annual boll weevil damage to our country is approximately 350 times the amount that this research expenditure would cost, according to the Agriculture Department.

Sincerely,

STROM THURMOND
COTTON RESEARCH NEEDED

In my last report, I mentioned that I am supporting a proposal by Mr. Robert Coker of Hartsville, S. C., to expand government research activities for the purpose of eradicating the boll weevil and its 350 million-dollar annual damage to our cotton crops. This week I want to tell you about another research activity which also deserves increased attention and support by the Congress and the Department of Agriculture. It is the problem of discovering new ways to improve the spinning quality of cotton so as to increase the consumption of cotton and cotton products.

During the past ten years radical changes in the production, harvesting, and ginning of cotton have been developed to help offset the constantly rising cost of producing cotton. While much progress has been made in these areas, such as the development of the mechanical cotton picker, many new and unsolved problems have developed.

Witnesses before the House Agricultural Appropriations Subcommittee have testified that these changes in cotton harvesting and ginning have resulted in a "gross deterioration" in the spinning quality of cotton. They say the proportion of short fibers has increased, the effective strength of the fiber has been reduced, and the general fine character of the natural cotton fiber has been lost. This has placed cotton, they say, at a disadvantage in competing with other fibers and is an added inducement for mills to switch to synthetics.

Some research in this vital field has already been conducted at Joanna Mills at Joanna, S. C., and at the pilot spinning plant facility recently established by the Department of Agriculture at Clemson College, Clemson, S. C. Additional funds are needed to increase research activities at both of these places and at other research projects across the country.

RESEARCH IN PULP INDUSTRY

One of the most important industries to South Carolina's economy is the forest products industry. The pulp and paper segment of this industry is being honored this week in South Carolina on the very day that nine Pilot Forests scattered throughout the state are being dedicated. These Pilot Forests will show South Carolinians how they can add to their incomes by using modern methods and practices in harvesting forest trees for pulpwood and other forest products. This is a form of research deserving of much praise. My heartiest congratulations to those individuals responsible for the Pilot Forests.

SC FARM CASH CROPS

According to figures furnished to me this week by the Department of Agriculture, cotton has declined sharply as a cash crop in South Carolina during the period 1924-57. In 1924, king cotton furnished 70 per cent of cash receipts from farm products. By 1957 this figure had dropped to 19 per cent. During this same period tobacco, dairy products, and hogs have shown an upward trend. In 1957 tobacco ranked as the top money crop in South Carolina, accounting for 23.7 per cent of all cash farm receipts. Other crops ranked in the following order percentage-wise: Cotton (lint and seed), 19.2; meat animals, 12.6; poultry and eggs, 10.4; dairy products, 7.5; fruits and nuts, 5.0; feed crops, 3.7; oil crops, 3.5; vegetables, 3.4; food grains, 1.5; other livestock, 0.3; and other crops grouped together, 9.2.

Sincerely,
STROM THURMOND
BACK DOOR TO TREASURY

Representative Howard Smith (D-Va.), chairman of the powerful House Rules Committee which controls the movement of legislation in the House of Representatives, has temporarily blocked House action on the $5,800,000,000 omnibus housing bill. I vigorously opposed this bill when it passed the Senate in February. Congressman Smith's position is the same as mine. The bill calls for spending far in excess of the nation's needs and is a backdoor approach to the Treasury of the United States.

Congressman Smith and I are the authors of House and Senate bills respectively which -- if passed into law -- will prevent the "backdoor approach." They would require prior clearance by the appropriations committees of Congress before money measures could be passed. Under existing procedures, billions of dollars are spent annually by many government agencies even though the money has not been appropriated.

DULLES WAS DEDICATED

John Foster Dulles, the nation's Secretary of State for more than six years, has been a topic of discussion among people throughout the world. Many disagreed with him, but none questioned his dedication and devotion to the job of keeping peace in the world while at the same time combating the world conspiracy of communism.

I differed with his policy permitting excessive textile imports to the detriment of the domestic industry, and my record in opposition to inefficiency and lack of realism in foreign aid has been stated before; however, on the question of standing firm against the Communist threat and refusing to accept promises in place of deeds, I have always supported Mr. Dulles. Few Secretaries of State have been better prepared for their roles in world affairs and few have given more of their time and talents in performing their duties.

A SENATOR'S THOUGHTS

South Carolina's daily newspaper editors attended the annual convention of the American Society of Newspaper Editors held here over the week-end. In welcoming many of them to the nation's capital, I was reminded of how fortunate our State is in having many able and sound editorial writers to guide public opinion in South Carolina -- men who believe in giving their readers the clear picture and not a blurred or biased one ... Washington is a beautiful city this time of year. The cherry blossoms have been in bloom much of the month, and it becomes increasingly evident why our nation's capital ranks as one of the prettiest in the world ... It was a privilege to speak briefly to the Senate Subcommittee on constitutional rights last week following the observations of Governor Hollings and other distinguished South Carolinians on proposed so-called civil rights legislation. I told members of the subcommittee that these leaders of the State are the real spokesmen for the people and that their views on these anti-South bills represent the thinking of at least 90 per cent of the people in our State.

Sincerely,

STROM THURMOND
The Senate was engaged in heated debate all last week, holding several night sessions and meeting also on Saturday afternoon, over the Kennedy-Ervin Labor Reform Bill. As reported to the Senate floor from the Labor Committee, the bill was described by Senator McClellan, chief of the labor racketeer investigators, as being totally inadequate. To make even this rubber tooth reform part acceptable to the union bosses, however, the committee added some sweetening provisions which would further increase the power of the bosses at the expense of the workers and the public. The bill as reported by the Labor Committee, had it been passed without amendment, would have been a fraud on the public and the workers demanding reform.

Although the bill still does not fulfill the needs as pointed up by Senator McClellan and his investigating committee, amendments were adopted on the Senate floor which make the bill worthy of passage as a commendable step in the right direction. I hope the House will improve the bill further.

Among the innumerable amendments adopted, most of which were substantial, were ones redefining "labor organization," tightening reporting requirements, requiring notice to be given of union elections, insuring the right of union members to inspect union books, establishing a fiduciary relationship between union officers and members, increasing the penalty for shakedown picketing, limiting the right of replaced strikers to vote after a reasonable lapse of time, redefining union officers and labor relations consultants, requiring bonding of those handling union money, outlawing hot-cargo clauses and limiting recognition picketing. There were many others.

The most important amendment adopted was Senator McClellan's "Bill of Rights" for labor union members, which was approved initially by a one-vote margin. It later had to be modified, however, after gross exaggerations were made in an effort to bring so-called civil rights questions into the amendment. The whole matter was an attempt to mollify the union bosses for political purposes even to the point of trying to cause political embarrassment to a great American and Southern Statesman, Senator McClellan, who has unflinchingly devoted his efforts to the best interest of the South, the working man, and the American public.

These gross exaggerations of the possible effects of parts of the "Bill of Rights" amendment were utilized to effectively corral enough votes to recommit or kill the reform bill, if the amendment were not revised. I joined Senator McClellan in supporting the revision, which still contained effective reform measures, and co-sponsored with Senator Ervin a jury trial amendment to the retained injunctive features in other parts of the bill to insure that the bill would not be defeated to the delight of Mr. Hoffa and other union hoodlums.

Our jury trial amendment was essential even had the McClellan "Bill of Rights" not been adopted. It was made neither more nor less essential by either the adoption or modification of the McClellan amendment. The power to convict without jury trial for contempt was part and parcel of the bill as reported by the Committee, and indeed, was one of the innumerable weaknesses of the bill that has been corrected by the Senate with floor amendments.

I hope that the House will adopt effective amendments to outlaw the hoodlums' weapons of secondary boycotts and organizational and recognition picketing, to remove the bill's exemptions from reporting requirements, and to tighten up the other provisions of the bill, all of which were offered in the Senate and rejected. I favored all of these amendments, which are in the interest of the working man and the public.

Sincerely,

STROM THURMOND
In recent years the U. S. Supreme Court in decision after decision has been drawing up for American Communists and their fellow travelers and sympathizers a long Bill of Rights, which the Communists say have made it much easier for them to operate in this country. In a recent issue of the Worker, the official news organ of the Communist Party, the paper's general manager, Mr. William L. Patterson, urged more boldness by party members with these words:

"Let's be bolder, McCarthyism has sustained a heartening defeat in our country. American reaction has in fact sustained a number of defeats on the political as well as moral front."

"We say this because it must be made clear that the prevailing political atmosphere permits increasing activities with lessening danger of victimization."

Here is the Supreme Court's Bill of Rights for Communists:

1. A citizen can be a member of the Communist Party without being in violation of the law. (SACB case) 2. A Communist—or any other citizen—may legally advocate forcible overthrow of the government as an abstract doctrine. (Yates case) 3. A Communist organizer cannot be prosecuted for forming new Communist cells. (Yates case) 4. A federal employee cannot be fired from a "nonsensitive" job merely for association with Communists. (Cole & Service cases) 5. A witness before a congressional committee cannot be compelled to answer questions about Communist affiliations unless the questions are shown clearly to be pertinent to the subject under investigation. (Watkins case) 6. A defendant can compel the government to show him, through the trial judge, statements that witnesses against him made to the FBI in secret, pre-trial investigations. (Jencks case) 7. A person cannot be denied a passport to travel abroad merely because of Communist beliefs or associations. (Dayton case) 8. A professor cannot be questioned by a State agency as to his belief in Communism or his advocacy of Communism in the classroom. (Sweezy case) 9. A board of education cannot fire a teacher for refusing to answer questions about Communist activity. (Slochower case) 10. A Communist cannot be prosecuted by a State for the crime of sedition. (Nelson case) 11. A State cannot deny bar membership to a lawyer who refuses to say whether he is a Communist. (Schware and Konigsberg cases) 12. A Communist who has been told to leave this country under a deportation order more than six months old cannot be kept under surveillance by the U. S. Attorney General. (Witkovich case) 13. An alien who violates the Internal Security Act by joining the Communist Party after entering the U. S. can wipe out this crime by leaving the country, quitting the party, and then re-entering the country. (Bonetti case)

For the latest favoritisms to Communists, watch your Supreme Court decisions.

Sincerely,

Strom Thurmond
STATES RIGHTS BILL PROGRESSES

As Congress reaches the mid-point of 1959's session, the focus of attention has shifted somewhat to the House of Representatives. Although the Senate has acted favorably on a number of controversial measures, its action has been by a smaller majority than was generally predicted early in the session. Few major legislative proposals have been passed by both houses and sent to the President. A number of the most controversial bills now seem ripe for a showdown in the House.

Last year, the "States Rights Bill," which is the strongest Court-curb legislation seriously considered by the Congress, passed the House and failed of passage in the Senate by the narrow margin of only one vote. This bill, numbered H. R. 3 last year, was reintroduced in the Senate and House this year as S. 3 and H. R. 3 respectively. The House has held voluminous hearings, and the Chairman, Congressman Celler of New York, who vigorously opposes this bill, has delayed action until next week to permit the Department of Justice to testify against the measure. This appears to be a last ditch stand, however, for the proponents of the bill in the House indicate they have the votes to report H. R. 3 favorably from committee for early House consideration, where prospects for favorable action also appear good.

On the Senate side, hearings on S. 3 were completed by a subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee on May 5. The testimony before this subcommittee was for the most part very favorable. The last witness heard was Justice Mussmanno of the Pennsylvania Supreme Court, who wrote the dissenting opinion in the Steve Nelson case in which the majority held that States could not enforce their laws against subversion. Justice Mussmanno was most persuasive in urging the passage of S. 3 to right this atrocious pro-communist decision. Another most persuasive witness who urged passage of S. 3 was Dr. Abner V. McCall, Dean of Baylor Law School and an eminent constitutional lawyer. I requested time for both of these staunch and patriotic Americans to testify.

TESTS -- EDUCATION AND HOUSING

Two bills unworthy of approval are also slated for early House action. It is reported that the House Education Committee is almost ready to report the Murray-Metcalf proposal for a three billion-dollar a year federal aid to education program. This proposal allots money on a per-pupil basis to all public schools for teachers' salaries and classroom construction. This bill is extremely dangerous. Its proponents "pooh-pooh" the threat of federal control, while knowing full well that he who controls the purse strings calls the tune, and that he who would be a dictator first seeks control of the educational process. Do not be deceived by this false promise of something for nothing -- it is just another example of the Federal Government offering the taxpayer the shirt off his own back, minus the buttons which control the wear.

House consideration of the Housing bill is also imminent. The Speaker of that body has announced his intention of forcing an early vote on this measure. Those of us who are violently opposed to this catch-all, unnecessary, socialist and inflation-pushing package are hopeful that even if the left-wing pressure groups succeed in marshalling enough votes to pass this monstrosity in the House, the margin will be insufficient to override the Presidential veto, which should be the President's immediate reaction.

Sincerely,

STROM THURMOND
THE STRAUSS NOMINATION

After hearing and reading the testimony for and against confirmation of Admiral Lewis Strauss to be Secretary of Commerce, my conscience dictates that I should support his nomination in Committee and on the Senate floor. This great public servant has ably served in the administrations of Presidents Wilson, Roosevelt, Truman, and Eisenhower and as personal secretary to Herbert Hoover prior to his election as President. I feel that Admiral Strauss has refuted the charges which have been made against him. It seems to me that whatever differences exist are concerned primarily with matters of judgment, or even differences in basic philosophy. If the nominee has erred—and I am not convinced that he has, although I realize that no human is perfect—it has been on the side of security for our nation, for which, in my opinion, he should be commended, rather than condemned.

