UPCOMING SENATE DEBATES

The 2nd Session of the 86th Congress which begins this week will be a rugged one.
Being a presidential election year, political issues will fill the air.

As I pointed out last week, the first major issue expected to come before the Senate is that of so-called federal aid for school construction, to which I am unalterably opposed. This debate could be followed by consideration of another bill which is also pending on the Senate calendar. It provides for an increase in the minimum wage from $1 to $1.25 and an extension of coverage to include several million additional employees, including some retail workers.

A few days before we adjourned in September, the groundwork was laid for early Senate action in 1960 on so-called civil rights legislation. The integrationists had been hoping to force a major showdown over this issue during the past session, but they were unable to do so. The 1960 fight has been tentatively scheduled by the leadership, without Southern approval, to begin in the Senate sometime in February. I am prepared to use every means at my command to defeat any such legislation which would attempt to treat our Southland or any other area of our country as a conquered province similar to that which existed during Reconstruction days.

There will also be another attempt to extend socialism in our country by passing a depressed areas (area redevelopment) bill. Its purpose would be to extend handouts from the central government to any geographic center which runs into economic trouble during a prosperous period. The central government would move into chronic unemployment areas which are in that condition because of poor labor relations or a lack of other basic industrial advantages and spend millions or billions of dollars to keep industrial plants from moving to areas which offer greater opportunities without such a vast expenditure of tax dollars.

Fiscal responsibility will again be a major issue in the Congress. This fight over government spending will come up every time one of the approximately 18 appropriation bills is debated, particularly the foreign aid appropriation bill. In addition, it will be brought out in debate when legislation authorizing new or non-essential programs is considered.

Our defense and space programs should come in for close scrutiny by the Congress. The Armed Services Committee, of which I am a member, will begin hearing top secret testimony on the status of our defense program on January 18. The Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences will also be delving deeply into the progress being made in our space program, which ties in so closely with our defense. Whatever is needed must be provided for both of these vital programs, even if it means that we must forgo or curtail some non-defense expenditures.

Much debate could be caused by a move to have our country surrender a treaty reservation which permits our government to deny assertion of jurisdiction by the International Court of Justice over matters which we consider to be "essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of the United States". This move has the backing of Senator Humphrey (D-Minn.) and President Eisenhower.

These are but a few of the many legislative battles which will occur during the session. I will do my best to keep you posted on these debates and my votes and actions as a representative of the State of South Carolina in the U. S. Senate.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

STROM THURMOND

Vol. VI, No. 1 January 4, 1960

UNITED STATES SENATOR FROM SOUTH CAROLINA

REPORTS

TO THE PEOPLE

Committees: Armed Services
Interstate & Foreign Commerce
I am very grateful for the many kind expressions of sympathy which have been extended to me since the death of my wife. They have meant so much to me and Jean's family.

FEDERAL VOTING REGISTRARS UNCONSTITUTIONAL

Although the Second Session of the 86th Congress has barely begun, the drive for so-called civil rights legislation has already been launched. In the House of Representatives, a petition is being circulated, without too much success thus far, to discharge the Rules Committee from further consideration of a four-point bill.

In the Senate, efforts of "civil rights advocates" center principally around the recommendation of the Civil Rights Commission for appointment of Federal voting registrars. Since this proposal concerns voting only, it was referred to the Senate Rules Committee, on which there is only one Southerner, rather than to the Judiciary Committee, where Southern Senators are more numerous and from which no such "civil rights" bill has been reported favorably since Reconstruction.

Seldom, if ever, have legislative proposals been considered which flaunted so many constitutional provisions as do the five voting registrar bills. The passage of any one of them by the Congress would constitute the most outright defiance of the Constitution since passage of the Reconstruction Acts. At a recent press conference, President Eisenhower, who is not even a lawyer, expressed grave doubt as to the constitutionality of these proposals.

These registrar bills provide that when nine or more petitions are received by the President, stating that the petitioners have been deprived of the right to vote or register because of their race, color, creed or national origin, the President shall refer the petitions to the Civil Rights Commission for investigation. If the Commission, after investigation, certifies that the petitions are true, the President is required to appoint from Federal employees living in or near the election district, a Federal voting registrar to assume registration duties from the duly constituted State authorities.

In the first place, the qualification and registration of voters is a matter within the jurisdiction of the States, being one of the powers reserved to the States in the Tenth Amendment to the Constitution. The registration of voters, which must necessarily include passing on qualifications, goes far beyond the authority of Congress to legislate as to the time, place and manner of holding elections.

Secondly, the Federal registrar proposals are in violation of the procedural due process guarantees of the Fifth Amendment to the Constitution in these particulars: there is no provision for notice to State officials of the intent to deprive them of their functions; there is no provision for hearings at which the defense of the State officials could be made; and no rules of procedure by which the Civil Rights Commission is to proceed are prescribed.

In the third place, Article III, Section 1 of the Constitution specifies that the judicial power of the United States shall be vested in the Judicial Branch of the National Government. The Federal registrar bills would vest authority for judicial decisions as to whether State officials had deprived a citizen of his right to vote unlawfully in the Civil Rights Commission, an agency of the Executive Branch.

Fourthly, Article II, Section 1 of the Constitution provides "The executive power shall be vested in a President of the United States." In violation of this provision, the Federal registrar bills would vest executive power in an agency of the Executive Branch, for when the Civil Rights Commission certified that nine citizens had been denied the right to register to vote because of race, color, creed or national origin, the President would be required to act. He would have no discretion. In effect, the Civil Rights Commission, an Executive agency, would have executive authority superior to the President.

These are but examples of the many unconstitutional aspects of these proposals. I am encouraged by the very vulnerability of the proposals to believe that they can be defeated, although the struggle will unquestionably be bitter.
RASH SESSION UNDERWAY

The 2nd Session of the 86th Congress is already proving to be on the rash and radical side, judging by the Senate's record for the first month. First, a band of left-wingers tried to capture control of the Democratic Party policy-making machinery in the Senate.

Next, the Senate passed a bill tabbed by its proponents with the pleasant-sounding title of the "clean elections" bill. We Southerners voted against it for several reasons. Primarily, we felt the bill struck another blow at local self-government by proposing to inject the national government into State and local primaries. The national government has no authority to regulate primaries, which are already regulated by State and local laws. Section 265 of Title 18 of the S. C. Code of Laws requires candidates in primaries to file their campaign expenses immediately after the primary, and failure to do so subjects the primary candidate to criminal penalties of fines up to $500 or imprisonment for six months, or both.

In addition, the bill fails to realistically cope with abuses in national elections. For instance, the bill does nothing to prevent union bosses from taking money from workers and using it to promote candidates and causes which many of the workers detest. My amendment on this point could not hold its original support after the "bosses" got busy against it in this election year. The bill does nothing to police expenditure of funds in a campaign for "educational" purposes. Such "educational" purposes include such activities as hauling voters to the polls, publication and distribution of campaign literature, and voter registration drives. Debate revealed that one union spent $37,000 per day in one county paying election workers.

Last week the Senate approved a bill which sets the stage for "federal" grants to States to combat the problem of juvenile delinquency. The opposition to this bill, which included me, indicated not a lack of concern but a realization that this moral problem can be solved only by a resurgence of parental responsibility, assisted by the churches and local communities for which "federal" money, now in short supply, is no substitute.

At this writing, the war of aggression for usurpation of individual and States' Rights in the Senate is concentrated in battles over poll taxes and education, both fields being exclusively within the jurisdiction of the States and the people.

On the question of poll taxes, there is a two-pronged attack by the enemy--one by the route of constitutional amendment and the other by statutory action. The latter route is patently unconstitutional, and the former is contrary to the basic precept of providing the maximum local self-government which underlies our governmental system.

The assault on the educational front is imminent, and only the breadth of the approach is still in doubt. With a pious effort to camouflage centralized control, the enemies' first objective will be school construction grants, and then grants for teachers' salaries.

Meanwhile, the enemies of the South continue to marshal their forces for an all-out fight on "civil rights" which they have placed on their timetable for February 15. Despite the gloomy prospects for this election year session, every one of us must give his utmost effort to preserving what is left of our constitutional republican form of government, and thereby, our liberty.

Sincerely,

[Signature]
DEFENSE PROCUREMENT

During the week, the Senate Armed Services Subcommittee on Defense Procurement, of which I am chairman, resumes hearings on the procurement investigation begun last year. Although the importance of the matter can be measured to some extent by the tremendous sums of money spent for defense procurement—approximately $24 billion per year—the complexity of the subject is of such greater magnitude that it is almost impossible to illustrate.