Much of the controversy over the Admiral’s nomination has centered around his original lone-wolf stand on the Atomic Energy Commission in favor of developing the H-bomb ahead of Russia, his vote with a majority of the Gray Board and the AEC to cancel security clearance to Dr. Robert Oppenheimer, and his opposition at one time to the overseas shipment of radioactive isotopes which he felt might possibly be used in some manner against our country since adequate supervision was not provided for in the proposal.

STATES RIGHTS, EDUCATION AND HOUSING

Last week I reported to you that various House committees would probably take favorable action on three pending bills, one of which I wholeheartedly favor and two of which I strongly oppose. Since that time the House Judiciary Committee, by a vote of 17-15, has agreed to report favorably H. R. 3, the States Rights bill. Congressman Robert Ashmore of South Carolina’s fourth district played an important role in the winning vote. This vital legislation, if finally approved, will assist immeasurably in preserving the rights of the States against federal usurpation, particularly by the U. S. Supreme Court.

The House Education Committee favorably reported a $4.4 billion-dollar general federal aid to education bill. This legislation is (1) unconstitutional because education is reserved to the States under the Tenth Amendment to the Constitution; (2) unnecessary because the States can and are doing the job; and (3) unwise because it would lead to federal control and ultimately could lead to federal dictatorship. In addition, Congressman Powell (D-NY) has vowed to offer his amendment to prevent Federal funds from going to segregated schools. He has been successful before on this.

The housing bill has now cleared the House Rules Committee, but I am hopeful that a substitute bill which will involve much less money can be passed if a bill is to be acted on.

TEXTILES AND GATT

Early last week a news dispatch from Geneva, Switzerland, reported that the State Department had instructed its delegates to the 14th session of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT) to assure success of the meeting by reducing textile duties on textile fabrics and fibers and some other products by ten percent. When this was called to our attention, Senators Pastore, Cotton, and I, members of the Senate’s Special Textile Watchdog Subcommittee, demanded that the State Department withdraw these instructions if such had been issued. Officials of the Department denied that such instructions had been given or even considered and they promised a full investigation into the report.
$50 MILLION FOR WORLD HEALTH

A good example of the fiscal irresponsibility which has accounted for much of the 285 billion dollar national debt, none of which will be repaid this fiscal year because of deficit spending, is the International Medical and Health Research Bill which passed the Senate this week. Under the terms of this bill, an initial expenditure of $50 million in 1960 was approved to create a new agency to duplicate efforts we are now making in the international health field through the United Nations.

The broad vision we Senators were supposed to see in this bill was a great research organization in which all of the world's best minds are working together to remove disease from the face of the earth. This is a noble vision -- so noble, in fact, that the bill passed the Senate by a 63 to 17 vote. The majority were blinded to the United States Surgeon General's testimony that he could not see how more than $7 million could be spent for this program. They also paid no heed to the nation's budget director's four objections to the bill:

1. It would further add to the diffusion within the Government of responsibility for dealing with international problems.

2. It would increase the complexity of United States efforts in the field of international health.

3. It is not desirable to establish a statutory institute to conduct international health research. (Once enacted, a statute is difficult to cancel out, requiring additional action by Congress).

4. It calls for much more money than needed.

I was impressed with the soundness of the position of the Surgeon General and Budget Director. I am also aware that the United States is conducting an excellent medical and health research program of its own. I have supported these domestic programs. However, I could not support this additional international adventure. The time has come that we must realize that even our wealth is limited, and we cannot carry all the world's health problems as well as its military and economic burdens.

WARNING ON INSURANCE BILL

The Life Insurance Company Income Tax Act of 1959 is now before a conference committee of the House and Senate. I am urging the conferees to consider carefully the language in this complicated bill so that insurance company income from tax-exempt bonds of States and Municipalities will clearly be tax-exempt; otherwise, States and Municipalities may have difficulties in selling their bonds. If this should occur, the States and Municipalities would be forced to turn to the Federal government for assistance and the control that would follow.

TEXTILE RECOMMENDATION FOLLOWED

President Eisenhower has authorized Secretary of Commerce Strauss to put into effect the initial recommendation made by Senators Pastore, Cotton and me in our Report on the Problems of the Domestic Textile Industry. This recommendation calls for an inter-agency committee to be established within the Department of Commerce to deal exclusively with textile affairs. Our Senate Subcommittee on Textiles will work closely with this soon-to-be-established inter-agency group to be made up of high-ranking officials of the Departments of Agriculture, Commerce, Defense, Labor, State, Treasury and others.

Sincerely,
STROM THURMOND
BOLL WEEVIL RESEARCH WINS

As a general rule, funds spent for research are funds well spent, especially where there is a vital need involved and there is some reasonable expectation of attaining some success.

I was very pleased this past week by the action of the Senate Appropriations Committee in approving an initial expenditure of $1,893,000 for a gigantic research program designed to eradicate once and forever the $351,000,000 in annual damage caused to our cotton crops by the boll weevil pest. Last year and earlier in this year I joined Mr. Robert Coker of Hartsville, S. C., the National Cotton Council, and others in urging the approval of these important research funds.

The Committee also added another $50,000 to the $50,000 which the House of Representatives had already approved for furthering research efforts at the pilot ginning laboratory at Clemson. The Clemson laboratory is a part of an overall program which has been proposed for determining and improving the spinning quality of cotton in order to assist cotton in its vicious battle with synthetics. More money is needed for other aspects of the proposed program, and if they cannot be obtained this year we will renew our efforts to win approval in the next agricultural appropriation bill.

SOIL & WATER CONSERVATION VITAL

One of the greatest needs facing our country today, especially our farmers, is the vital need for research to determine the best utilization and conservation of our soil and water resources. This is particularly important to South Carolina because of the introduction into our State of new crops and more modern farming techniques. To continue this essential transition with assurance, based on knowledge rather than guess-work, it is imperative that our farmers be provided as soon as possible with up-to-date research data on the major soil and water management factors of the area.

Recognizing this need, I joined with Congressman Bryon Dorn in introducing a resolution in the last Congress for the purpose of establishing a soil and water conservation laboratory in the Southeast. The Congress voted to set up a committee to study whether there was such a need and, if so, in what areas such laboratories should be located. The committee has now reported to the Congress that labs should be established in the Great Plains and the Southeast Plains areas. Members of the South Carolina congressional delegation met with representatives of the S. C. Association of Soil Conservation District Supervisors during the week, and we promised to continue our efforts as long as necessary to obtain these research facilities for our area.

SALINE WATER RESEARCH

The Interior Department is currently doing valuable research work on developing conversion plants which will take salt water and convert it into fresh water by economical means. In 1955 the United States' fresh water requirements were 221 billion gallons daily. By 1980, the nation's needs will be almost tripled to 597 billion gallons each day. Two of our coastal cities, Beaufort and Charleston, have expressed an interest in having the Atlantic Coast demonstration plant located in their communities. If the demonstrations and tests prove successful, many communities in our country and around the world may begin building their own plants.

Sincerely,

Strom Thurmond
FIRMNESS WITH RUSSIA

In recent weeks major attention has been focused on the Big Four Foreign Ministers meeting in Geneva, Switzerland. The purpose of this important conference is to lay the groundwork for a possible summit meeting of the Big Four heads of state at some later date. At the time of the writing of this report, little progress has been made except that the Communists have seized upon this as another opportunity to spew their propaganda around the world while attention is centered on the conference.

I am glad that President Eisenhower has let it be known again that unless real progress is made at the foreign ministers meeting he will not agree to make the trip to the summit. The President has demonstrated time and again that he is more than willing to sit down and confer with the Kremlin leadership when he has firm assurances that the talks will be conducted in good faith with an earnest desire to move toward a lessening of world tensions. He knows, as do most Americans, that agreements with the Communist leaders amount to no more than mere scraps of paper, and that summit meetings are used by them only to further their propaganda efforts and to give the appearance of being proponents of world peace. It is not just coincidental that the "Worker", the Communist news organ in the United States, and red front groups continually advocate summit meetings.

THE BYRNES POLICY

The only way to deal with the Communists is resolute firmness. I am proud of the fact that a great American and South Carolinian, James F. Byrnes, initiated the "get tough with Russia" policy while Secretary of State. He did so over the protests of Commerce Secretary Henry Wallace, whom President Truman had the good judgment to dismiss from his cabinet as a result of his opposition to the Byrnes policy.

With the Byrnes policy, we forced Russia to move out of Iran after Stalin had threatened armed conflict if he were not permitted to continue his occupation of that country in violation of his war-time treaty agreement with Iran. Also in 1946, we backed Turkey when Russia tried to force that country into an undesirable treaty affecting control of the Straits of the Black Sea. The Communists again made war-like noises, but they backed down.

RUSSIA GAINS NO MORE

In 1948 the Communists tried to force us out of Berlin, as they are now trying to do, but our Berlin Airlift operation scored another "toughness" victory for the free world. I feel, however, than we could have averted the huge expense and loss of life which the airlift cost us if we had employed the necessary firmness to have maintained our rightful ground routes through East Germany to Berlin.

More recently, Secretary of State John Foster Dulles, who died of cancer two weeks ago, refused to be frightened by Communist bullying tactics and threats. For six years the cold war has been in a stalemate, but Russia has gained no ground. In fact, during this period she has been forced out of Austria.

The "stand firm" diplomacy advanced by Mr. Byrnes, and practiced for the past six years by Secretary Dulles, has kept the Russians from taking over all of Europe. I hope President Eisenhower and his new Secretary of State, Christian Herter, will continue to be steadfast on the side of right, because such a policy is the key to continued liberty for the peoples of the free world and the hope of all enslaved peoples.

Sincerely,

Strom Thurmond
The voice of the people can be a powerful instrumentality for good. Sometimes it takes prolonged clamor and loud cries for the people to gain the ear of those who write the nation's laws, interpret them, and enforce them. The bureaucratic air in Washington is very thick and smoggy and oftentimes proves to be most difficult to penetrate.

I have made many speeches and fights against recent Supreme Court decisions affecting the rights of the States and the security of our country, against wasteful spending and deficit financing, against extravagant foreign aid grants, and against forced mixing of the races without regard for State laws and the wishes of the people. I am convinced in my own mind that my views on these matters are shared by an overwhelming majority of the people of South Carolina and by a majority of the people of the nation as a whole. My mail bears out this belief. However, because the three branches of the Federal Government--the Congress, the Supreme Court, and the Executive--have not reacted favorably to the voice of the people in a reasonable period of time, many have become discouraged and disheartened.

VOICE PENETRATES SOME

During the past week several actions in Washington gave some reason to be hopeful that at last the cries of the majority of the people are being heard in the nation's capital. On Monday the Supreme Court handed down two decisions which indicate a change, though slight, in the Court's thinking on cases affecting subversives. In one 5-4 decision, the Court modified its 1956 ruling in the case of Steve Nelson v. Pennsylvania, which threw out all State anti-sedition laws, to say that the States can enforce their own security laws when they apply to activities against the States. In another 5-4 decision, the Court relented a little in its opposition to the House Un-American Activities Committee and the Congress in questioning suspected Communists. In an earlier decision, the Watkins case, the Court had tied the hands of congressional investigations in security questioning with red tape.

MORE GOOD SIGNS

News analysts in Washington were speculating during the week that President Eisenhower may get his balanced budget this year after all. Most of the credit was being given to the people who have been making their wishes known on this issue. It now appears that the extravagant airport aid extension bill will have to be cut back to previous authorization spending levels. The omnibus housing bill, with its backdoor spending features, has been vetoed and will have to be trimmed to get by the President. The Appropriation Committees of Congress are holding the line against wild spending proposals, and some who initially promised extra government spending are now pointing with pride to the sensible actions of the Appropriations Committees. Late in the week the Senate Foreign Relations Committee voted to turn from grants to loans in the field of economic aid under the foreign aid program. At the same time, the State Department was estimating that the temporary giveaway program should continue for "25 to 50 years." The sentiment of the people indicates, however, that we may see the end of this program soon.

I was also encouraged to read that President Eisenhower has again spoken out against punitive so-called civil rights laws--this time before the National Conference on Civil Rights. The President's remarks indicate he has learned well the lesson of Little Rock. Another piece of good news I have for you this week is that the House of Representatives should have passed H.R. 3, the States Rights bill, by the time you read this report.

Sincerely,

Strom Thurmond
SPENDING BILLS UP

The Senate is now working hard on appropriation bills for fiscal year 1960, which will begin July 1. Except for certain back-door spending schemes, the appropriation bills are supposed to account for all spending by the Federal Government.

While the House Appropriations Committee, of which Congressman John Riley of South Carolina’s second district is a member, acts first on all appropriation bills, the process of arriving at a figure for any particular appropriation bill begins many bureaus and months earlier. The process begins with some small component in an agency such as the gigantic Defense Department. Many months in advance, a section chief will submit his spending requests for the coming fiscal year to his immediate superior. From there it goes to the appropriate service Secretary, then to the Secretary of Defense, and on to the President’s Bureau of the Budget.

BALANCED BUDGET FOR 1960

The Bureau generally pares the requests down and presents the overall budget request to the President, who in turn, submits a budget message to the Congress shortly after his annual State of the Union address. In January, 1959, President Eisenhower submitted to the Congress a budget request of $77 billion for fiscal year 1960. According to the receipts which he expected, the government to collect, $77.1 billion, we would have a slight surplus if his budget recommendations were carried out exactly by the Congress.

The President’s budget request was divided into five major categories: major national security, $45.8 billion; interest, $8.1 billion; agriculture, $6 billion; veterans, $5.1 billion; and other, $12.1 billion. His receipts were broken down into four major categories: individual income taxes, $40.7 billion; corporation income taxes, $21.5 billion; excise taxes, $8.9 billion; and other, $6 billion.

CONGRESS DOING O. K.

Thus far this year, the Congress has done an admirable job in working toward a balanced budget for fiscal year 1960, as contrasted with fiscal 1959 when a deficit of $13 billion was incurred. Most of the appropriation bills which have been approved by one or both houses are within or below the budget request figures. The House has acted on 14 of the 18 appropriation bills, with four more—the foreign aid, military construction, atomic energy, and 1st supplemental bills—still awaiting action. The Senate has acted on eight bills thus far and should complete action this week on three more, among them being the important and expensive Defense Appropriations Bill. The House cut the President’s defense budget request of $39.2 billion to $38.8 billion. At the writing of this report, the Senate committee had not yet made its recommendation to the Senate.

I feel that I have been very diligent in voting to reduce or eliminate altogether certain spending requests that are either extravagant or unnecessary and thereby threaten the financial stability of our government. In defense spending, however, we must give our defense experts the benefit of the doubt. The bare minimum in national defense is not sufficient, for this is an area which concerns our very survival as a nation. It is vital that we provide the money to insure the following: (1) the ability of the Strategic Air Command to maintain at least a reasonable portion of its force on constant air alert; (2) speed up production of second generation missiles, particularly the inter-continental missiles, the intermediate range polaris system, and the anti-missile missiles; and (3) more modernized weapons and equipment for a well-trained and sufficient ground force (Army and Marines) to deal effectively with aggressions of limited aims. I shall endeavor to make certain that the money is made available for these important defense items.
To the people
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Bills moving fast

I told you last week that the tempo in the Senate was speeding up, and it has. We have been meeting early and staying late at night—in a few cases until the wee hours of the following morning—in recent weeks. I had to cancel an important speaking engagement at the Hampton Watermelon Festival on Thursday because of pressing duties here. My first obligation is to be present in the Senate whenever the roll is called for a vote. Thus far this year I have not missed a vote, and I do not plan to.

We stayed in session from 9:30 a.m. Thursday until 1 a.m. Friday in order to pass a bill extending present corporate income tax rates and certain excise taxes for another year. Had the Congress not acted prior to June 30 the Treasury would have lost $9 million for every day's delay.

Example of waste

The Senate approved four more appropriation bills during the week. I voted against one of them, the appropriation for the Labor Department and the Health, Education, and Welfare Department. The Labor Department's portion of the appropriation was under the budget request, but the HEW Department's part was $380 million over the budget request. This would have more than cancelled out the savings we have effected to date on most of the appropriation bills. One reason the 4 billion-dollar bill was over the budget request was because the bill included more funds for the National Institutes of Health than the Surgeon General testified he could possibly use. He said all over the amount he asked for would be wasted because he was already overworking all available trained research personnel. This is an example of foolish government spending. Almost everyone favors spending as much money as we can effectively use for health research, but I do not believe the taxpayers favor waste in any form.

Peter & Paul

The Congress has now voted the President the extra borrowing power he needs in order to help the Treasury "rob Peter to pay Paul". The permanent debt limit was increased this week from $285 billion to $288 billion, and the temporary limit was upped to $295 billion. This is another bill which had to be rushed through in order to enable the Secretary of the Treasury to issue some more government securities (go into debt) the same day. In fact, it was passed in the Senate in seven minutes. I recorded myself as being against it, as a protest against deficit financing and our astronomical debt of $285 billion. It appears now that only some near-fatal financial crisis is going to put our government back on the road to fiscal sanity.

H. R. 3 passes House

The House didn't stay in session as long as the Senate did this week, but it accomplished more good in a lively five-hour debate and a roll call vote on H.R. 3, the States Rights bill. A coalition of Southern Democrats and Republicans won passage of this vital legislation, which will do more to reverse the trend toward a totalitarian central government than any bill considered by the Congress in many years. You will recall that it was defeated in the Senate last year by a one-vote margin. The margin of victory in the House was closer this year than last. This indicates we will have an even tougher fight on our hands in the Senate, but those of us co-sponsoring the Senate version, S. 3, are doing our utmost to get an early and favorable vote.

Good oats news

Hugh Agnew, longtime president of the S.C. Farm Bureau Federation, sent me some good news about some sound action which we got the Agriculture Department to take recently. He said the Anderson County ASC office has not had to take any materially weathered (or black) oats in the CCC loan since the Agriculture Department reversed its position and agreed to make them available for loans. Mr. Agnew said CCC loan eligibility has "prevented a low price for such oats to the point that all oats moving are being offered for sale and being currently purchased at 60 cents per bushel."

Sincerely, Strom Thurmond
WASHINGTON, D. C. --- CONGRESSIONAL QUARTERLY's annual economy voting record survey should once again show Senator Strom Thurmond (D-SC) to be among the leading voters for economy in government spending in the United States Senate.

The South Carolinian has consistently opposed extravagant and unnecessary expenditures this year—public housing, urban renewal, increased federal aid for airports, depressed areas, international health, increased maritime subsidies, and a number of miscellaneous programs of extravagance.

In addition, Senator Thurmond is on record in opposition to widespread Federal aid to education and "giveaways" to foreign governments. He is also leading a struggle in the Senate to close the "back door" to the Treasury out of which billions of dollars have been slipping without first being properly appropriated by the Congress.

In 1958 CONGRESSIONAL QUARTERLY ranked Senators Frank Lausche (D-Ohio) and Strom Thurmond (D-SC) as being the top two economy-voting Democrats in the Senate. Behind Lausche and Thurmond were the Virginia Senators, Robertson and Byrd.

In 1957 the situation was about the same. Senators Thurmond, Byrd, Robertson and Senator Allen Frear (D-Del) were ranked as the top economy voters among the Senate Democrats.

END
COURT WIPES OUT INDUSTRIAL SECURITY

Our country is today without an effective program for screening security risks out of our industrial plants doing vital and highly secretive work for the Defense Department. On June 29 the Supreme Court in the case of Greene V. McElroy, invalidated the Defense Department's security clearance procedure for protecting our defense secrets which must of necessity be exposed to some who work in industrial plants. The nullification of the Defense Department's Industrial Security Program presents one of the most urgent problems faced by the Congress in recent years.

Realizing the necessity of swift action by the Congress in establishing a new program to replace the one knocked out by the Court, I introduced in the Senate the following day a 19-page bill which should adequately take care of the Court's objection to the invalidated program. I have requested that the Senate Judiciary Committee hold hearings on my industrial security bill as quickly as possible so we can get the new program established before the Congress adjourns, possibly late in August.

The Court's decision in the case of Greene V. McElroy is another flagrant example of the Court's mental gymnastics which have resulted in undermining our nation's internal security in decision after decision favoring the Communist conspiracy. Contrary to the Court's rationale, there was no right of the individual involved in this case. The sole question involved was whether the Government could use any procedure it deemed advisable in the national interest in determining who should have access to secret information.

The Government has the right to determine who, under what conditions, shall receive classified information. The loss of employment which occurred in this instance was incidental to the decision of the Department of Defense to deny such information to Mr. Greene. Since no right of the individual was involved, the procedure utilized by the Department of Defense in arriving at the decision is and was immaterial. Justice Clark wisely noted this distinction in his dissenting opinion in the case.

My bill sets up a security clearance procedure similar to the one ruled out by the Court, but the new procedure would have the authorization of the Congress and the President. The Court invalidated the old procedure on the narrow ground that it had not been authorized by either the President or the Congress.

BACKDOOR AID DEFEATED

Another foreign aid bill authorizing billions more to be given away to almost every country in the world, including Communist Yugoslavia, is in the process of passing Congress. I am again voting against this wasteful and extravagant program.

During consideration of the bill, however, the Senate was forced to take one action which gives heart to those of us who favor fiscal sanity and government economy. The proponents of the bill accepted the procedure contained in the proposal I have been advocating for blocking backdoor withdrawals from the Treasury in violation of the Constitution. In Article I, Section 9, the Constitution provides that "no money shall be drawn from the Treasury, but in consequence of appropriations made by law." This means that any authority to borrow money from the Treasury or make contract commitments, as well as direct spending, must be appropriated by the Congress through the Appropriations Committees of both houses.

The foreign aid proponents had proposed that we merely authorize, without following the regular appropriations procedure, direct borrowing from the Treasury at the rate of $1 billion per year for five years for the aid program's loan development fund. After losing the initial vote on a point of order, the foreign aidsers agreed to follow the appropriations procedure with this bill. This victory gives me more hope that my resolution, Senate Resolution 81, which was introduced in March, will win approval of the Senate so we can stop backdoor spending in other programs as well.

Sincerely,

Strom Thurmond
Advocates of federal aid to schools have always maintained that federal aid did not mean that federal control would follow. They have continually insisted that federal aid could be voted without danger of federal control. In the past I have given many examples of evidence which explode this myth and prove that control follows as surely as night follows day. Perhaps one of the best and most recent examples can be found in a so-called civil rights bill. This particular proposal, S. 959, would authorize the U.S. Commissioner of Education in Washington to confiscate local school facilities in school districts receiving federal aid under Public Laws 815 and 874 if he decides that "free education is unavailable to pupils attending those schools." These laws provide federal assistance for schools overcrowded as a result of a nearby federal installation with its families who pay no local taxes.

We hear too much these days about "due process," particularly where efforts are made to protect the security of our country. No such concern is evidenced in the confiscation proposals in S. 959. This proves beyond question that the overemphasis on "due process" where subversives are concerned, is a one-way street. Under the terms of S. 959 the constitutional right of local citizens to manage their own schools would not even merit a court action, merely the determination of the Commissioner of Education.

The House Judiciary Committee is reported to be giving serious consideration to including a similar confiscation or seizure provision in an overall so-called civil rights bill. I shall oppose this obnoxious proposal with every means at my command if it should get to the Senate floor.

LIQUOR ALOFT

The Federal Aviation Agency has announced a plan to restrict the sale of alcoholic beverages on airplanes. This is a long-overdue step in the right direction but the FAA's plan will be virtually impossible to enforce. The airline stewardess aboard the plane is charged with determining whether a passenger is intoxicated or appears to be intoxicated, and if so, she is to serve the passenger no drinks. This plan of enforcement is completely unrealistic and impractical. The only effective way to cope with the drinking menace to air safety is to prohibit the service or consumption of alcoholic beverages aboard all aircraft. I introduced such legislation my first year in the Senate. This bill, S. 1432, has brought me more mail, 99 per cent favorable from drinkers and non-drinkers, than any other pending legislation. Thus far, the Senate has done no more than hold hearings.

FOREIGN AID CUT

During the past week the Senate performed about the most effective job of trimming a foreign aid authorization bill that I have witnessed during my service in the Senate. The Senate chopped off $363.5 million or approximately 10 per cent from the committee version. Even this cutback left the authorization standing at $3.5 billion, which I voted against because this amount is too extravagant and much of it will be wasted as usual in administering the program.

SOUTH CAROLINA TOBACCO FARMERS WIN

The Agriculture Department has agreed not to prohibit South Carolina tobacco farmers from selling loose tobacco on the Georgia markets if they choose to do so. State Agriculture Commissioner William Harrelson and State Farm Bureau President Hugh Agnew contacted Senator Johnston, Congressman McMillan, and me about the department's prohibition plan, which was to be put into effect the following day. We were successful in persuading the Department that such action would be unwise and a gross discrimination against South Carolina tobacco farmers.

Sincerely,

Strom Thurmond
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UNLAWFUL POLITICAL ACTIVITIES

Senator John McClellan’s Committee on Improper Activities in the Labor or Management Field has announced plans to investigate the political activities of labor and management. Most of Senator McClellan’s work to date has been directed toward improper non-political doings by unscrupulous labor bosses such as Jimmy Hoffa and by officials of management who have conspired with union officials against the best interests of their employees. A thorough study of the political activities of the big unions, as well as big management, could be quite revealing. I personally am interested in hearing an explanation of how some of the big union bosses explain their use of membership dues to support candidates for political office, who are objectionable to many of the members.

"STRIVE FOR EXCELLENCE"

Dr. James R. Killian, until a few days ago President Eisenhower’s special assistant for science and technology, met with me his last day in Washington and gave the following advice to his fellow South Carolinians (Dr. Killian is a native of Blacksburg, South Carolina):

"The great opportunity and the great need we have in the United States is to stress excellence in all that we do and particularly in our education. I think that the problem is to make sure that we are identifying and finding the talent we have in our country, that we are giving this talent the opportunity to be educated to its fullest potential."

DIPLOMATIC BLUNDERS

The American National Exhibition in Moscow opens this weekend, but its chances of being an unqualified success have already been diminished by adverse publicity centering around diplomatic blunders. First, there was the art exhibit which, originally at least, featured the work of many pro-communists, and more recently the fashion shows which feature integrated dances and scenes in "typical American homes."