A SOUND procurement policy for defense needs must necessarily have two overriding basic objectives. First, it must facilitate the acquisition of all items needed for defense in the shortest possible time. Second, it must enable the services, and, in fact, require the services, to acquire their needs at the lowest possible price. The first objective is essential to insure that we have the tools and weapons at a time early enough to provide adequate military protection for the country and to deter enemy attack. The second objective is necessary to insure that our economic structure is spared the drain of a tax rate which could wreck our economy.

There are other desirable objectives which follow the first two in priority, but which are of necessity, subordinate.

COMPETITIVE bidding has unquestionably proved to be the best method for achieving the lowest possible cost. Partly because of the increased complexity of weapons systems and the security which must be practiced with respect to new developments in defense items, this method is used in only about 17% of all defense procurement. It would be virtually impossible to seek competitive bids for the research and development of a weapon which our defense leaders agree we need, but have no idea as yet how to build. Disregarding the considerations of security, competitive bidding on such projects would be impossible.

Another factor which must be considered is the capability of the contractor to do the job desired. Some competitive bids could not be accepted, even were they at the lowest price, because the bidder would obviously not be capable of doing the job at all, or not doing it in the period specified.

THESE ARE but a few very superficial illustrations of the innumerable problems involved in defense procurement. There are many others that are more difficult and intricate. As the defense needs progress to even more advanced states, the continued realization of the two basic objectives of a sound procurement policy, which even now often are in contradiction to each other, will be more difficult of accomplishment.

A proper solution to existing and future problems of procurement can only be obtained by detailed study and analysis of the whole system. This is the reason for our investigation.

Aside from the importance of acquiring our defense needs expeditiously and at the minimum expense, this investigation illustrates the "fact finding" part of the legislative process. Most often, the votes on the final passage of legislation and a few spectacular Committee hearings occupy the attention of the press and, thereby, the public. This is only natural, but it does not detract from the vital nature of the "dry and technical" studies which constitute the most time-consuming work in the legislative process.

Sincerely,

Strom Thurmond
This week the Senate Foreign Relations Committee resumes hearings on Senate Resolution 94, which would give the World Court a right to decide an element of jurisdiction presently reserved to the United States in cases to which our country is a party.

The International Court of Justice, commonly called the "World Court," was created in the United Nations Charter in June, 1945, as the principal judicial organ of the United Nations. The Court is comprised of 15 judges, not more than one of whom may be a national of any one Nation. The judges are elected by majority vote of the General Assembly and Security Council of the U.N., from nominees submitted by the various member nations.

The U.N. Charter does not require all members to submit to the Court's jurisdiction. However, in 1946, the U.S. filed a document with the U.N. submitting to jurisdiction of the World Court all international disputes with countries which had also submitted to the Court's jurisdiction. Prior to the Senate's approval of the document, however, it was amended upon motion of former Senator Tom Connally, to reserve the right to the U.S. to decide whether any question was international or domestic in nature. It is this reservation which S. Res. 94 would repeal. The resolution was introduced by Senators Humphrey and Javits and has the indorsement of the President and many leaders in the National Government.

According to the text of the U.N. Charter, the Court has jurisdiction over four areas. These are: (1) "the interpretation of a treaty," an example of which would be the U.N. Charter itself, including the "Universal Declaration of Human Rights" which is a part of this Charter; (2) "any question of international law," an example of which, should the reservation be repealed, might be whether the U.S. could deny admission to the country of citizens of another country; (3) "the existence of any fact which, if established, would constitute a breach of an international obligation," or, for example, whether the precedent of the U.S. foreign aid program would preclude this country's right to discontinue it; and (4) "the nature or extent of the reparation to be made for the breach of an international obligation."

The late Secretary of State John Foster Dulles always had the idea that there should first be an agreement among nations as to what laws were to be applied before the Court was given jurisdiction and thereby the right to make the law as well as to apply it. His wise counsel was largely ignored. Mr. Dulles also objected to the Court being given the right to make "advisory opinions" where no "case or controversy" existed, for this tended to constitute the judges as a "ruling body" rather than a Court.

Under the Constitution, a treaty, along with the Constitution itself, and laws made pursuant thereto, is a part of the Supreme law of the land. It is a dangerous risk to surrender jurisdiction over our international disputes to a court, which, in actuality, can make the law it applies as it goes. How much greater danger would be involved in risking to an international body the right to decide whether any question is international or internal, thereby subjecting our people to the World Court's self-made law and decision, rather than the National and State Constitutions and the laws made pursuant to them?

Sincerely,

STROM THURMOND
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Now that President Eisenhower has submitted his farm message to the Congress, the House and Senate Agriculture Committees have begun consideration of farm legislation for 1960. One of the principal farm decisions which must be made by the Congress is whether to extend eligibility for the conservation reserve (soil bank) program beyond this year.

PRESIDENT Eisenhower has asked the Congress to increase the soil bank acreage from the present 28 million acres to 60 million acres. Senator Ellender (D-La.), Chairman of the Senate Agriculture Committee, has stated that the program will be neither extended nor expanded. Congressman Harold Cooley (D-NC), Chairman of the House Agriculture Committee, has indicated that he expects the program to be extended although it may carry some other name and operate differently.

One of the principal reasons the Administration wants the program extended and expanded is to fight the mammoth wheat surplus of 1.3 billion bushels--$3.3 billion--which the Government will be holding by mid-1960. The President has suggested that wheat farmers be paid in whole or part with surplus Government-stored wheat for placing their wheat acreage in the soil bank. While an effort will be made to channel a substantial part of the authorization funds for operating the soil bank program, if it is extended, to the wheat areas, there is little question but that representatives of other farm areas will insist on having a proportionate share of the funds allocated for use in their areas.

THE HOUSE Agriculture Committee is holding hearings on general farm legislation. Among the various bills pending before that committee is a new proposal which was introduced by Congressman Poage (D-Tex.) and several others. It would provide for compensatory payments, geared to the cost-of-living index, rather than price supports, for all farm commodities except tobacco, sugar, and wool. These latter commodities are already under rigid controls. The bill would authorize each commodity group to establish voluntary marketing quotas in exchange for the compensatory payments.

Congressman John McMillan (D-SC), a ranking member of the House Agriculture Committee, has voiced doubt that a comprehensive farm bill will be passed this year. Many others hold this same view. Something will probably be done, however, to help cope with the wheat surplus, and some action will be taken one way or the other on the soil bank program. In addition, our tobacco farmers will be the beneficiaries of legislation introduced by several of us from tobacco States for the purpose of stabilizing tobacco support prices for 1960 at the 1959 level of 55.5¢ per pound for flue-cured tobacco. For the succeeding years the support price will be based on a 3-year moving average of the tobacco farmers' cost of living.

AGRICULTURE Department officials have informed me that egg, broiler, and hog prices should be better in 1960 than 1959, principally because of an expected reduction in production. These officials are fearful, however, that turkey prices may go down sharply if growers go forward with their plans to increase production by 6%.

Saturday, February 27, at 3 p.m. is precinct meeting time for South Carolina Democrats (unless some different time has been set locally). If you want to have a voice in selecting delegates to the County, State, and National political conventions you should be present for this important meeting.

Sincerely,

Strom Thurmond
BEHIND CHESSMAN

The intervention of the U.S. State Department into the Caryl Chessman plea to the Governor of California for a stay of execution carries very serious overtones which should be of concern to all Americans. It is not essentially a question of whether or not one favors capital punishment. Rather, it is a question of whether we wish our local affairs handled at the local level and whether we wish to tailor our domestic policies to suit the whims of some group of people in a distant land, such as Uruguay.

This action points up the lack of respect, even the contempt, held by many Washington bureaucrats for the rights and powers of the States. It points up further the confidence of the State Department's one-worlders in foisting their internationalist ideas on the American people.

It is not enough that we should tax our people heavily in order to give away more than $70 billion in foreign aid handouts. We must also close and/or curtail work in many of our domestic industries because our trade program has been perverted by the State Department into an instrument of foreign policy for which it was never intended by its originator, Cordell Hull. We must also disrupt domestic harmony and peace by forcibly mixing the races in our public schools against local law and sentiment so we will not offend foreigners, none of whom have been able to fashion and preserve for themselves the individual liberty which we all enjoy in America.

AT THE PRESENT time in the Senate the integrationists and the internationalists—usually one and the same—are arguing that it is vital to our foreign relations program that we approve the pending proposals which would put our Southern people in a "civil rights" strait jacket. These proposals are being particularly pushed in the Senate in this election year by our crop of Senate presidential candidates. There are only 10 of us actively fighting the "civil rights" proposals, but it is not beyond the realm of possibility that we can win if all 10 give our utmost efforts and employ every means at our command.