I have called these blunders to the attention of Secretary of State Christian Herter, urging him to make an investigation of them. The desirability of having men in responsible governmental positions who do not use better judgment in important matters of this nature is questionable.

ACTION ON BILLS

Action was taken on three of my legislative proposals during the past week. (1) The Senate Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee approved with minor changes my amendment clarifying the "equal time" provisions of the Communications Act. Under the terms of the amendment, radio and TV stations will not be required to provide equal time to political candidates on news programs. The "equal time" rule will apply to other programs...(2) My amendment to the Defense Appropriations Bill which passed the Senate guarantees a 300,000-man Army Reserve by calling for the recruitment of 44,000 men under the six-month training program to replace the 44,000 who are expected to be discharged during fiscal year 1960...(3) My MATS amendment to the Defense Appropriations Bill failed passage by one vote after lengthy debate. The vote was 46 to 46 but the amendment required a majority vote for passage. It was designed to get the most out of our defense air transportation dollars by holding down on Military Air Transport Service money channeled to commercial airlines. Too much MATS money used for commercial hauling purposes can result in having empty MATS planes flying training missions behind the loaded commercial planes. MATS crews have to get in a certain number of hours per month and we might as well use their training or proficiency missions to haul military cargo and personnel.

Sincerely,  

STROM THURMOND
SPENDING CONSEQUENCES

Fiscal problems are plaguing our governments in this country at all levels—federal, state, and local. Government spending at all three levels, especially on the part of the federal government, has soared to astronomical heights. Taxes are already unbearable to many, and they tend to stifle private initiative. We are plunging further and further into debt. At the same time, the evil of inflation, which is no respecter of pocketbooks, is robbing our purchasing power day by day. The root of these fiscal problems stems directly from the popular political gimmick of trying to "give the people something for nothing." What too many have not realized fully in the past is that the government—whether it be federal, state, or local—can give nothing but that which it first takes from the people. Thank goodness, however, the vast majority of the people are no longer being deluded by this political trick, which many prefer to call "liberalism" but in actuality is no less than socialism. I have prepared the following figures which tell a very shocking story which should be of concern to every American.

### SPENDING INCREASE IN BILLIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1938</th>
<th>1958</th>
<th>% Increase</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Federal</td>
<td>$7.2</td>
<td>$84.0</td>
<td>1066</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td>464</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>372</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>$16.4</td>
<td>$131.0</td>
<td>699</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TAX TAKE IN BILLIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1938</th>
<th>1958</th>
<th>% Increase</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Federal</td>
<td>$5.9</td>
<td>$76.8</td>
<td>1202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>332</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>$14.2</td>
<td>$108.8</td>
<td>666</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### DEFICITS IN BILLIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1938</th>
<th>1958</th>
<th>% Increase</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Federal</td>
<td>$37.2</td>
<td>$276.3</td>
<td>643</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>345</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td>41.5</td>
<td>157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>$56.6</td>
<td>$332.5</td>
<td>488</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

MATTER OF PATRIOTISM

Sensible government spending may be considered old fashioned by some, just as it now appears that patriotism is about to be thrown by the wayside. We spent two days in the Senate last week debating a proposal which did not even merit consideration by the Senate. Under the National Defense Education Act passed last year, persons who accept grants or loans under the program must first execute an oath of allegiance to the United States and swear that they do not belong to a communist organization. The Senate Labor Committee reported to the Senate floor a bill to repeal the allegiance and affidavit requirements.

I can see no reason why anyone should object to pledging his loyalty to his country if he wishes to share in special benefits offered by the government or to serve in a position of trust or responsibility in the government. In fact, every person employed by the government must now execute a similar oath of office. Every member of my office staff has done so. I am glad to report that the Senate, after several close votes, finally voted 49-42 to recommit the bill to the Labor Committee for—I hope—posterity.

SOVIETS APPLAUD STRAUSS DEFEAT

A news dispatch from Moscow last week quoted Soviet Deputy Premier Mikoyan as being very joyful over the Senate's recent rejection of Commerce Secretary Lewis Strauss. He said the Secretary had prevented 12,000 tons of steel pipe from being exported to Russia, adding: "I'm not usually in agreement with the (U.S.) Senate, but we were pleased when the Senate disapproved his nomination." Mr. Mikoyan's comments confirm my opinion that the Senate did a great injustice to a competent and loyal American.

Sincerely,

(STROM THURMOND SIGNATURE)
WHAT IS THE NATIONAL DEBT?

One of the most encouraging developments during this year is the increased public interest in the Federal Government's fiscal affairs. Already, the public's intense interest has resulted in a brake on deficit expenditures by Congress. Much of the attention which has been directed at federal expenditures resulted from the all-time high 13 billion-dollar deficit for fiscal year 1959. Unfortunately, however, the national debt continues to increase.

Despite the increased interest in the country's fiscal condition, many people apparently do not understand just what is the national debt. A constituent recently suggested that it "just be cancelled." Unfortunately, no such easy solution to our public indebtedness exists.

The national debt is now approximately $285 billion. As of March, 1959, --the latest date for which accurate figures are available--this debt was represented by $282.2 billion of securities, and the balance is represented by bills for operation of the Government which have not yet been paid. It is interesting to see who loaned the Federal Government $282.2 billion dollars. The breakdown is as follows:

- commercial banks, $62.9 billion;
- federal reserve banks, $25.5 billion;
- individuals, $64.5 billion;
- insurance companies, $12.0 billion;
- mutual savings banks, $7.4 billion;
- corporations, $21 billion;
- state and local governments, $17.9 billion;
- U. S. Government investment accounts, $53.7 billion;
- and miscellaneous investors, $17.2 billion.

In the final analysis, the national debt is owed to the American people.

EVERYONE AFFECTED

Even if you do not personally own any savings bonds as an individual, the Federal Government still probably has borrowed some of your money. A portion of your savings account, your bank deposits, the taxes you paid to your town, county, or the State of South Carolina, your insurance premium, and the price you paid for a share of stock, have in all probability been loaned to the Federal Government. The $53.7 billion owed to "U. S. Government investment accounts" includes the major portion of the contributions paid in by various participants in Government retirement programs. The savings and security of the American public are on loan to the Federal Government. Inability or failure to pay by the Government would result in disaster to almost every American family.

Unlike most private institutions where money is invested, the Government does not produce income to pay its debts. The only source of income for the Government is the taxpayer. Borrowing by the Government is, therefore, just an indirect method of levying more taxes. It is sound business only so long as it is used to prevent fluctuations in the tax level to meet expenses which fluctuate; it is now at a dangerous extreme. If direct taxation instead of borrowing had been used during fiscal 1959 to pay the 13 billion-dollar deficit only, it would have required the confiscation of all personal incomes above $4,000.

The greatest danger of a higher debt lies in the possibility that the dollar will continue to deflate in value. History is replete with examples of liquidation of national debts by cheapening the currency to make it easy. This is just a slightly less quick, but equally disastrous method of wiping out the savings of a society.

The national debt must be paid, and paid in hard dollars. Any other course would wipe out all retirement funds, savings accounts, bank deposits, insurance policies, and indeed, all financial values. There is but one way to meet the obligations of the Federal Government. Expenditures must be cut well below the level of income derived from the present level of taxes, and the balance used systematically to pay off the Government's unconscionable debt. Such a course will be unpopular with those who want always more and bigger welfare programs. It can only be accomplished if the public fully realizes the danger and keeps the pressure on the Congress to cut expenses.

Economy has played a major part in my evaluation of legislation before the Congress. I have opposed, and will continue to oppose, new and unessential spending, for any other course would sacrifice the security of almost every person in South Carolina and the United States.

Sincerely,
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LET'S SHOW KHRUSHCHEV

The forthcoming visit to this country by Soviet Premier Nikita Khrushchev and the return visit to Russia by President Eisenhower could have a profound and salutary effect on world peace and the cold war if our government makes the most of our opportunities which these visits afford. I make this statement as one who has time and again warned against the danger of the Communist Goal—that of communising and enslaving all the people of the world under the rule of the Kremlin leaders. Recently, I urged that the President proceed cautiously in giving consideration to a summit meeting with Khrushchev. I did so because of this country's and the free world's sad experiences as a result of many of the World War II and postwar conferences, such as those held at Teheran, Yalta and Potsdam. In the past 25 years, the United States has had 3,400 meetings with the Communists. The negotiators at these conferences spoke 106 million words and executed 52 major agreements. Of these 52 agreements, the Communists have broken 50 of them. These agreements have been broken in accordance with Lenin's teaching that "promises are like pie-crusts—made to be broken."

In having Khrushchev visit our country, however, our leaders are not called upon to engage in a summit meeting or to make any agreements. What they can and should do is to educate the Master of the Kremlin as to our unity, our strength, and our steadfast determination to peacefully pursue our own way of life in America without outside interference or dictatorship from anyone or any foreign power. I am glad that Defense Secretary McElroy has offered to conduct the Premier on a tour of defense installations. We should not reveal any secrets to him, but we can demonstrate to him our strong defensive and deterrent capabilities. In sitting as a member of the Senate Armed Services Committee, I am becoming more convinced every day that the gravest danger we face from the Soviets, so far as armed attack is concerned, is a miscalculation by the cocky Communist leaders who boast of superior rockets and missiles. If he were sufficiently acquainted with our love of freedom, our unity, our determination, and our huge arsenal of mixed deterrent weapons, I feel that the Premier might return to Moscow a wiser and more cautious man, without any agreements to break.

A JOB TO DO

President Eisenhower will have an opportunity to clarify our position with the Russian people by countering the Kremlin propaganda that our people are warmongers. Vice President Nixon did a good job of enlightening the Russian people through the facilities and opportunities made available to him on his recent visit to Russia. I have little fear that the Soviet Premier will be able to make any headway in changing the thinking of the American people on his United States tour. Our people like the American way of life. They have tasted of socialism and regimentation, and are beginning to show their rejection of any system which restricts or compromises freedom.

Our foreign relations experts must do their utmost to convince the peoples of the captive nations that our sole purpose of having Khrushchev as our guest is to educate him and not to deal with him at the expense of anyone.

To some the exchange of visits may seem to be a calculated risk. The visits probably are a calculated risk, but we must never attempt to hide our heads in the sand like an ostrich when we have a job to do. Our job today is to win the peace, and to accomplish this essential end we must convince the Kremlin leadership and the unconvinced Russian people that it is not in their best interest to continue pursuing their Communist goal of world communization and domination.

Sincerely,

Strom Thurmond
The radical drive to ram another so-called civil rights bill through the Senate will probably pick up extra steam this week with the congressional adjournment date now coming into focus. Unless the radicals win approval of a bill extending the life of the Civil Rights Commission, it will expire on November 9, 1959. There is a very strong possibility, however, that it will be ruled out of existence earlier by the courts because it is unconstitutional. I told the Senate in my 1957 extended address against the so-called civil rights bill that the integrationists would be back in 1959 trying to keep the Commission alive and agitating for more anti-South legislation. I also told the Senate that the 1957 bill was unconstitutional. Since that time a Federal Judge has held the Commission's rules of procedure and its action thereunder to be unconstitutional. A three-judge panel will rule soon on the constitutionality of the 1957 Act which established the Commission. If this case finally finds its way to the U. S. Supreme Court, the Court will be forced to declare the Commission's rules of procedure to be unconstitutional, if the Court adheres anywhere near closely to its recent decisions on "due process" and "individual rights" in the Communist cases.

I intend to vigorously oppose all so-called civil rights proposals which are designed to impose the will of the do gooders and the integrationists on the people of the South. The people of South Carolina did not send me to the U. S. Senate to permit Northern politicians to remold the South to conform to an integrationist philosophy which the people from the North and other areas are not willing to accept for themselves.

NORTHERN SEGREGATION

Up North the have a segregation system which is much different from that which we have in the South. Ours is an honest, above-board and definite system which is regulated by law as well as custom. The Northern segregation system is founded on hypocrisy and deceit, and fundamentally on geographical separation which is either total or as near-total as the Northern ingenuity can make it in the face of mounting Negro immigration. The prevailing pattern in the North is segregation by flight. The Negro is told that he is equal, that he has all his rights, and that he will not be discriminated against; then he is simply avoided. The whites flee to the suburbs, and through the housing pattern, a de facto segregation is maintained, except in a few unfortunate fringe areas which degenerate into centers of racial tension and crime and whose whites leave just as soon as they can accumulate sufficient funds. By and large, the Northern system is eminently successful. It may be ruthless, it may be hypocritical and deceitful; but it works.

The drive for what they term "civil rights" legislation has a dual motivation on the part of the integrationists: first, there is the political factor which offers as a reward the powerful minority bloc votes which can swing a State or local election or tip the scales in a presidential election by throwing the large electoral vote of a key State like New York to the more radical candidate; and secondly, there is the old pre-war and reconstruction desire to remold the Southern mind and make it conform. Both of these motivations are repugnant to the people of the South, and we shall resist them and their intended results with all our might in the best interest of all the people of the South--both white and colored--and the country as a whole.