While we have been wrestling with the "civil rights" battle, the State Department, through the President, has sent a message to the Congress asking for another $4.2 billion to carry on the foreign give-away program. This program, now in its 13th year, shows little sign of ever ending or even tapering off in cost.

The use of our trade program to win friends abroad is placing several domestic industries and the jobs of their workers in grave peril. The most recent government figures show an alarming increase in foreign low-wage imports in the textile industry, particularly in cotton cloth, cotton apparel, and cotton yarn—so much so that we are now for the first time importing almost as much as we are exporting. Japan, once the principal rival for our domestic textile markets, has now been joined by Hong Kong, India, Formosa, Korea, Spain, France, Portugal, Germany, Austria and other countries in flooding U.S. markets, by courtesy of the State Department.

VIRTUALLY the same situation exists with regard to our plywood and shrimp industries. It is imperative that action be taken soon, either administratively or legislatively, to remove this threat by establishing a reasonable system of mandatory quotas on imports. It would also be helpful if the State Department would operate the trade program in accordance with its intended purpose—that of helping rather than destroying our domestic industries and jobs.

Sincerely,

Strom Thurmond
'Civil Rights' Fraud

MANY OF THOSE pushing for so-called civil rights legislation maintain that the issue before the Senate is merely one of protecting the "right to vote." They adroitly refer to the pending Dirksen bill as a "voting rights" bill. The idea is to convey the impression that we Southern Senators are against protecting the "right to vote."

AS A MATTER of fact, the "voting rights" provisions of the pending bill constitute only two of the seven sections in the Dirksen package. One of the two would require State and local election officials to preserve voting records for three years and make them available to the U.S. Justice Department for inspection upon demand. We have no voting deprivations to hide in South Carolina. State Attorney General Dan McLeod says we have had but one complaint in 10 years, and this one was remedied at the State level. Under no circumstances should we be forced to submit to outside interference and inspection of election records by Washington.

THE OTHER "voting rights" section sets up the procedure for court-appointed referees to oversee registration, voting, and vote counting, not only in national elections, but in State and local elections as well. Under the Constitution, the States have primary responsibility for the conduct and control of elections, particularly State and local elections. To give in on this point would be to surrender one of the few remaining vestiges of State sovereignty. It would also open the door to such widespread election frauds as occurred in the North before a similar Reconstruction law was repealed in 1894.

HERE BRIEFLY are the other provisions of this "voting rights" bill: (1) provides a fine of $10,000 or imprisonment for two years for what a judge might determine to be an attempt to obstruct a desegregation order by talking or writing a letter or editorial; (2) creates a "federal" crime for fleeing to avoid prosecution for bombing of a religious or educational building (State laws already cover bombings); (3) indorses the Supreme Court's iniquitous segregation decision, obligating State and local governments to "take steps toward the elimination of segregation in their public schools" and authorizing "federal" bribes to complying school districts; (4) authorizes reclamation of "federally" aided schools for use of children of servicemen in areas where public schools are closed to avoid integration; and (5) sets up an FEPC to control employment policies of government contractors and to set the groundwork for doing likewise in private industries not executing government contracts.

IT IS THUS easy to see the "voting rights" fraud that the "civil righters" are trying to pull on the American people and ram through our band of 18 Southern Senators. EVEN THE two sections on voting are not necessary, wise, nor in the best interest of preserving the division of powers between the National and State governments. There are already more than ample laws and court decisions to protect the privilege of voting--and it is a privilege rather than a right because in order to vote one must be qualified, else we would have imbeciles, lunatics, criminals, illiterates, non-residents, etc. determining the outcome in some elections. Our Founding Fathers, in their infinite wisdom, realized that qualifications would have to be established for voting, and they left to the States, in an effort to vest this responsibility as close to the people as possible, the right to set voter qualifications.

REGARDLESS of what compromises may be advanced in the "civil rights" extended debate--and they will come--the only complete victory I can count for the South, and ultimately the Nation, is no bill at all. Toward this end I pledge my utmost efforts.

Sincerely,

Strom Thurmond
THE SENATE'S round-the-clock sessions of extended debate over the issue of so-called civil rights has been much in the news lately, as has the move to limit debate on the issue by invoking cloture. I regret that the Senate has had to waste so much valuable time over what is simply a gigantic political farce being pushed by both major parties in an effort to win minority bloc votes in large metropolitan areas outside the South. There are many more vital and pressing matters, such as defense, space exploration, reduction of the national debt--to mention a few--which merit the attention of the Senate. We 18 Southern Senators did not ask for the marathon sessions, but since they were forced upon us the only alternatives we had were either to surrender to the innumerable obnoxious proposals, or talk.

IN THE SENATE, which is known as the greatest deliberative body in the world, a Senator has the right to talk for as long as he can physically or vocally hold the floor in representing his State until 16 of his colleagues file a cloture petition and two-thirds of those present and voting (67 if all 100 are present) vote to invoke cloture (close debate). If the necessary two-thirds majority vote is obtained, under Senate Rule 22 no Senator is permitted to speak "in all more than one hour" on any motion, amendment, or any type business pertaining to the pending matter.

ON MARCH 10 an effort was made by the most ardent "civil righters" to gag our group from further debate on the "civil rights" proposals. Fortunately, however, they were unable to muster the necessary two-thirds vote, the vote being 53-42 against cloture. Among those voting with us against cloture were Majority Leader Lyndon Johnson and Minority Leader Everett Dirksen.

THIS VOTE illustrates the great reluctance on the part of many Members of the Senate to close off debate by their colleagues because of the basic respect which many Senators have for the principle of free debate, a Senate tradition which has served our country well on numerous occasions. The mere existence of this tradition--cloture has only been invoked 4 times--has accomplished two great things for the country: First, by discouraging extreme legislation in any direction, and preventing violent swings from left to right, it promotes stability in government. Second, by giving minorities a defensive shield against tyranny, it discourages the arising of tensions and situations which could, and probably would, lead to various and frequent forms of civil strife, perhaps actual civil war.

THIS TRADITION is further proof of the infinite wisdom which our Founding Fathers demonstrated in setting up our structure of government. They had only recently freed themselves from tyranny and oppression, and they realized that tyranny in any form--whether it be by one man or an unrestrained majority--is ruthless and harsh. That is why they wrote into the Constitution in numerous places the requirement for a two-thirds--or three-fourths in some cases--rather than a simple majority vote before some types of proposed actions could become binding on all the people.

IN SETTING UP its rules of procedure, the Senate followed Thomas Jefferson's advice to protect the minority against the tyranny of the unrestrained majority. For many years there was no limitation at all on debate. In 1917, however, President Wilson, once an advocate of free debate, had his will thwarted on his armed neutrality ship bill by a vocal minority. Following this debate, Rule 22 was approved.

SINCE A DETERMINED effort is being made to apply the political whiplash against the South and our numbers are few in the Senate, we must use every means at our command to protect the interest of our people--and ultimately the interest of the Nation. This is why we elected to talk rather than to surrender to tyranny. Our decision is beginning to pay dividends, and I hope we will ultimately prevail.

Sincerely,

Strom Thurmond
THE PROONENTS of the so-called civil rights proposals before the Senate talk mostly about voting rights which are covered by the 15th Amendment. In actuality, the majority of the proposals are centered around the 14th Amendment. For instance, of the seven sections in the basic amendment which has been before the Senate, only two deal with voting; of the 22 pages in the amendment, only 5 deal with voting rights. Thus, the amendment of dubious origin—the 14th—is the true fountain of difficulty.

IN 1867, the former States of the Confederacy had re-established their State governments in pre-war form and elected Senators and Representatives to Congress. The Congress, dominated by the hate-inspired Thaddeus Stevens, refused to seat these newly-elected representatives in flagrant violation of the constitutional provisions that "no State, without its consent, shall be deprived of its equal suffrage in the Senate" and "each State shall have at least one Representative." By illegally refusing to seat these Senators and Representatives, the necessary two-thirds majority in both Houses was obtained to propose the 14th Amendment. Even this was possible only after unseating one Senator from New Jersey to reduce the membership and thereby, the required two-thirds, by one vote. This step in itself was in violation of the Constitution.

TEN SOUTHERN STATES and four others promptly rejected the amendment. This constituted a rejection by more than one-fourth of the 37 States then in the Union. The Congress then passed the Reconstruction Act, which was vetoed by President Johnson because it was patently unconstitutional. Congress overrode the veto.