Sincerely,

Strom Thurmond
Labor union bosses are now venting their wrath and hurling threats at the courageous 229 Members of the U. S. House of Representatives—all six South Carolina Representatives included—who resisted the torrid lobbying efforts of the union bosses against the Landrum-Griffin Labor Reform Bill which recently passed the House. On August 18, 1959, Mr. James B. Carey, President of the International Union of Electrical, Radio and Machine Workers and Vice-President of the AFL-CIO, wrote a very intimidating and threatening letter to these Congressmen. Prior to this, Teamster Boss James Hoffa said he would blacklist the 229 Congressmen from coast to coast. Both actions brought immediate reaction by the Congressmen, the press, and the public. Messrs. Hoffa and Carey may have made invaluable contributions to the ultimate passage of the vitally needed effective labor reform legislation.

Congressman Steven B. Derounian of New York gave the best answer to Mr. Carey that I have seen. Here are excerpts from his reply:

"In the privacy of my own conscience, I do not doubt that I have given the problem of violence, embezzlement, thuggery, and mayhem in the labor movement more consideration than have you. And when I considered the consequences, I considered them in the light of all the people of the United States, not just the high paid union bosses like yourself. The Landrum-Griffin bill allows members to remove crooked officers, protects union funds and freedom of speech and assembly for union members, prohibits increases of dues or imposition of assessments except by a vote of the membership, protects the right to sue, guarantees a free election by secret ballot, allows legitimate picketing but protects the public against blackmail picketing, and so on.

"You call this Landrum-Griffin bill, which received a majority of the House vote, 'punitive and repressive.' In addition to benefiting unions in the attainment of their legitimate objectives, spelling out the opportunity of future growth for labor and protection of the union member, it clearly represses the abuses perpetuated by the evil overlords of the underworld who have moved in on the unions and are victimizing the rank-and-file union members. So, Mr. Carey, if the shoe fits maybe you ought to try it on for size. At any rate, I accept your challenge. Let the American people pass judgment.

"P.S.—Please send me 10,000 copies of your letter of August 18. I want to distribute them to the residents of my district so they can see how you operate."

I have also felt the scorn of the union bosses because I have sought to put real teeth into labor reform legislation designed to end the exploitation of the working people and the public. They have also blacklisted me because of my opposition to socialistic measures that have been coming before the Congress in increasing numbers during recent years. I owe my seat in the Senate to no special interest group—be it labor or business—but to the people of South Carolina who bucked the tide in a write-in election for the right to vote their own consciences. I believe they expect me to vote my conscience regardless of the opposition it may generate from out-of-State union bosses or anyone else. My conscience dictates that I continue my support of effective labor reform legislation in the best interest of the working people and the public.

BRIEF NOTES

I have issued approximately 2,000 passes to attend Senate sessions to South Carolinians thus far this year. More should take advantage of this opportunity to witness the transaction of the people's business. The "goobers" rights maneuver by the so-called civil rights proponents may end up hurting many small farmers who grow and sell boiled peanuts. By attaching so-called civil rights amendments onto a bill exempting boiled peanuts from quota restrictions the peanut bill may be put on the shelf.

Sincerely,
COTTON AND TEXTILES

Although each Senator must do his utmost to keep up with all legislation which comes before the Congress, to be effective in his representation of his constituent, he must select certain areas of legislative action on which to concentrate. In determining what these areas should be, the economy of his home State is a major consideration.

In South Carolina, textiles is the largest industry. In fact, South Carolina is not only the largest textile production State, but it has almost one-third of the entire domestic textile production. As of July 4, 1959, there was a total of 20.3 million spindles of textile production in the United States, of which 6.6 million spindles were in South Carolina. Any national policy which affects textiles therefore affects South Carolina more than any other State.

Historically, South Carolina has been a major producer of cotton. Although we have lost ground comparatively in recent years, cotton-growing is still a major item in our economy.

Two national policies have been major handicaps to both textiles and cotton production. These are our foreign trade and "two-price" cotton programs.

We are all well aware that the economy of the entire country depends materially on foreign trade. Our economy is geared to the production of more than we can consume domestically. Under the leadership of former Secretary of State Cordell Hull, the United States inaugurated a program of "reciprocal trade." Since the beginning of the program, it has lost a great portion of its reciprocal nature. To be successful, a trade program must be truly reciprocal, and it must be shaped in such a way as to prevent our domestic industries from being destroyed by low-wage imports. I recently requested the Commerce Department to compile statistics on the treatment of U.S. textiles by foreign countries which have textile industries of their own. The information received reveals that our trade program is largely a one-way street as far as textiles are concerned. Foreign countries are protecting their textile industries with tariffs, quotas and currency manipulations. Such countries include Japan, India and the United Kingdom, which are exporting great quantities of textiles to the U.S. I plan to make an address to the Senate on this matter very shortly.

On August 1, 1959, the price differential on cotton increased to $4 per pound. This means that a domestic manufacturer must pay $4 more for cotton, either domestic or foreign, than his foreign competitor. As one result, the American textile industry is having to shift to the production of synthetics, providing less and less market for cotton.

The National Cotton Council has filed a petition with the Secretary of Agriculture for relief from this impossible situation. The Council includes cotton growers, ginners, merchants, warehousemen, seed crushers and spinners. The petition points out that the price differential, when combined with low-wage foreign imports, is making it impossible for our textile industry to stay in business and provide employment for the more than a million workers in textile and related industries. Unless some relief from the inequities in our trade program is granted, the entire structure of the program might well fall apart. Although textiles is the most hard hit, even such major industries as steel and automobiles are feeling the pinch.

LUMBER FREIGHT RATES

Another vital industry in South Carolina's economy is lumber and lumber products. This industry is also suffering badly from Government policies. West coast lumber has a natural advantage of cheaper production, while the South has traditionally enjoyed an advantage of proximity to the major eastern markets.

Freight rate policies by the Interstate Commerce Commission have all but completely wiped out our advantage by juggling the freight rates, making it almost as cheap to ship lumber the long distance from the west coast to the east coast as it is to ship the short distance from South to the East. At a hearing on the nomination of ICC commissioners' appointments, Senator Smathers and I brought up this matter. I believe that the ICC will shortly make a complete study of the discriminatory lumber freight rates.

Sincerely,

Strom Thurmond
The Civil Rights Commission, which was established by the unconstitutional Civil Rights Act of 1957, is making some very radical, vicious, unconstitutional and obnoxious proposals to the President and the Congress. They range from virtually stripping the States of their rights to decide who should vote in elections to the withholding of federal aid funds from schools which refuse to integrate. Other proposals would authorize federal registrars to supervise elections, have the Federal Government integrate all housing by executive fiat through the VA and FHA home loan programs, utilize the Commission as a conciliation and advisory service for speeding school desegregation, and have the Federal Government interfere in the operation of private schools, private real estate boards, and other areas which have nothing whatsoever to do with government action.

I warned my Senate colleagues in 1957 that they were creating an awesome monster which would stir up racial tensions, strife, hatred, and bitterness that could last for years to come. That was one of the principal reasons why I made my extended address of more than 24 hours. I regret that the proposals of the Commission--none of the worst carry the endorsement of a majority of the Commissioners--have made my prediction come true.

I commend Commissioner Battle and concur in his sentiments that the report "is not an impartial statement ..., but rather, in large part, an argument in advocacy of pre-conceived ideas in the field of race relations."

During recent weeks I have been calling the attention of the Senate to the mounting evidence that the great majority of the people of the country do not desire forcible integration of the races. Among the points of evidence I have cited to the Senate have been the revealing New York Times article which reported that thousands of New York Negro parents are sending their children to the South for a peaceful and segregated education and an Associated Press dispatch about a telegram sent to President Eisenhower by a large group of Alabama Negroes stating their unqualified opposition to forcible integration. I told the Senate that there is little sentiment for forced integration in the South except by the few Communists we may have, some militant NAACP leaders, and a few other race agitators.

The Congress has completed action on labor reform legislation after a group of Senate-House conferees spent 12 days thrashing out the differences between the Senate and House versions. This final bill is a major improvement over the Senate's Kennedy-Ervin bill, particularly on the issues of secondary boycotts, picketing, and the no man's land area of jurisdiction. It does not entirely answer the need for legislation in this field, but the great improvement over the original bill constitutes a victory for the American people, especially our workers.

President Eisenhower has demonstrated great courage and wisdom in exercising his veto power over bills which would plunge our country further into debt and--if the trend should continue--possibly into national bankruptcy. In recent weeks, he has twice vetoed extravagant housing bills with integration overtones in public housing and urban renewal features. He has also vetoed a public works appropriation bill carrying 67 unbudgeted projects at a price tag of more than $800 million. His vetoes have served as a very effective brake on extravagant and wasteful public spending.

Sincerely,

Strom Thurmond
LONGER SESSIONS, MORE TROUBLE

Much legislation has been approved by the Congress in the final days before adjournment. We have been meeting from early in the morning until late at night almost constantly during the past few weeks in order to complete action on that legislation which the leaders of the administration and the Congress feel are “must” items.

This first session of the 86th Congress has been the longest session since I came to the Senate in January 1955. I don’t mind the long sessions from the standpoint of work, but they do cause me considerable concern from the standpoint of the South and our fight to maintain local self-government. With the current trend of federal legislation, we would be better off with shorter sessions and less legislation. The longer we stay in session the more trouble we are apt to have shoved at us by the so-called “liberals.”

INTEGRATION AND CRIME

I believe our day-by-day exposure in the Congressional Record of terror and racial strife in the large Northern cities, particularly New York, Washington, and Chicago, have contributed immeasurably to the success we have had in holding down strong and ominous legislation in the field of so-called civil rights. When the police and such notable ministers as Dr. Billy Graham acknowledge the incontrovertible link between crime and forced integration in these large cities, then the evidence speaks even louder for itself. We must continue to seize every opportunity to prove to the so-called civil rightsers and do goods the follies and failings of forced integration.

HOUSING DANGERS

During the closing days of the session, the Congress passed a third omnibus housing bill after the President had vetoed the first two. Only seven of us—Senators Cotton, Curtis, Eastland, Russell, Stennis, Taliaferro, and I—voted against passage of the bill. The President was able to sign this bill into law because the Congress finally cured most of his objections. My opposition ran much deeper, however. I do not oppose the Federal Housing Administration’s home loan guarantee program or other good features of our housing laws which promote home ownership. I am, however, against provisions in the housing bill which further expand on the socialistic public housing and urban renewal programs.

‘SCATTERED’ INTEGRATION

Not only are both programs costly to the taxpayers—especially when the total cost is added up over a long period of years—but they also constitute an imminent danger to segregated housing. On two separate occasions I have been able to extract from housing legislation some provisions which would have permitted integration of private housing areas by scattering single public housing units with a family of a different race into the once-segregated areas. Now three of the six members of the Civil Rights Commission have suggested that this “integration by scattering” provision be put into effect by the Congress in order to speed overall integration of the races. The Commission has also, by a divided vote, urged that the President by Executive Order the integration of all housing which has any connection whatever with the Federal Government. This includes guaranteed home loans by both the Veterans Administration and the Federal Housing Administration.

It is thus very easy to see that the integrationists intend to use every Federal tentacle of control—and believe me there are many of them—to force their will on the unwilling Southern people of both races. The danger of forced integration is not as grave or imminent in the VA and FHA loan programs as in the public housing and urban renewal programs because the Federal Government merely guarantees loans in the VA and FHA programs as against much more direct participation from a monetary and a control standpoint in the other two programs. Thus, I believe you can understand my opposition to omnibus housing legislation.

Sincerely,

Strom Thurmond
In retrospect, the two principal issues which faced the 86th Congress were in the fields of fiscal policy and labor reform. Judging on these two issues, the first session of the 86th Congress was a great improvement over the 85th Congress.

In the second session of the 85th Congress, deficit spending was rampant. From legislation enacted principally during that session, the Federal Government incurred the highest peace-time deficit in its history—approximately $13 billion. The reaction of the public was primarily responsible for the changed attitude in the first session of the 86th Congress, where spending was actually reduced below budget requests. Only two appropriation (spending) bills finally passed by Congress were in excess of budget estimates. The 86th Congress, where spending was actually reduced below budget requests.

Much of the money spent by the Federal Government each year is by "backdoor" financing. "Backdoor" financing is a method of legislative authorization for spending which does not follow the appropriation procedure. By diligent efforts, we were able to considerably reduce "backdoor" financing this year and to prevent the use of this unwise spending procedure in new programs. There was an effort to incorporate "backdoor" financing in the foreign aid program. The defeat of this effort was one of the most encouraging occurrences in this session.

The efforts of the 85th Congress to enact reform legislation in the field of labor-management relations were abortive. Despite the revelations of corruption by the McClellan committee, the initial action by the Senate on the labor reform legislation this year gave every indication of a repeat performance. It was an aroused public opinion that changed the attitude of legislators and made possible the passage of a constructive labor reform bill. Although the legislation which was enacted was not adequate in all respects, it was a major victory for the public and the working man.

Housing legislation was the most recurring issue in the 1959 session. Of the three housing bills which the Congress passed, the President wisely vetoed the first two. All three bills contained additional public housing and urban renewal, which, in addition to being socialistic and costly, are tools for integration of the races.

The Senate lowered its reputation for fair-play in refusing to confirm a great patriot, Admiral Strauss, as Secretary of Commerce. The American people were the real losers.

So-called civil rights was a plaguing issue throughout the session. A change in the rules of the Senate confronted us as soon as we convened, but any serious change was averted. Bills which embodied a "conquered province" attitude toward the South were suppressed, and only an extension of the commission, created in 1957, was passed.