THE RECONSTRUCTION ACT put the Southern States under martial law, and, by its terms, ratification of the 14th Amendment was made a condition of reinstatement to the States of statehood and representation in Congress. The Act inconsistently denied recognition to the States for the purpose of exercising any of their constitutional prerogatives, while presupposing their capacity to ratify a constitutional amendment as a State.

THE RAPE OF THE SOUTH which followed under military rule accomplished the desired farce. Puppet or quisling State governments, established by the military, went through the form of ratifying the Amendment. In Louisiana, the federal military commander had the audacity to preside over the Legislature to assure ratification. In California, the federal military commander had the audacity to refuse to ratify the Amendment. Ohio and New Jersey, who ratified the Amendment, withdrew their ratification by formal legislative act prior to the declaration of adoption by the Secretary of State. The Secretary refused to acknowledge the withdrawal.

THE SUPREME COURT has refused to decide on its validity on the ground that the question is political rather than judicial. The highest court of almost every State has decided that such a question is not political but legal.

SUCH IS THE sordid history of the "amendment" which has spawned most of the so-called civil rights proposals.
Calhoun's Doctrine Prevails

MUCH OF THE expressed animosity of the non-South press to the efforts of Southern Senators and Congressmen against anti-South legislation stems from its lack of understanding of the issues involved. The stakes are much higher than any combination of legislative proposals to which they draw the public's attention. The attack we seek to repel is aimed at the very foundation of our traditional method of government, and is an inseparable part of a general war, in which the attack on the Senate rules in 1959 was a major engagement.

WHILE THE REAL stakes usually constitute only an undercurrent in the debate on legislation, they are at times laid bare, only to suffer obscurity at the hands of closed-minded newsmen and editorialists. Possibly the clearest admission by our opponents in the current debate was in a statement by Senator Clark, (D-Pa,) who said: "...what we have done is to resurrect and to drag out... the repudiated doctrine of the concurrent majority... advocated by Senator John C. Calhoun..." He added, "We must adjust our procedures... and get back to the overall majority rule..."

CALHOUN'S DOCTRINE of the concurrent majority is more than a doctrine; it is a political fact. Despite the War between the States and Reconstruction, it is not repudiated. It is, in essence, the substance of our political system, the antithesis of majority rule, and thereby the impediment to the absolute power of the central government.

CALHOUN'S DOCTRINE is not complex, but practical, and even flexible. The U.S. is unique among nations in its tremendous diversity—a collection of many different climates, races, cultures, religions and economic interests. No one group is strong enough by itself to impose its will on the others. Each group must inevitably at some time rely on the assistance of another group for its self protection; and therefore, force and coercion, which inspire retaliation, cannot be resorted to without grave danger. Calhoun recognized that in practice, each group had an informal, highly elastic, veto of governmental action which is not just prejudicial, but absolutely abhorrent to its interest. The elasticity derives from the fact that the system is neither official nor legal, but is bounded by the objectivity and self-restraint of those who exercise it for each group. An excessive or unwarranted use or abuse of this flexible veto can result in retaliation.

PRACTICAL EXAMPLES of the doctrine's operation in contemporary politics are innumerable. A clear-cut example was Truman's nomination for Vice-President in 1944. Bronx Boss Edward J. Flynn pointed up in his memoirs that Wallace was vetoed by "businessmen and party machine organizations"; Brynes was vetoed by "Catholics, organized labor and Negroes"; Rayburn was vetoed because he came from the South; Truman, however, had the negative qualification of being abhorrent, at this time, to no group, and therefore, was the man who "would hurt least" on the ticket.

IN THE SENATE, the compromises resulting from the doctrine's operation are usually accomplished in committee. In extreme cases, however, a particular veto is exercised by means of extended debate, which can be ended only by a two-thirds vote of those present and voting under the provisions of Senate Rule XXII. It is the doctrine of the concurrent majority that makes it difficult to obtain the necessary two-thirds to end debate, for on another day the shoe might be on the other foot.

THIS DOCTRINE which prevents unrestrained, tyrannical rule by any bare majority, and which provides the essential quality of stability to our government, is the actual target of the modern self-styled "liberals." So long as the doctrine prevails, their drive for a centralized government with absolute power can, at best, make only gradual progress. This is the real issue—government in some moderation, or tyranny by a bare majority of the moment.

Sincerely,

Strom Thurmond
After 'Civil Rights', What?

SIX OF THE approximately 12 weeks that the Senate has been in session this year have been devoted to so-called "civil rights." In the other six weeks, only three major measures other than appropriation bills have been passed by the Senate, and all of these major bills are still pending in the House. They are the bill on elections, a federal aid to education program, and a resolution containing three proposed constitutional amendments—to eliminate the poll tax, to allow Governors to fill certain vacancies in the House of Representatives, and to permit the residents of the District of Columbia to vote in certain instances.

FOR THE CONTINUED operation of the government, Congress must each year pass a number of appropriation bills. The District of Columbia, Commerce, and Interior appropriations have been passed by both Houses. The Treasury-Post Office appropriation has been passed by the House. All of the major spending bills remain to be acted on.

OF THE APPROPRIATION bills yet to receive action, the Defense appropriation is by far the largest—approximately $40 billion—and, in all probability, will be the most controversial and time consuming. The magnitude and sufficiency of our defense efforts are contingent on the structure and level of this appropriation.

OTHER MEASURES which are almost sure to be considered at length include the foreign aid authorization and appropriation bills, which are annual problems. Opposition to foreign aid has increased annually since its inception 12 years ago.

ANOTHER PROPOSAL which seems to have a good probability for consideration by both bodies is that which proposes amendments to the Fair Labor Standards Act. In its present status, this bill would remove or limit 19 exemptions presently existing in the Act and raise the minimum wage from $1 to $1.25. Because of its broad scope, this measure also will be debated extensively.

OTHER BILLS for which a demand for consideration has been widely publicized include a proposal to repeal the non-communist affidavit requirement contained in the National Defense Education Act. This measure, sponsored by Senators Clark and Kennedy, is still pending in the Labor Committee to which it was recommitted last year. Another widely publicized bill is the Forand Bill pending in the House. This measure would include medical benefits for retirees under the Social Security program.

ALTHOUGH THE House Ways and Means Committee has been studying a mass of proposed amendments to the income tax law, it now appears likely that no broad program will be considered during this year.

THE NATIONAL conventions of both political parties are scheduled to meet in July. If Congress adjourns prior to the meeting of the conventions, as is expected, there remains only 14 or 15 weeks for the completion of congressional work. Congress traditionally increases the pace in the passage of legislation toward the end of the session, but even despite a probable increased rate in the passage of legislation, it seems unlikely that Congress will find the necessary time to enact very much legislation of consequence in the remaining days of the session. Since a great majority of legislation passed in recent years has been detrimental rather than desirable, the American people are indeed fortunate that the Congress will be pushed for time this year.

Sincerely,

Strom Thurmond
OUT OF THE vociferous abuse aimed at the Southern States during the so-called civil rights debate, there appears a pattern of defeat for the NAACP and its spokesmen. Their defeat was by no means due to a lack of effort, for never in legislative history have so many vicious, unconstitutional, and unconscionable proposals been pushed so hard and with such determination. The fact remains—they could not reimpose Reconstruction on the South.

MOST WANTED by the NAACP and its advocates in Congress was a proposal commonly referred to as "Part III," which was stricken from the 1957 "civil rights" bill. This proposal would allow the U.S. Attorney General to bring suits at the expense of and in the name of the U.S. for anyone who claimed his "civil rights" had been denied, thereby saving the NAACP the expense it incurs from agitating in the courts. Released from this financial limitation, the NAACP could multiply its agitation. This proposal and slight variations of it were vigorously pushed time and again and each time defeated.

ANOTHER "PET" project of the radicals was to have Congress indorse the Supreme Court's 1954 school desegregation decision. This effort failed twice, the last time by a vote of 61 to 30. This 2-1 rejection of the Court's substitution of sociology for law indicates the repulsion of the whole country for the Court's lawless desegregation decision.

A PROGRAM OF grants by the National Government to school districts which would mix the races in the schools was also repulsed. In addition, the "bribe" section was tried twice and defeated twice.

BOTH THE SENATE and House bills contained a section which would authorize the U.S. Commissioner of Education to seize schools which were closed to prevent race mixing if they had received funds from certain federal aid programs. This provision was stricken from both bills in the Senate.

AN "PFPC" proposal, which would have established a commission to force government contractors to hire without regard to race, was another example of the radicals' all-out attempt and failure.

THE CIVIL RIGHTS Commission's plan for the appointment of Federal voting registrars—and several variations of it—who would not only register voters, but would accompany them to the polls, supervise voting, and count the ballots, was also rejected on several occasions. This was an attempt to have the National Government completely take over the electoral process in the South, thereby making of the Southern States no more than "conquered provinces."

NOR WERE ALL of our successful efforts of a defensive nature. On the offensive side, a section which made a criminal offense of interfering with court orders in school desegregation cases was broadened to include interference with all court orders. Also—and this caused a real howl of panic from the radicals—a section which made a criminal offense of interstate flight to avoid prosecution for "bombing" religious or educational property was broadened to include "bombing" of any property. The Northern radicals may find these provisions extremely difficult to live with because of the racketeering in their midst.

THIS IS NOT the end of the rejected proposals. As long as the minority bloc votes constitute, or can convince politicians they constitute, the balance of power in heavily populated States, politicians will attempt legislative Lynchings of the South to incur their favor. As shown by this year's Congressional fight, all is not black yet; and as long as we keep our guard up and fight vigorously, all will not be black.

Sincerely,

Strom Thurmond
Social Security and Medical Benefits

IN EVERY ELECTION year, the Social Security law receives the attention of Congress. Actually, the Social Security program of the National Government includes a variety of programs, among which the most well known are Old Age and Survivors Insurance Benefits, Unemployment Compensation, Public Welfare, and Assistance to the Blind.

THE OLD AGE and Survivors Insurance Benefits program, which affects the most people, is financed through taxes imposed under the Federal Insurance Contributions Act. Under the terms of this Act, there are, at least nominally, three separate taxes imposed. The first tax is imposed directly on each person who works for wages and must be withheld and paid to the government by the employer. The second tax is imposed on the employer, and although paid by the employer, is carried on his books as an expense incurred for labor. It is, therefore, a part of the employee's earnings for all practical purposes except the computation of income for tax purposes. Originally these taxes were imposed on the first $3,000 of wages, but this was raised later to $3,600 and now stands at $4,800. For 1959, the tax on employees and the tax on employers were each 2 1/2%; they are each now 3%, and they rise progressively until 1968, when the rate for each will go to 4 1/2%. The third tax is imposed on persons who are self-employed, and now stands at 4 1/2% of the first $4,800 of earnings, and this rate increases progressively to 6 3/4% in 1968.

EACH TIME the benefits of the program are increased, the rates must be increased to a proportion larger than the increase in benefits, for invariably the increased benefits are extended not only to active participants, but also to those already eligible to receive benefits and who are, therefore, no longer paying premiums.

THE PROGRAM has proved inadequate as a basis for retirement income for elderly and retired people, largely due to the inflationary spiral or cost of living increases we have experienced in the last two decades. At the head of the list of things which are beyond the reach of the benefits received by retirees is medical service, which has more to offer than ever before, but like everything else, at a higher cost. The problem now facing the Congress is how to deal with this problem. The problem is recognized universally as one that cries for a solution, but on the method of approach there are great and basic differences.

THE MOST PUBLICIZED proposal calls for the inclusion of medical services payments in the Old Age and Survivors Benefits. This would involve either a direct increase in tax rates which are already burdensome to the point where they are prohibitive, and/or a raise indirectly by increasing the base wages against which the taxes are applied. This approach does not face up to the basic difficulty, which is inflation. Inflation can be checked by a decrease in spending by governments, particularly the National Government. This unfortunately, appears more difficult as an approach for legislators, and apparently has little chance of prevailing.

ONE SUGGESTION which appears to have merit involves a change in the income tax law. At present, if a child or children of an aged parent or relative contribute to the medical expenses of the aged parent or relative, they can only deduct the amount of the medical expense they contributed which exceeds 3% of their gross income. Assistance with payments for medical services by children for their aged parents and relatives would be greatly encouraged if the entirety of their contributions could be deducted, just as it could be deducted by the person over 65 if paid by him.

Sincerely,

Strom Thurmond
THE VETO POWER

The power of limited veto granted by the Constitution to the President of the United States is a vital part of the system of checks and balances among the three coordinate branches of our National Government. In the hands of some Chief Executives it has enjoyed frequent and effective use; others have employed it not at all.

In the course of American history, from 1789 through April 19, 1960, the veto has been invoked 2,171 times. This figure includes both regular vetoes and pocket vetoes (refusal to sign within the final 10 days of a session) against both public and private bills. The potency of this Executive power is abundantly evident from the fact that on only 72 occasions has Congress overridden a veto by the necessary 2/3 vote of both houses.

The extent to which the veto power has been used has varied greatly among the 33 men who have served as President. Eight Presidents—both Adamses, Jefferson, Van Buren, Harrison, Taylor, Fillmore, and Garfield—never used the veto at all. At the other extreme were Cleveland, who vetoed 584 measures, and Franklin D. Roosevelt, who used this power 631 times. President Eisenhower, who has vetoed 160 bills, has probably been overridden by the Congress least of all. He has lost on one veto, that coming on a public works appropriation bill which he had already twice vetoed and which had been reduced to meet some of his objections.

Between now and the first part of July, when the Congress is expected to adjourn, I hope President Eisenhower will use the veto power or the threat of this power to hold the line on Congressional spending forays. I also hope he will use it this election year, to prevent enactment into law of radical and politically-inspired programs which would foster socialism and the growth and power of the National Government. Last year he effectively utilized this power in fighting successfully for a budget of balanced proportions.

On the spending (appropriation) bills, I would go one step further and give to him or any other President the power to veto any specific items within such bills in the interest of eliminating waste, extravagance, and pork barrel expenditures. At present, the President must veto an entire appropriation bill—the largest involving more than $40 billion—in order to knock out pork barrel items. In other words, in place of the scalpel to do the necessary pruning, the President is forced to use the meat ax or swallow all the pork barrel items.

At present 42 of the 50 States have given their Governors the item veto power, and no State which has ever extended this power has subsequently withdrawn it. I had this authority when I was Governor and found it to be a very effective instrument for weeding out waste and extravagance.

Although the power of item veto has been proposed for years, the Congress has never moved to relinquish its right to pad appropriation bills through submission to the States of an amendment to the Constitution. Congress will never make such a move until the people demand that the President be given the power of item veto. This is a reform proposal which is long overdue, which could be of much benefit to the taxpayers, and which would make a substantial contribution to national fiscal responsibility.

Sincerely,

Strom Thurmond
The Chicken or the Egg?

THE PRESSURES FOR SPENDING by the National Government increase annually. In 1958, an all-time record high of peacetime spending was made. The $80.69 billion spent that year resulted also in a record shattering peacetime deficit of $12.42 billion, and put a severe strain on the Treasury's borrowing ability. Public reaction to this spending orgy caused a mild braking action to be applied last year and spending was held to $78.38 billion with the Government operating in the black by a narrow margin.

THIS YEAR the President's budget calls for expenditures of $79.81 billion, an increase of $1.4 billion over last year. The Administration estimates that receipts will increase by $3.4 billion. The fact that this is a Presidential election year, coupled with the bait of an estimated surplus, gives added impetus to the pressure for increased spending.

THE FOLLOWING TABLE gives some indication of how both National and State revenues and expenditures have increased in the post war years. Gross National Product figures are included for comparison.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM</th>
<th>1946 (IN BILLIONS)</th>
<th>1959 (IN BILLIONS)</th>
<th>% INCREASE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gross National Product (constant $)</td>
<td>316.0</td>
<td>478.8</td>
<td>51.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Receipts, Nat'l. Gov't.</td>
<td>38.568</td>
<td>73.282</td>
<td>90.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expenditures, Nat'l. Gov't.</td>
<td>41.080</td>
<td>80.322</td>
<td>95.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Receipts, State Gov'ts.</td>
<td>12.357</td>
<td>41.219*</td>
<td>233.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expenditures, State Gov'ts.</td>
<td>11.028</td>
<td>44.815*</td>
<td>306.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*1958 expenditures used are latest figures available

IT IS APPARENT that both receipts (or taxes) and expenditures, at both State and National levels, are too high and are increasing out of proportion to gross national product. The question is—how to reverse the trend and return to a sound fiscal program? With taxes at a fixed rate, receipts will increase with national product. Experience proves, however, that lower tax rates are the best stimulus for GNP. For example, the largest increase in GNP (8%) in peacetime followed the tax reduction in 1954.

THE USUAL APPROACH to economy is to attempt to reduce expenses in order to be able to reduce taxes. So far, as the table shows, this approach has been notably unsuccessful.