On the whole, the South and the American public generally fared better in the first session of the 86th Congress than at any session in recent years. The groundwork is being laid for a difficult session next year, however. Many proposals which are repugnant to the people of South Carolina will be pushed in that presidential election year. Only our most vigorous efforts will prevent their passage.

The relatively good showing of Congress this year was largely due to the well-expressed attitude of an aroused, letter-writing public. If the public keeps the pressure on in 1960, Congress can improve its record even more.

Sincerely,

Strom Thurmond
WASHINGTON, D. C. is truly a unique city. It is the capital city of the world’s most progressive and prosperous country. It is a federal city run by a Board of Commissioners appointed by the President to administer the laws for the city as passed by the Congress. In past years, the capital city has been peaceful and a wonderful showplace for tourists--its millions of annual foreign and domestic tourists.

"TO THE DOGS"

Lately, however—since the District of Columbia has become the integration "pilot model" for the South to follow—it has been, so to speak, "going to the dogs." Such crimes as murder, forcible rape, mayhem, aggravated assault, muggings, etc. have been increasing so alarmingly that most residents—especially the women—are fearful of walking the streets at night and some streets even during daylight hours. The hoodlums have carried on their attacks not just against ordinary citizens but even against Metropolitan Police Force. There has been a 30 per cent increase in assaults on police this year over last year, 26 in July alone. As one woman who had been attacked remarked recently, "The police used to travel in twos. I think maybe they should go in threes or fours now."

Newsweek magazine says the capital city is beginning to look more and more "like a crime-infested morass in a miasma of brutality." In the first six months of the year, the crime rate rocketed 15.3 per cent and juvenile crime, over a 12-month period, had increased by 25 per cent, compared with a national average of 6.5. Now that a Negro Congressman, a Congressman’s wife, and the widow of the late Deputy Defense Secretary Donald Quarles, have all been threatened or attacked in recent weeks, action is being taken to try to cope with the Washington crime wave. The Congress is augmenting the 2500-man police force by 500 men at an additional cost of $2.5 million. Some have proposed the employment of police dogs as are used in neighboring Baltimore, and one Congressman has urged the deployment of two companies of U. S. Marines to assist in the cleanup.

REASON FOR THE MESS

The principal reason cited by Newsweek magazine for the Washington difficulties was the influx of Negroes and the exodus of whites to the suburbs. The magazine says Negroes now constitute 54 per cent of the population. Negro students comprise approximately 73 per cent of the school population in the District’s "pilot model" system. A 1957 congressional investigation of the public school system in Washington revealed that forced integration was the principal cause of the mammoth problems which have come to light in the school system. One of the many findings on integration by the investigators said:

"The forced integration of the schools in the District of Columbia greatly accelerated an exodus of the white residents to the suburban areas of Virginia and Maryland. The present exodus seriously threatens the educational, economic, cultural, religious, and social foundation of the District. If the exodus continues at its present rate, the District will become a predominantly Negro community in the not too distant future."

Washington is not alone in its integration follies, failures, and crime consequences. An even larger mess can be found to the north of the capital city in the New York City melting pot. Washington, however, was supposed to be the "pilot model," and it has made the case for segregation against forced integration even stronger than our lengthy and wellocumented legal arguments.

Sincerely,
Many proposals have been submitted for a reorganization of the work schedule of the Congress. Most have arisen as a result of the Congress' difficulty in completing its business until late in the year. One proposal would provide that the Congress have two sessions each year—the first from January 7 until July to enact legislative proposals; the second to be held in the fall to consider appropriation (spending) measures.

The volume of legislation considered by Congress grows annually. It seems that every year Congress must stay in session later and still leave business not completed. The incompletely business does not always result from a lack of effort on the part of Senators and Members of Congress, but is quite often due to time limitations.

Some figures have been compiled on the activities of the 84th Congress (1955-56) which will illustrate the increasing workload. There has been a considerable increase even between the 84th and 86th Congresses.

**LEGISLATION GALORE**

In the 84th Congress the Senate was confronted by a total of 7,290 legislative proposals. Each of these was either introduced by a Senator or sent to the Senate for consideration after passage by the House of Representatives. The Senate committees reported to the Senate for consideration 3,053 of the 7,290 proposals. Of those reported by the Senate committees, 1,028 were enacted into public laws, and 893 were enacted into private laws.

The large number of laws enacted illustrates not only the workload of the Congress, but also the fact that the Federal Government is ever expanding its tentacles of control and regulation.

During the 84th Congress the Senate was actually in session 224 days out of the 287 working days which the session lasted. During this period the Senate spent 1,361 hours in session, an average of about six hours per day.

Most of the real legislative work in the Congress is performed by committees and subcommittees. Each Senator serves on at least two committees, and most of them serve on innumerable subcommittees. During the 84th Congress there were a total of 3,971 official meetings held by the Senate committees. These committee meetings consumed a total of 11,677 hours, or almost ten times the amount of time that the Senate was in session.

**TREATIES, NOMINATIONS TOO**

The committees of the Senate not only consider legislative proposals, but also executive nominations and treaties. Again, the number of nominations considered indicates the enormous size of the Federal Government. In the 84th Congress, the committees considered approximately 85,000 nominations.

As a practical matter, some better organization of the working time of Congress will have to be undertaken. It would be of a much greater benefit to the people of the country, however, if the Federal Government could be restricted in its activities to those strictly prescribed by the Constitution. If this were done, the number of proposals considered by the Congress would undoubtedly be reduced substantially.

As a result, more time would be available for consideration of those measures which did come before the Congress, and deserving legislation would not have to be postponed due to time limitations.

Sincerely,

[Signature]
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TOUGH SCHEDULE AHEAD

During the Congressional adjournment period I have been preparing material for two of the initial legislative battles which will probably come before the Congress next year. A few days before we adjourned on September 15, the groundwork was laid for early action next year on the controversial issues of so-called civil rights and federal aid to education for school construction. A band of rabid integrationists was able to obtain from the leaders of both parties in the Senate agreements on their part to call up for Senate consideration on or shortly after February 15, 1960 a so-called civil rights bill. Almost simultaneously the Senate Labor Committee reported to the Senate calendar a federal aid bill authorizing the expenditure of $500 million annually for a two-year school construction program.

'CIVIL RIGHTS'

The integrationists have been preparing for the 1960 battle over what they term civil rights for some time. They had hoped to force a major showdown over the issue during the past session, but they were unable to do so. Included in their arsenal of so-called civil rights weapons with which to lash the South are vicious proposals to force mixing of the races through an integration czar in the person of the U. S. Attorney General, federal aid bribery, or any other obtainable means—regardless of whether they be logical or constitutional.

I hope the fight can be averted because of its many adverse ramifications, particularly that of dividing our people of this nation during a time when unity is so vitally needed. Should it come anyway, I will be fully prepared to use every means at my command to defeat legislation which would make of our Southland a conquered province similar to that which existed during Reconstruction days.

FEDERAL AID

The limitation of two years in the federal aid bill is merely a "foot-in-the-door" gimmick. Many Federal Government programs have been passed initially with a cutoff date in order to get the programs started, but very few have ever found their way to the graveyard where many of them deserve to rest in peace. It is difficult to wean special interest groups off federal handouts, and it is an even more insurmountable task to abolish the agencies because of the tight grip which the bureaucratic jobholders exert in holding onto their positions.

I am opposed to general federal aid to education because it is unconstitutional, unwise, unnecessary, and uneconomical.

FISCAL POLICY

Another major issue which will be with us during the entire next session will be that of fiscal responsibility. We were successful this year in holding appropriation bills and "backdoor" spending measures to within the overall balanced budget figure submitted by the President. Next year those of us who believe in a sound government financial program will have to hold down supplemental or deficiency spending requests so as not to unbalance our budget figure we voted for the current fiscal year. In addition, we will have to be on guard against the numerous spending schemes which will surely be devised and offered in the 1960 presidential election year. Special interest groups which received little satisfaction from the tight-fisted spending policies of the past session—compared to the 13 billion-dollar deficit of fiscal year 1959—will be back knocking at the door for more taxpayer dollars.

With many other such issues staring us in the face, it will be a tough session for those of us who believe in government economy, States Rights, and constitutional government.

Sincerely,

Strom Thurmond
TRADE AND AID

For some years now a number of American industries, particularly textile and plywood, have suffered from competition of low-wage foreign imports. The attitude of the Federal Government and those outside the hard-hit areas has been that only a few industries and a few jobs, comparatively speaking, were affected; and in the "common good", these industries and persons could shift to new products and new lines of work.

Recent events indicate that there may be reason to believe that both the people of the country and the Federal Government are changing their attitude. The change arises not from any clearer understanding of the difficulties of the first industries affected or the workers who have lost their jobs already. Rather, the change is caused by the increasing number of industries affected and the shift in our over-all balance of trade.

The steel strike has played a major part in focusing attention on the grave dangers to our entire economy from low-wage foreign products. The steel industry is feeling the first pangs of low-wage imports. Since 1949, imports of steel have increased from 300,000 tons to 1,700,000—a rise of 467%. The domestic manufacture of this steel would have provided employment for 30,000 Americans. But it is only half the story. During the same period, our exports have decreased 37% for a total of 1,600,000 tons. Last year we imported 83% more steel than we exported. In addition, more than 430,000 foreign cars were sold in the United States in 1958, which meant fewer jobs, not only in the automotive industry, but also in steel.

The steel strike has permitted foreign steel producers to find many new customers in the United States and in the world market generally.

The principal factor responsible for our poor competitive position is the wage differential. The average wage of the U.S. steel worker in 1958 was $3.03 per hour, compared to 72 cents in West Germany, 84 cents in Great Britain and 48 cents in Japan. Other factors contributing to our unfavorable competitive position are our outmoded depreciation allowances and high taxes. Unrealistic depreciation rates necessitate higher profits to supplement depreciation reserves for replacement of worn-out or out-dated machinery. High taxes necessitate both high profits and wages.

Americans have had to compete all along with low-wage foreign products, and until recent years have done so successfully despite the wage differentials. Historically, our competitive advantage has sprung from technical know-how and higher quality of skill. In the post-war period, the United States graciously shared our know-how with all nations, and even went so far as to send American instructors to train foreign labor. At least temporarily, our technical know-how advantage has been largely erased.

Despite all of our disadvantages, our situation would not be nearly so drastic were it not for other factors. Principal among these is our foreign aid program. Under this program, there is an outflow of dollars from the United States of about $2.5 billion per year. In addition, U.S. military expenditures abroad have been running about $3 billion per year; and with the encouragement of the Government, there is an outflow of private capital of about $2 billion a year. Since our exports exceed our imports only about $4.5 billion per year, we are now experiencing a net outflow of dollars to the tune of about $9 billion per year. This is what has finally brought the attention of the Government to the fact that something must be done to change the situation, rather than the loss of jobs by American workers.

Among other disadvantages with which our domestic producers have had to contend are trade barriers against U.S. exports applied while our import restrictions were being reduced or abolished. Administration spokesmen have now called for a change in attitude by our foreign friends and for a relaxation of restrictions on U.S. exports. Also, they have called on our allies to share in supplying capital for the development of poorer countries, which so far has been shouldered almost wholly by the United States.

The change in attitude is heartening, but, oh, so late and long overdue. No lukewarm or dilatory approach by the United States will suffice. Drastic reductions in our foreign aid program are in order—much more drastic than made this year. Inflation must be checked, and the line against increases in prices and general wages held. If our pleas for better treatment of our exports are not productive, we have no alternative but to make our trade program "reciprocal" by retaliating against offending countries with import restrictions of our own.

Sincerely,
UNITED STATES SENATOR FROM SOUTH CAROLINA

STROM THURMOND

REPORTS

TO THE PEOPLE

Committees: Armed Services
Interstate & Foreign Commerce

October 26, 1959

UNITED AND FLEXIBLE SOUTH

Much consideration is being given these days to the presidential nominating conventions and the general election of November, 1960. Most of the principal candidates have either thrown their hats into the ring or have given very firm indications of their intentions.

During this period it is very important for the people of the South and their leaders to be united and not committed to any candidate or party until we have had ample opportunity to determine what they are going to do for us—or what concerns us more—to us. The South will never win any concessions by jumping in the bag in advance and staying there regardless of the radical views of the candidates or the bitter pills contained in the platforms. This is a lesson which has evidently been learned by many of our people but by too few of our leaders. In this regard, I was disappointed at the adverse reaction at the recent Souther Governors Conference to South Carolina Governor Ernest F. Hollings' suggestion that the South consider following an independent course of action if necessary in 1960.

I believe there is strong sentiment in our State to send an uncommitted delegation to the National Democratic Convention next year and then have the South Carolina Democratic Convention reconvene after the national convention to decide what course to pursue. I hope that South Carolina and all other Southern States will follow this procedure. Lack of Southern unity and determination in the past has contributed immeasurably to our present day difficulties. In national politics, the bosses who pull the strings from backstage understand only power politics. Thus far the small minority groups have outplayed the biggest and most stepped-on minority group in this nation, the people of the South. We must not permit this to continue.