PROFESSOR C. NORTHCOTE PARKINSON, a noted political scientist at the University of Illinois, in his recent book The Law and the Profits raised the pertinent question which might be phrased—which came first, the chicken or the egg? In the book, Prof. Parkinson expounds and explains his second law of political science—"expenditures rise to meet income." If this be true, the correct approach is to reduce taxes so that expenditures must follow to the extent that additional revenues from the resulting increase in GNP do not make up the difference.

THIS APPROACH has been adopted in the Herlong-Baker bills in the House. These bills would reduce taxes gradually and systematically over a five-year period. The scheduled reductions could be postponed for one year only if it appeared that an operating deficit was imminent (or in the event of war).

CONGRESS WOULD be highly reluctant to spend itself into a deficit if it meant a scheduled tax reduction would thereby be postponed, for the wrath of the aroused public would be vent on the Representatives and Senators. This "new approach" lends itself to reason, and should be given serious consideration by Congress. Perhaps we've had the cart before the horse all this time.

Sincerely,

Strom Thurmond
Election-Year Paternalism

The philosophy which apparently guides the action of a surprising number of persons in the policy-making level of the National Government could well be described as the “Uncle Sam can fix it” attitude. No matter what problem arises in our society, whether it be economic, moral, social or political in nature, there are those who will surely insist that the matter cannot be solved without injecting the National Government into the picture.

This is especially true in an election year such as 1960 when constructive legislative efforts have given way to attempts to create political lures for votes. Problems which don’t even exist are “created” so that solutions through the National Government can be proposed to prove the politician’s concern for the public’s welfare. Even legitimate issues are exaggerated and magnified out of proportion. Realism is rare in an election year.

One of the best illustrations that the source of deception lies in the minds and actions of the politicians, rather than the people, is the "Emergency Home Ownership Act" passed by the House on April 23. If ever there was a fabrication of a political bait out of thin air, this is it.

In the first place there is no emergency with respect to housing. In 1959, there were 1,341,500 units of private housing started. This was only 11,000 units under the all-time record in 1950. In terms of dollar volume, the $22.3 billion of new housing construction in 1959 topped the $14.1 billion of record-year 1950 by 58%, and exceeded the record dollar volume year of 1955 by 20%. In addition, new housing construction is only a part of the picture, for purchases of existing homes and remodeling have increased steadily in recent years as a percentage of total housing activity. Even were there to be a realization of the most pessimistic forecast of a 10% to 12% decline in new housing starts in 1960, activity in the housing field would still operate at an extremely healthy level. A new record cannot be set every year.

In the face of these facts, the proponents of this bill are attempting to create the false impression that an “emergency” exists in the housing field. As their remedy, they would authorize and direct the Federal National Mortgage Association to borrow $1 billion from the U. S. Treasury and purchase FHA and VA mortgages at par.

In the first place, this is another backdoor raid on the Treasury, and another attempt to bypass the appropriations procedure. In the second place, if there were an emergency—and there is not—this approach would not help the situation. The same device in the same amount was used in 1958. The mortgages sold to FNMA through December of 1958 under this program represented only 8,602 new starts, only 8/10 of one per cent of housing starts in 1958.

The balley-hoo about housing is intended to deceive the public on two scores: first, that there is a housing emergency, when in fact there is not; second, that this $1 billion program would cure the non-existent emergency, which it would not, even if one existed. It is a patent attempt at deception, designed to lure the votes of the public for politicians who would have the people believe that the National Government can be all things to all people, and provide cradle-to-grave security and tranquility.

Sincerely,

[signature]
"IF THERE ARE still those in the free world who believe that the enemy can be moved by logic, or that he is susceptible to moral appeal, or that he is willing to act in good faith, those remaining few should disabuse themselves of that notion. Our one serious mistake during the negotiations was in assuming, or even hoping, that the enemy was capable of acting in good faith. Future textbooks can set down the maxim that the speed with which agreement is reached with the Communists varies directly as the military pressure applied; and that the worth of any agreement is in proportion to the military pressure you are able and willing to apply to enforce it."

THESE ARE the words of Admiral Charles Turner Joy who learned the hard way about negotiating with Communists at the peace table at Panmunjom, Korea. These ominous words of caution stand as only one of many reminders of what should be the hard, cold fact that we cannot expect to negotiate with the Communists and gain anything more than a black eye.

WE HAVE HAD many sad experiences as a result of many of the World War II and post-war 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 agreements, the Communists have broken 50 of them in accordance with Lenin's teaching that "promises are like pie-crusts--made to be broken."

THIS IS BUT a small part of the case against trying to negotiate agreements with the Communists at a summit meeting or elsewhere. If we want to just talk or show them our strength and demonstrate our firmness, that is another matter--just so long as we do not enter into any agreements with any naive notion that they will be lived up to on the other side.

THESE FEW FACTS I have cited also give ample evidence of the importance of keeping well posted on Communist intentions and aggressive capabilities by almost any means deemed advisable by our leaders charged with the vital responsibility of maintaining our national security. It should be most reassuring to the American public to know that our country is not relying on Communist lies, deceptions, and exaggerations as to what is going on behind the Iron Curtain in devising our strategy and strength for national defense purposes.

THERE CAN BE no question but that our government agreed to a summit conference with reluctance, to pacify our allies who have been conditioned to the top level meeting by a constant rattling of arms by Mr. Khrushchev, and their fear of war as a result of an "incident."

THE FACT THAT continued reconnaissance flights over Russia have been made by U. S. planes for several years without provoking an attack by the Communists, illustrates that the Russians also know the dangers of starting the shooting, contrary to what the summit boosters would have us and our allies believe.

IN ADDITION, our ability to successfully accomplish the flights should reaffirm confidence in our own strategic Air Force, for if reconnaissance planes can make regular runs over the Russians several years before they can shoot down the first one--if indeed they did shoot it down--it is reasonable to assume our bombers could still make delivery without prohibitive losses. Although we should continue to seek realistic methods to accomplish a peaceful solution to the conflict with Communism, we should also recall that our allies and the other small nations of the world still must depend for their continued existence on the strength of the United States. Our reconnaissance flights will immensely increase in the eyes of the world the appreciation of the ability of the U. S. to protect itself and its allies.

Sincerely,

[Signature]
Cold War Has Many Sides

May 23, 1960

THE "SUMMIT FIASCO" should prove once and for all to even the most idealistic wishful-thinker that the Communists never had any intention of negotiating in good faith. The Soviet foreign policy is designed solely to advance their basic aim--communication of the entire world. Once again the cold war is out in the open.

OUR ARMED STRENGTH is the cornerstone of any realistic hope for a peaceful victory against the Russian menace, so we must maintain a strong defense force.

IT IS EQUALLY IMPORTANT, however, for America to be conscious that the "cold war," whatever its relative temperature at a given moment, is also a "total war." Deterred from aggression by military means, the Communists will concentrate on propaganda and economic warfare. Khrushchev's propaganda sword has lost much of its keenness, more from excessive use than from any "expertise" at parries and counterblows on our part.

ON THE ECONOMIC FRONT it is essential that we now concentrate for a renewed effort. Despite unsound policies of government interference and hamstringing, our domestic productive capacity continues to grow. Public demands for fiscal responsibility by the National Government inspire hope for an even more vigorous growth. There is another factor, however, which bears heavily on our economic strength, and on which we have been far too self-satisfied in our approach. This factor is the foreign trade of the United States.

HISTORICALLY, the United States has been a leader in world trade, and is still far and away the world's largest supplier. Last year's foreign sales of $16.2 billion was more than half again as much as our nearest competitor. This is scant cause for satisfaction, however, for sales in 1959 showed no increase over 1958, and a 2% drop from 1957. Between 1956 and 1959, international sales of the U.S. dropped 7.4%. This was during a period of unprecedented economic expansion in the Western world, when many new markets were opening up. For instance, during the same period, exports from West Germany increased 33.2%; France, 23.6%; Japan, 38.2% and even the lesser industrialized Italy increased exports by 34.4%.

EVEN WORSE, our imports rose rapidly. We have traditionally enjoyed a substantial margin of exports over imports, but by the end of 1959 our world trade surplus was down to $0.9 billion, 71% below the average annual surplus in the fifties. To make it worse, in 1959, about $1.5 billion of our exports were purchased with our foreign aid funds, which partially accounts for our deficit in balance of payments.

INCREASINGLY, our domestic manufacturers have been encouraged to build plants abroad to compete with foreign goods. This is not helpful to our trade picture, but harmful. Increased exports mean more jobs for Americans, but foreign manufactured goods make fewer jobs for Americans, no matter who finances the production.

A THOROUGH STUDY of our foreign trade now in progress by the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, of which I am a member, has revealed that our declining trade posture is not due entirely to our higher costs of production. One drawback is the lackadaisical attitude of the State Department toward our commercial efforts, resulting in slow, low-priority treatment of trade matters through our embassies overseas. Another drawback is our failure to develop a system of financing export sales that will enable our domestic producers to compete throughout the world on credit terms. We must also insure that our trade agreements are "reciprocal" in practice, by requiring other countries to abolish discriminatory trade barriers against our goods.

STRONG ARMED FORCES are the cornerstone of our defenses, but the cornerstone must be laid on the foundation of a healthy and vigorous economy.

Sincerely,

Strom Thurmond
The Rush to Adjourn

The 86th Congress is now heading into its final stages, with only a little over five weeks remaining before the Congress must adjourn in time for the first of the two major political conventions, which begins July 11. To finish by that time will require many long sessions and much hard work.

In a time of legislative haste, as we will be facing in the coming weeks, there is special need for careful study and consideration of all aspects of the various legislative proposals advanced for passage. This is when the "sleepers" are pulled out for hasty action, and the old adage about "haste making waste" rings truer than ever.

I am glad that the Senate has disposed of the depressed areas bill before the rush period. Last week the Senate refused to override the President's veto of this political, socialistic, and costly legislation which seeks to substitute federal aid handouts for the three primary requisites for creating a favorable industrial atmosphere: capital, business judgment, and a market for the product produced. There may be an attempt to revive the legislation in a more limited form, but I hope not.

The Senate has also recently passed another appropriation bill, this one to operate the Agriculture Department for fiscal year 1961. Included in the bill, which is now in a joint conference committee, is $675,000 to be added to the $1 million approved last year in the new research drive to find ways to stamp out the boll weevil's annual cotton crop damage of $350 million. Some of the other appropriation bills have already passed both houses, but a few more are awaiting House action, while several more must be acted on by the Senate. Among those still pending, the most controversial and costly will be the defense, foreign aid, and public works appropriation bills.

Senator Kennedy is back from the primary campaign trails, and now he will be trying to obtain Senate action on his bill to expand coverage and increase the minimum wage under the Fair Labor Standards Act. He is also expected to devote his efforts toward winning passage of his bill to repeal the loyalty oath requirements of the National Defense Education Act of 1958. That bill came up last year, and we opponents of the bill were able to get it recommitted to committee by a narrow margin.

Now that both houses have passed federal aid to education bills, with only conference committee action and ratification of that action by both bodies remaining, I hope the President will veto the final version. If he does, I am confident that there are sufficient votes in the Senate and the House to prevent his veto from being overridden. Otherwise, the advocates of complete federal usurpation of the field of education will have won a gigantic victory at the expense of both education and local self-government.

During these final weeks, the Secretary of the Treasury will be trying to get the national debt limit raised to enable the Government to pay its bills, and he will also be prodding the Congress to give him more flexibility in the interest rates the Government pays to borrow money. Some of the other principal legislative items which may consume much time in consideration are the following: some form of medical aid for the elderly, legislation to extend the deadline for VA housing eligibility, an omnibus housing bill, legislation to increase the pay for federal employees, a tax bill, and some type farm legislation.

Sincerely,

Strom Thurmond
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Loyalty and Academic Freedom

IN 1958, the proponents of "Federal Aid to Education," thwarted in their attempts to completely hand over the field of education to the National Government, used the general concern over the first Sputnik to obtain enactment of an aid to education bill called "The National Defense Education Act." Although the relation between this Act and national defense is nebulous, if not entirely non-existent, the "Defense" angle was played to the hilt in obtaining its passage.

ONE OF THE FEW limitations in the bill provides that no funds under the Act shall be paid to any individual unless he has executed and filed with the Commissioner of Education a loyalty oath and an affidavit that he does not believe in overthrow of the Government by force or illegal methods, and is not a member of an organization teaching such principles.

ALTHOUGH THE LOYALTY oath and non-Communist affidavit provisions appeared to be of no concern during the lengthy debates on the bill in both houses of Congress, they have been the subject of most vociferous abuse since passage. Eight colleges refused to participate in the program, and 18 withdrew from the student loan program, because they considered the loyalty and affidavit requirements "offensive" to academic freedom. The presidents, boards, or faculties of a number of other colleges have joined in the clamor against these requirements.

IN 1959, Senator Kennedy's bill to repeal the loyalty oath and non-Communist affidavit provisions was sent back to the Labor Committee by the narrow margin of one vote after vigorous debate on the Senate floor.

THIS YEAR another bill, to repeal only the non-Communist affidavit requirement, is now pending on the calendar.

THE PRINCIPAL REASONS given for repeal of the non-Communist affidavit requirement are hinged on the allegation that "students" are being discriminated against and "academic freedom" denied because this particular group is singled out for such an affidavit execution. Even were this the only instance where civilians were required to execute the disclaimer, there is a very cogent reason for its application to this group. The grants and loans authorized for this program are not for the purpose of generally aiding education, according to the statement of purpose in the Act, and according to those who supported the bill in the first place--and they are largely the same group who now object to the non-Communist affidavit. The only justification for passage of the Act, from either a constitutional or a practical aspect, by those who voted for its passage, was its contribution to our defense effort. The very fact that this is a defense program justifies the requirement that recipients of the tax funds execute a non-Communist affidavit.

AS A MATTER OF FACT, this is not the only imposition of the requirement. Over 10 years ago such a provision was included in the National Science Foundation Act. There was such a disclaimer requirement in the 1947 Taft-Hartley Act, and it remained in force until last year when it was replaced by something even stronger--a criminal statute. Government employees by the thousands, uniformed and civilians, (including my staff) have executed such a disclaimer.

NO ONE IS REQUIRED to execute the non-Communist affidavit, for participation in the program is voluntary. Although the Act sails under the flag of defense, there is no "draft provision" and no compulsion.

IF ONE IS PATRIOTIC enough to voluntarily participate in a defense program, he should have no qualms about signing a disclaimer as to Communist beliefs and membership in Communist organizations. The investment of tax funds in the education of those who are reluctant to execute such an affidavit would be a highly "speculative" investment from a defense standpoint.

Sincerely,

Strom Thurmond
The Invisible Tax

INFLATION IS A TERM we hear much about, but one that doesn't seem to concern our people nearly as much as it should. It means simply that we pay more for items we buy—in other words, our dollar buys less and less as the cost of living rises. The cost of living has been moving upward almost steadily in recent years, so much so that the good old 1939 dollar is today worth only 47.1 cents.

GENERALLY, INFLATION creeps up on the public and gradually erodes purchasing power over a period of time. It is felt at the cash register when we pay one cent more for a commodity, but only negligibly so at each price rise unless, of course, prices jump radically as they did from 1941 to 1942 and from 1946 to 1947, when the consumer price index increased by 10.8 per cent and 14.5 per cent, respectively. In both periods, the purchasing power of the dollar dropped more than nine cents.

THE EFFECTS OF INFLATION are manifold. It serves as an invisible tax which affects everyone, particularly those who are less able to bear the extra costs involved. The inflationary tax does not work on the principle of the graduated income tax. It hits everyone equally, having an especially hard impact on fixed income groups who have only a certain amount to spend on the essentials of life.

IN ADDITION TO ROBBING fixed income groups, inflation has its adverse effects on retirees and holders of savings deposits, bonds, and insurance policies. Then there are our farmers, who have probably felt the effects of inflation more than any other group, since they have been forced to receive less for their products yet pay more for the implements and commodities they must buy. Inflation also deters industrial expansion, causes increased government spending, higher personal and public debts, and more taxes. If carried far enough, inflation can result in the collapse of our national financial structure. History has shown us the ruinous course of inflation within the memory of the present generation—such as the German, Austrian, and French inflationary spirals of the early twenties and the price spirals in South America and elsewhere which are taking their toll today before our eyes. In fact, inflation in Germany made it possible for Hitler to take over, just as inflation in Hungary paved the way for Communist domination of that country of freedom fighters.

INFLATION CAN BE CAUSED by a number of factors. One is excessive wage demands that are not justified by increases in productivity. This must be controlled by the good judgment of both labor and management. Another primary cause of inflation is deficit financing by government—that is, spending more money than the Treasury takes in.

GOVERNMENT SPENDING is one inflationary cause which we in the Congress can do something about. I have been doing my best to bring a halt to wild spending for non-essential programs, and there have been others who have also fought hard to arrest this federal "spenditis" disease. We have been outnumbered, however, and we need the support of the people to reverse the trend toward deficit financing, unbalanced budgets, and an ever-rising national debt of $290 billion, which, together with future obligations and c.o.d.'s amount to a 750 billion-dollar mortgage on our posterity.