ADA ZERO SCORE

I was very pleased to learn this week that I have again been honored by the left-wing ADA group as having scored a zero rating for not supporting a single issue espoused by that organization. Others sharing the honor with me were Senators Byrd (D-Va.), Robertson (D-Va.), and Eastland (D-Miss.). This group of so-called Americans for Democratic Action was described by the Charleston Evening Post in a recent editorial as being "one of the most active of the anti-Southern groups that seek to inflict a new era of reconstruction on this section. It is also dedicated to socialism, to lavish handouts, and to encroachment on the rights and powers of the States."

This ADA score was based on 13 sample votes. I trust, however, that I did not give these left-wingers even the slightest satisfaction on any of the Senate's 216 roll call votes during the past session.

ACTUAL LEGISLATIVE WORK

In a recent report, I gave some facts and figures on the legislative workload of the 84th Congress (1955-56), making the suggestion that some better organization of the working time of the Congress be devised. Since that time figures have been compiled on the legislative activity of the 1st Session of the 86th Congress (1959) which just ended September 15.

These figures show that the Senate was in session on 140 days for a total of 1,009 hours and 48 minutes. The House met 141 days for a total of 527 hours and eight minutes. This means the Senate was in session on actual floor work, excluding committee work which runs approximately ten times longer for all committees, for more than seven hours each day we met. During this time the Congress enacted into law 383 public bills and 236 private bills out of a total of 13,837 measures which were introduced.

In addition, the Senate acted favorably to confirm 43,567 of 46,934 executive nominations submitted by the President and gave its approval to eight treaties.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

[Name]
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THE MODERN ARMY

This report has been prepared at Fort Leavenworth, Kansas, where I have been enrolled in a two-week active duty course on the employment of nuclear weapons at the Army's Command and General Staff College. The instruction, which has been ably presented, should prove helpful to me not only in my Army Reserve assignment as deputy to the Army's Chief of Civil Affairs-Military Government, but also as a member of the Senate Armed Services Committee.

Since World War II and even the Korean War our entire concept of warfare has undergone radical change. This has been necessitated by the great technological developments which have been pushed forward in the atomic and space age. The U.S. Army of today bears few resemblances to that of World War II vintage.

The new pentomic division concept of organization, which substitutes five battle groups for three regiments, is designed to enable more efficient operations in atomic warfare. Each battle group is so organized and equipped that it can operate as a self-contained, self-sustaining unit in the much wider and deeper division zones of action.

Manpower, which has always been the most important ingredient in any army, must today measure up to higher standards than ever before in order to handle the complex weapons and equipment of U.S. Army personnel. I have seen many missile and electronic devices which appear to require the talents of a genius on the battlefield. In addition to his technical skills, the average American fighting man must be three times the soldier of his Soviet counterpart because numerically the Soviet Army outnumbers our Army by 3-1-2,500,000 to 870,000.

MORE MODERNIZATION NEEDED

An army can be no more modern, however, than the weapons and equipment of the troops. The Army has issued new types of equipment and weapons to our soldiers in recent years, but more are needed at a faster rate of speed. The Army has planned well in advance, but to do more planning and to put more urgently-needed items into production and into the hands of the troops, more money is required. This can be made available if we will cutback on non-essential and wasteful spending programs.

The Russian soldiers have been re-equipped in recent years with newly developed tanks, guns, missiles, and efficient means of tactical movement by land, air, or water. We must forge ahead of our arch enemy in these vital areas if we expect our soldiers to offset the 3-1 numerical superiority of the Soviet Army. We owe this to our servicemen and women, to our country, and to ourselves.

Some progress has been made in providing more modern weapons and equipment, but too much is still on the drawing boards. We are now arming our troops with the newly-standardized M-14 rifle-machinegun to replace the old M-1 Garand rifle, the carbine, the Browning automatic rifle, and the M-3 submachinegun. A new recoilless anti-tank weapon with greater range and more power is being developed to replace the already obsolete 3.5-inch bazooka of Korea. Weapons with atomic warheads ranging from use by the individual soldier to rockets and missiles requiring many more personnel are also being developed and tested.

FROM GROUND TO AIR

The old army that used to crawl on its belly is now gradually taking to the air with development of aerial personnel carriers, airborne guns and tanks, and flying platforms.

The Army is not the only service turning to modern methods of warfare. The Air Force is in the process of switching its main striking force from manned aircraft to missiles and rockets, and the Navy is finding increased opportunities to play its vital role in atomic warfare by greater and wider use of its nuclear-powered submarines with their polaris missile capabilities.

A strong and modern national defense force must come first in Uncle Sam's pay line not only as a defensive weapon but also as a deterrent which forces peace on the world.

Sincerely,

STROM THURMOND
THE PAPER CURTAIN

One of the most important tasks facing the people of the South today is that of piercing the Paper Curtain which has been thrown up by many news media outside Southern borders in an effort to hide or distort the South’s position in the segregation-integration controversy. Most Southerners are familiar with the disparaging remarks about us contained in many non-Southern publications and the lack of coverage given our strong points. We are also accustomed to the mammoth headlines given any racial incident in our area as contrasted with the lack of display given racial incidents outside the South. Living here in Washington during the Congressional session each year, I can attest to the fact that it is difficult—and in many cases impossible—to find any news articles involving Northern racial flare-ups, which many times outnumber any difficulties we may be having in the South. The Northern editors rationalize the lack of play given these stories on the theory that they do not wish to further stir up racial tensions particularly in the “pilot model” area of Washington, D.C., and in New York City where integration troubles are rapidly making that city the “crime capital” of our nation.

There are some writers and publications, however, that dare to present the facts as they exist, even though they write from behind the Paper Curtain. Mr. David Lawrence, editor and publisher of U.S. News and World Report, stands out among those objective writers. Not only is his weekly news magazine one of the best edited and written but it is also the most informative periodical on current news. I also have great respect for the facts and views presented in his news column.

Here are the names of some other writers who also print the facts objectively: Raymond Moley, Ray Tucker, Holmes Alexander, William F. Buckley, Jr., in National Review, and the editors of American Mercury.

THE CASE FOR THE SOUTH

One of South Carolina’s most able and distinguished newsmen, Colonel W. D. Workman, Jr., has written a book entitled THE CASE FOR THE SOUTH which should be off the presses in January. It should be read by every Southerner and all fair and open-minded Americans outside the South who are anxious to get a true and objective picture of how and why the great majority of Southerners feel as they do about preserving separate and equal school facilities for the children of both races in their own area. This book is a masterpiece, and if we fail to place copies in the hands of millions behind the Paper Curtain we will lose a wonderful opportunity to convince many brain-washed non-Southerners that we do have a case, and a very strong one at that.

FREEDOM AND FEDERALISM

Mr. Felix Morley, a distinguished writer and political philosopher from Gibson Island, Maryland, has recently written and published through the Henry Regnery Company, an excellent book entitled Freedom and Federalism. Mr. Morley’s theme is that freedom can be maintained in this country only so long as we have a government of separated and divided powers—which, I might point out, we are fast losing in the trend toward socialism and centralization.

OUTSIDE INTERESTS

Not only am I concerned with presenting an objective picture of the South’s position to the rest of the American people, but I am also concerned about the picture being presented to our own people by some supposedly Southern news media which have been bought out by Northern interests. Mr. Edward H. Sime, editor of The Times and Democrat of Orangeburg, recently pointed out in a very provocative editorial that this is occurring and that all too often the editorial views of such publications reflect the thinking of some outsider who is not familiar with the local customs, traditions, and views of the community. I am glad that this has not happened so far in South Carolina.

The news media in this country are powerful and most influential in molding public sentiment. At the present time most of it is being used against the people of the South. Some of this material is quite open and direct, but some like the recent Loretta Young TV program on prejudice are most clever and subtle, casting the people of the South in the role of appearing to be bigots. I wouldn’t say Hollywood has been very kind to us either.

The job of piercing the Paper Curtain and countering this persecution of Southern customs and traditions is a big one, and it merits the attention and consideration of everyone.

Sincerely,

STROM THURMOND
PRESIDENTIAL ELECTORAL REFORM

November 16, 1959

Have you ever wondered why presidential candidates of both major political parties advocate what they term "liberal"—but which are more aptly described as radical or left-wing—proposals? A large part of the answer lies in the method used to elect the President of the United States. The present electoral college system, which disfranchises millions of voters in each presidential election and usually permits big city bosses and minority bloc-voting elements to determine the winner, is one of the principal causes of the trend in this country toward socialism and away from the principles of constitutional government.

In all the wisdom they demonstrated in drafting the Constitution, the Founding Fathers failed to foresee the rise of political parties and their use of the "party slate" method of choosing presidential electors. They did not envision that this, together with the concentration of foreign, racial, and other minority blocs in large metropolitan areas such as New York, Chicago, Philadelphia, etc., would make it possible for a relatively few voters in those areas to control the outcome of presidential elections and consequently, national policies. Under the present setup, it is possible for one voter in New York City to hand over New York State's 45 electoral votes—slightly under 1/5 of the votes needed for election—to one of the two presidential candidates. This is the winner-take-all feature of the present system which leaves the other candidate, who may have received 49.9 per cent of the State's popular vote, with no electoral votes. To carry this one step further, we find that this New Yorker's power to swing 45 electoral votes packs 15 times the wallop of a Delaware voter, whose single vote could possibly throw his State's three electoral votes to one candidate. Under this system the strength of your vote is determined by "the place you live.

By their balance-of-power strength, these organized pressure groups, most of which are steeped in socialist traditions rather than constitutional government and States Rights, figure prominently in the selection of candidates and the shaping of party platforms. In addition, these big-city pressure groups carry great weight in the election of the most rabid of the so-called civil righters in the Congress. Whom they send to the Congress is naturally of concern to those of us in other States, but is actually beyond our control, as it should be. Their control of presidential elections and national policy, however, is not only a matter of concern to us but is also within our control if we can muster the strength to amend the U. S. Constitution. I must point out here that we must amend the Constitution by legal means because we, unlike the minority pressure groups, do not have a Supreme Court of our own to change the Constitution to suit our whims of the moment.

There has been much debate as to the best method to follow in effecting electoral reform. The idea is to maintain the electoral college but to provide that the popular vote in each State shall be reflected as accurately as possible in the electoral vote of the State. The electoral college serves as a buffer against national intervention with the rights of the States to name their electors. A compromise plan mustered a majority vote in the Senate in 1955, but we were shy of the required two-thirds vote. To amend the Constitution is no easy task. It requires a two-thirds vote of both houses of Congress and ratification by three-fourths of the State Legislatures. The salutary results which this would bring, however, are well worth our efforts. On these efforts may hinge the salvation of our Federal Republic and its manifold freedoms.

Sincerely,

Strom Thurmond
STEEL STRIKE AND NATIONAL BUDGET

Although the nation's steel workers are back at work and steel production has resumed at least temporarily, the far-reaching effects of the strike will be felt for some time to come. The extensive consequences of the suspension of steel production could well cause the revision of several national policies.

It now appears that the National Government's loss of revenue resulting from the steel strike will be the difference between a balanced and an unbalanced budget for fiscal year 1960. The budget submitted to Congress by the President was balanced by a narrow margin, and Congress actually appropriated slightly less than was proposed in the budget. The revenue estimates on which the budget was based, however, anticipated an 8 per cent increase in gross national product, a percentage increase which has occurred only once in recent history--1955, the year following a major tax reduction. Without any major suspension in production, it would have been surprising for the budget revenue estimates to have been realized. Whatever chances existed for such an increase in gross national product, the steel strike has foredoomed. The budget revenue estimates will not be matched by collections.

Government policy and laws with respect to strikes which endanger the national health and welfare will almost certainly be subjected to agonizing reappraisals should the strike resume after the 80-day cooling-off period. Demands are already being heard for more effective procedures than are now contained in the law, despite the fact that the Taft-Hartley procedure has proved effective in 10 out of the 14 instances where it has been utilized.

NO COMPULSORY ARBITRATION

Compulsory arbitration is antagonistic to the American philosophy of both government and economics. Arbitration in a labor dispute is vastly different from the familiar court arbitration of a contract. In the latter case, the court has jurisdiction to require the parties to agree to a settlement which is within the terms of a contract originally made by the parties. Compulsory arbitration of a labor dispute, on the other hand, would involve a process of forcing both labor and management to sign, and be bound by, a contract to the terms of which neither might be agreeable and which has been drafted and impressed on them by an agency of the Government. Even the dire consequences of the steel strike do not justify a resort to compulsory arbitration of labor disputes.

It is possible that a partial solution to the dilemma lies in the decentralization of collective bargaining. A change in the national labor law could prevent collective bargaining at a level higher than the individual company, so that negotiations of labor contracts would have to be with each company rather than an entire industry. While "pattern bargaining" might still result in all contracts within an industry having identical terms, the danger of an industry-wide strike would be materially decreased.

ANOTHER POSSIBLE SOLUTION

Under the present law, the fact finders appointed by the President when he invokes the Taft-Hartley procedure have no authority to make recommendations for the settlement of the strike. If this group should be authorized to make recommendations to the President, their recommendations would surely marshal the full force of public opinion, and from a practical standpoint, might well be equivalent to compulsory arbitration. A less dangerous course, which holds possibilities for improvement, would be to authorize the fact finders to make recommendations for the settlement of the strike if no settlement has been made or is in prospect after 70 days of the 80-day cooling-off period have elapsed.

Should the strike resume after the 80-day period has elapsed, there is no question but that the National Government will have to enact more stringent measures to prevent re-occurrences. Even such a tower of economic strength as resides in the economy of the United States can ill afford repetition of this economic disaster.

Sincerely,

Strom Thurmond
The most important single domestic issue which will confront the American people when the Congress reconvenes in January is the issue of States' Rights—the problem of preserving the rights of the several States against ever-increasing National encroachment. It is certain that a strong, punitive so-called "civil rights" measure will be pushed by the radical forces early in the session; and, in very large measure, the future of States' Rights in America will hinge on the outcome of the struggle which will develop over this bill.

It is essential that the people of this country keep in mind at all times a sense of the fundamental importance of States' Rights. And in order to do that, we must, of course, be very clear in our minds as to just what we mean by the term.

There are some who would have us believe that States' Rights is no more than a time-worn cliche which is employed by Southerners as a device to facilitate the exploitation of racial minorities. We know that this is not so. States' Rights is an enduring and valid principle which completely transcends the issue of race.

States' Rights is simply the American term for the principle of local self-government, a fundamental and inalienable human right for which, over the centuries, our ancestors—both in Europe and in America—have fought, struggled, and died. In the establishment of our Union, we recognized this right of self-government, we incorporated it in our written Constitution, and we gave it its American name of States' Rights.

Important as this principle of self-rule is, however, States' Rights is more than that. In our American constitutional system, States' Rights is the keystone of Individual Liberty. States' Rights is one of the two main principles which the Founding Fathers built into the Constitution to insure that Americans would be forever free.

The other principle relied upon by the Founders was, of course, the principle of Separation of Powers—the independence of the three coordinate branches of the National Government. These two devices—the Nation-State division of powers, and the separation of the judicial, legislative and executive functions—constitute the basic framework of our system of checks and balances.

The ultimate objective of this checks-and-balances system, indeed the highest purpose of government, is the protection of the rights and freedom of the individual citizen—the promotion and preservation of individual liberty. "Liberty," said Lord Acton, "is not a means to a higher political end. It is itself the highest political end."

The Founders were determined that the newly-won liberties of the American people must be preserved. They knew full well that the greatest potential threat to the liberty of the individual lay in government. That is why they were insistent that the new government they were setting up be limited and decentralized. To this end, they carefully built the new governmental structure into a compound Federal Republic around two basic principles: Separation of Powers and States' Rights.

Thus we can see that States' Rights is no mere meaningless slogan, but is a vital feature—an indispensable element, in fact—of the structure of our checks-and-balances system, which is the very basis of our individual liberty. In keeping up a constant struggle for States' Rights, we are fighting not merely for a name, but for an essential support of liberty: "the highest political end."

Sincerely,

Strom Thurmond
In reading Mr. Felix Morley's excellent new book, Freedom and Federalism, my attention has been drawn to some political misnomers which Mr. Morley decries and which I have long intended to bring to the attention of the public.

First, there is the misapplication of the term "federal government" to refer to the central government in Washington. This has also led to the practice of referring to the centralization of power and the exercise of such power by the central government as "federalism." A federal government is one of divided powers, whereby a group of political subdivisions get together and delegate certain enumerated powers to a central government in order to form a federal union. We who espouse the cause of States' Rights favor federalism in its true sense, whereby powers are divided between the central government and the States so as to preserve our freedom against dictatorship and totalitarian government. The very point Mr. Morley makes in his book is that our freedom depends on maintaining our federal system of government. Wherever federalism has vanished--the best example being in Germany with the advent of Hitler--all powers have been drawn to the central government and individual liberty has perished.

Many also make the mistake of referring to our form of government as being a democracy rather than a republic. A pure or absolute democracy is one in which the people meet and pass their own laws. Our government is a republic. The sovereignty resides in the people, but they elect representatives to take care of their affairs of government. Since our government is one of divided and separated powers we might more correctly describe our form of government as being a compound republic. James Madison, generally referred to as the father of the Constitution, has expressed his preference for a republic over a democracy with these words: "A democracy...will be confined to a small spot. A republic may be extended over a large region."

Another misnomer is the application of the term "liberal" to a socialist. It is a favorite trick of "share the wealth" radicals to hide behind the pleasant sounding appellation of "liberal," which is designed to make them appear to be merely broadminded. We should not permit this. At least, we should not contribute to the deception by getting in the habit of referring to them as "liberals." This particularly applies to the Americans for Democratic (Socialistic) Action, commonly called the ADA.

While on this general subject, I might add that I make a practice of capitalizing the "S" in the word "State" when it refers to a State in our political Union. Our States deserve this respect. Besides, during modern times when the States are being downgraded in favor of a central government, I feel it is important to counteract the trend with every means at our command. This is one.

I am glad to report that the Bureau of the Budget is requiring all agencies of the central government to complete by the end of this month an evaluation of all their commercial-industrial activities and to discontinue them where appropriate. This new policy has the twofold purpose of furthering the free enterprise system and permitting government agencies to concentrate their efforts on primary objectives. The agencies will be required to justify their continued competition with private enterprise on any one of the following three criteria: (1) That national security requires government operation of the facility; (2) That procurement from private industry would be unreasonably costly; (3) That procurement of comparable goods or services from private enterprise is clearly unfeasible.

The most recent inventory--the spring of 1956--revealed almost 20,000 government-operated business activities that employed 340,000 persons and had assets valued at $12 billion.

This decompetition directive is a wholesome policy and merits the support of all our people.
UNITED STATES SENATOR FROM SOUTH CAROLINA

BATTLE OF THE BUDGET

Mr. Maurice Stans, director of the Bureau of the Budget, recently made a very eloquent plea for support by the American people of a balanced budget for fiscal year 1961 which begins July 1. The battle of the budget will begin in January when the Congress begins legislating on government spending items. Mr. Stans has called on the people to make their voices heard above those of the various pressure groups which will be vigorously lobbying on Capitol Hill in an effort to get their "fair share" of our tax dollars.

The national debt at present is approximately $292 billion. This, however, does not include commitments voluntarily undertaken beyond that, such as military and civilian government employee retirement accruals, pensions to veterans and their dependents, public housing projects, the interstate highway program, civil public works projects, urban renewal, college housing, community facilities, merchant marine subsidies, and conservation reserve payments to farmers. Some of these are vital programs, but we must remember that they constitute future commitments totaling more than $700 billion above the annual costs of providing for national defense, welfare, and commerce. Thus, with these future obligations staring us in the face, plus the annual 2½ billion-dollar built-in increases in national spending, we must all help to fight the battle for economy in government spending now and in proposals for more future commitments if we are going to disprove Mr. Khrushchev's boast that the Communist system will bury our free enterprise system economically.

The American Institute for Economic Research, a non-profit and non-political institution, stated in a recent report that "the U.S. Treasury stands today on the brink of insolvency." This report pointed out that foreign creditors have by law first call on our fast dwindling gold reserves and that American citizens must take what is left, if anything. Consider the situation today with $140 billion of paper and credit purchasing media (currency and demand deposits) pyramided on the slender foundation of only $3 billion in gold (after allowing for net foreign claims). Some may feel that because they hold no government bonds or securities they would not be affected by national bankruptcy. A substantial amount of the national debt, however, is owed to the American people through loans to the government of portions of bank deposits, savings, insurance premiums, stock purchases, local and State tax dollars, retirement funds--especially government employees--and dollars contributed for college and other charitable endowments. This consideration, however, is not nearly so crucial as is the possible loss of our freedom to a Communist dictatorship without a shot being fired.

The national interest must be placed above special interest on the part of any group or any individual. I hope more of the American people will line up on the side of government economy. I have been very encouraged by the interest of South Carolinians in government economy in my visits around the State this fall.

BRIEF NOTES

President Eisenhower's current good-will tour of many foreign countries is evidently meeting with much success. Many South Carolinians have expressed to me their keen interest in his tour and his efforts to promote world peace. The President makes a good ambassador, and his overseas visits should do much to remove the distrust which many foreigners hold for our country as a result of Communist propaganda. The current Senate investigation into drug prices should prove to be very wholesome. Any manufacturer, wholesaler, or retailer is entitled to a reasonable profit. On the other hand, the public is entitled to information on unreasonable profiteering. The investigation should help by either spotlighting unreasonable profiteering or by providing explanations to the public as to the necessity for high prices for some drugs. Senator Javits acknowledged at a press conference last week that his mail from New York reflects a strong minority opinion against so-called civil rights legislation he is advocating. Since coming to the Senate, I have been receiving many letters from New York expressing the same sentiments.

Sincerely,

STROM THURMOND
The December 21, 1959 issue of U.S. News and World Report contains an article which should be read by every American. It is entitled "The Coming Choice for U.S.: FIGHT OR SURRENDER? Story of the Blackmail Behind the Threat of Nuclear War."

The article quotes an unidentified "official who sits in the top councils of the U.S. Government" as making a point I have been trying to focus attention on for some time. This point is that the American people must get a military defense force second to none and that we must sacrifice, if necessary, to attain this vital goal.

The only prize being offered in the atomic and space age for being second best in military strength and preparedness is disaster. We can have the best defense system in the world within the framework of a balanced budget if we practice the strictest economy in government spending and eliminate or curtail unessential government activities. However, if we insist on increasing expenditures for non-essentials while we are making available the additional billions required to put us ahead in the space race and to perfect and produce the best in military rockets and missiles, then our mighty defense force could prove to be of little value to us in fighting off Communist conquest as a result of economic collapse. This would be making it easy for Mr. Khrushchev and his Kremlin cohorts.

This top official was quoted by the magazine as having said: "The American Government, to hold power, is forced to direct its effort toward satisfying the voters' desire for more and more of the good things of life instead of toward assuring safety for the nation through a dominant position in the world. Soviet Russia, by contrast, is hard. As a nation, its objective is fixed. Every move, every action, all the nation's power is directed toward reaching that objective of world domination."

This life-or-death struggle forced on us by the Communists merits top priority not just by our national leaders but by every American. On it may depend our freedom or even life itself.

A MATTER OF PATRIOTISM

Speaking of national loyalty, some eastern colleges and some of the presidential candidates are beginning a new drive to repeal the loyalty oath requirements of the National Defense Education Act of 1958. The Act requires that students who accept grants or loans under the program must first execute an oath of allegiance to the United States and swear that they do not belong to a Communist organization. A repeal move was defeated on the Senate floor during the last session of Congress by a vote of 49-42.

I can see no reason why anyone should object to pledging his loyalty to his country if he wishes to share in special benefits offered by the government or to serve in a position of trust in government. In fact, every person on my office staff must now execute a similar oath of office. All public servants must do so, as well as labor leaders, our servicemen and women and many others. I fear that patriotism is becoming old-fashioned or a thing of the past with too many persons. To me it is one of the highest qualities of character which a person can possess.

If this repeal move gets back to the Senate floor I pledge my best efforts in fighting it again.

MERRY CHRISTMAS

Mrs. Thurmond, my staff and I wish for everyone everywhere a very Merry Christmas and a Happy and Successful New Year.

Sincerely,

[Signature]
The first major issue expected to face the U. S. Senate after Congress reconvenes on January 6 is that of so-called federal aid to education. More properly it should be referred to as "anti-federal" aid since it threatens to further upset our federal system of divided powers by taking away another State power and vesting it in the central government.

Late in the last session the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee approved a bill authorizing the expenditure of $500 million annually for a two-year school construction program. As I have previously pointed out, the two-year limitation is merely a "foot-in-the-door" gimmick. Almost all of the government's approximately 100 grant-in-aid programs had their beginning as "temporary crash" programs. Some of these "temporary" programs date back as far as the 1870's.

The objectives of many of these programs are very wholesome. In many instances, however, the objectives could be obtained at much lower cost and the programs administered more carefully and effectively by State and local officials with local revenues made possible by turning over some of Washington's many tax sources to State and local governments. After all, the taxes must come from the people regardless of which level of government collects them. Washington gets most of the tax take now. Of $98.3 billion collected in fiscal year 1958, $68 billion went to Washington, with $15.4 billion going to local governments and $14.9 billion to State governments.

At present the States retain two primary aspects of sovereignty. They are control over education and police powers. Advocates of centralization of power in Washington are now trying to reduce the status of our States to that of mere entities or subdivisions by seizing control of these two important powers. The Supreme Court's school segregation decision, efforts to force school integration, so-called civil rights force bills, and so-called federal aid to education bills are all a part of the gigantic scheme to strip the States of their remaining sovereignty. This is one of the principal reasons why all such centralization legislation must be resisted by those who believe in the principles of constitutional government.

General so-called federal aid to education is unconstitutional, unwise, unnecessary, and uneconomical. I am prepared to discuss these points in detail when the aid bill is considered.

Brief Notes

A TV news announcer commented recently that street crimes in Washington, D. C. are continuing on the upswing. In addition to the suggestions of increasing the police force by 500 and using Marines and police dogs to lower the crime rate, it has now been suggested that bus drivers and trolley operators be armed. Uncle Sam has approximately 2.4 million civilian employees and approximately 2.5 million military personnel. Most civilian employees work in the Executive Branch's more than 2,000 agencies and offices. The Post Office Department accounts for the largest number of workers, approximately 534,000. I plan to resume my weekly 5-minute radio broadcasts over many South Carolina stations beginning with the week-end of January 9. The broadcasts are generally scheduled on Saturday or Sunday afternoons.

Sincerely,

Strom Thurmond