INFLATION, AND ITS COMPANION, the huge national debt, are major national problems which affect everyone's pocketbook and posterity. To bring them both under control will require individual effort and interest on the part of all Americans.

Sincerely,

Strom Thurmond
Deception in Slogans

THE HISTORY OF SLOGANS almost exactly parallels the history of advertising. In present day usage, no other gimmick is a better and more used seller than the descriptive or catch-word slogan. Admittedly, the emotional or intellectual appeal of a slogan is illusive, but it undeniably exists.

THE SLOGANIZING of legislative issues is a relatively new development. Even major legislation in the Congress, prior to the advent of radio and television, was known for the most part to the public at large after its passage. In post-war years, however, with the development of rapid communications and news media, the public has followed closely even some of the less important legislation before the Congress. Since legislation has become a matter that is "advertised," it too has come, in many cases, to turn on slogans.

AN EXAMPLE OF THE DECEPTIVENESS of the slogans on legislative issues is one characterized by the phrase "closing tax loopholes." From time to time there does develop, either through an oversight by the Congress in the passage of the act, or through court decisions construing the act, unintended and unjust results. Unfortunately, however, the phrase "loophole" is not so restricted in its use, and is deceptively used to describe an intentional and purposeful feature of the tax law.

A MAJOR EXAMPLE of the deception which arises from the use of the term, "tax loophole," is that of the tax dividend credit and exclusion. In 1954, when the Internal Revenue Code was revised, a provision was written into the law which provides that the first $50 of dividends received by any individual is excludable from taxable income and, therefore, not taxable. In addition, a credit is allowed equal to 4% of the remaining dividend income received, subject to certain limitations.

SINCE DIVIDEND INCOME is the only type of income which receives such treatment, those who object to the purpose of this provision, or wish to make an appeal for votes of the general public in the full knowledge that those who receive dividend incomes are unorganized, characterize their efforts to repeal the provision as one to "close a tax loophole." The use of "tax loophole" in this connection is completely deceptive, for the dividend tax credit and exclusion is not a loophole. It was intentionally enacted for two reasons.

THE FIRST REASON was to promote the investment of private savings in free enterprise ventures to provide additional jobs for our growing population. In most industries, an investment of thousands of dollars is required to provide a job for one person. This money can come only from private sources, and individual savings are the largest single source of these funds.

THE SECOND REASON LIES in the very nature of the tax treatment of income received from dividends. Dividends, by their definition, are paid by private corporations from the profits of the business which they conduct. The profits of the corporation, however, are taxed prior to the payment of dividends, usually at a flat rate of 52%. When the dividends are paid to the stockholders, who have invested their money in the corporation for its operation, the individual must pay personal income tax on these funds. It is apparent, therefore, that the income, on which this so-called "favorable treatment" is given, has already been taxed once before the imposition of the tax on which the credit and exclusion is given.

WE ARE ALL AWARE that all is not gold that glitters, and we should be equally aware that every tax treatment called a "loophole" is not a giveaway.

GRATITUDE

I am very grateful to the people of South Carolina for the magnificent vote of confidence given me in the June 14 primary election. I shall continue to give my best efforts to my duties in the Senate and my responsibilities to our people in order to fulfill to the utmost the great confidence placed in me.

Sincerely,

Strom Thurmond
ONE OF THE IMPORTANT responsibilities placed upon the United States Senate by the Founding Fathers is found in Article II, Section 2 of the Constitution. This is the section which gives the President power to enter into treaties with foreign countries, "by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, provided two-thirds of the senators present concur." This is a very important responsibility because treaties, when ratified by the Senate, become just as much a part of the "supreme law of the land" as is the Constitution and the laws made in pursuance thereof.

DURING THE PAST WEEK, the Congress was called upon to ratify the new treaty between the United States and Japan. This treaty, as proposed, caused me much grave concern. I had certain reservations about some of its provisions, but I felt that in view of the serious world conditions we are facing today it was imperative that the Senate ratify this treaty and do so by an overwhelming vote. This the Senate did, by a vote of 90-2.

THERE WERE TWO compelling reasons in favor of ratification. First, the Communists in Japan have been leading riots against ratification of the treaty by the Japanese Government, evidently because of the feeling that ratification would be in the best interest of their goal of communization of the world. If the U.S. Senate had refused to ratify the treaty at this critical time, such action would have played directly into the hands of the Communists, by insuring without question not only the downfall of Mr. Kishi but of the entire present Japanese Government, which is friendly to us. This would result in increased strength and prestige for the radical and riotous elements in Japan to the detriment of the overwhelming majority of the Japanese people, our own country, and the rest of the people in the free world.

SECOND, THIS TREATY serves notice on Mr. Khrushchev and his Communist cohorts that the armed might of the United States stands firmly behind the Japanese people against Communist attack. The Senate's refusal to ratify the treaty would have been an open invitation to the Soviets to gobble up Japan, as they have so many other countries before and since World War II. Japan is without question the key to the Far East. Should it fall to Communist domination, there would only be a brief period of time before all of Korea, Formosa, and other vital areas in the Far East, as well as in Southeast Asia, with its heavy population and great natural resources, would likewise topple into the Communist column.

I VOTED FOR THE TREATY realizing that it was by no means a perfect one. Under the circumstances, however, there was no alternative but to support ratification, despite the serious reservations which I had as to some of its provisions.

Sincerely,

Strom Thurmond
Defense and Secondary Boycotts

THE AWESOME DANGERS of a gigantic, sprawling National Government are many and grave, and not the least of them is the difficulty of co-ordinating the different fields of activity to which the Government is committed.

IN 1959, in direct response to widespread and vocal public demand, Congress passed a labor reform bill, one of its major purposes being the prohibition of secondary boycotts. A strike accompanied by a picket line is an economic weapon, the use of which against an employer in a legitimate dispute has always been recognized and permitted by law. This is a "primary boycott," and it is against this use of picketing that the 1959 act is applicable.

THE USE OF A PICKET line to effect a secondary boycott occurs frequently on construction sites. On most large construction jobs, there is one or more "prime" contracts, and also any number of subcontracts for specialized work, such as plumbing, cement finishing, electrical work, roofing, etc. When a contractor or subcontractor has a dispute with his own employees, and those employees establish a picket line on the entire construction job, a secondary boycott usually results; for the employees of the remaining contractors and subcontractors refuse to cross the picket line, and thereby, an economic sanction is applied to parties who are not involved in the dispute.

AT THE PRESENT TIME, most types of "common situs" picketing are prohibited by law. A bill introduced by Senator Kennedy, now being considered by the Senate Labor Committee, would legalize such "common situs" picketing, and, thereby, a wide variety of secondary boycotts.

ON THE FACE OF IT, the issue raised by the common situs picketing bill would appear to be largely confined to the labor-management relations field. Upon examination, however, the heaviest impact of this bill would fall on our national defense effort. The defense establishment is at present engaging in continuous construction of missile testing facilities and launching sites throughout the country. Repeatedly, these missile sites and test facilities have been completely closed down by "common situs" picketing. Among those that have been affected are Redstone Arsenal in Alabama, Cape Canaveral in Florida, and Atlas and Titan sites in Kansas and Wyoming. In almost every instance, applications to the National Labor Relations Board or to the court have, by injunction, brought an end to the picketing. Should the common situs picketing bill be enacted, these work stoppages could not be ended since they would be legal.

THE COST OF DEFENSE CONSTRUCTION would also be drastically increased in addition to being delayed. Contractors will have to increase their bids to cover possible work stoppages over which they have no control.

IT IS A PARADOX that while some machinery of Congress is operating in an effort to reduce excessive costs of defense and to speed up our effort, other Congressional machinery is building roadblocks that will have the opposite effect. We will attempt to defeat this bill, but the very bigness of the National Government insures that situations of this type will recur time and again, and many of them may well not be discovered in time.

Sincerely,

Strom Thurmond
NOW THAT THE CONGRESS has recessed--the Senate until August 8 and the House until August 15--the attention of the country is being focused on the Democratic National Convention and the upcoming Republican National Convention. When the Congress reconvenes, both national party tickets will have been selected, and the presidential battle will shift from the conventions to the Congress, particularly the Senate floor. The recess left several major pieces of legislation stranded without final action, some of them in Congressman Howard Smith's Rules Committee, a valuable stumbling block for unconstitutional, socialistic, and extravagant legislative ideas.

BILLS IN THE STRANDED category are federal aid for school construction, housing, minimum wage, foreign aid, federal aid to combat juvenile delinquency, medical aid to the elderly either through subsidy or additional Social Security taxes, and the Jenkins-Keogh bill.

ALL OF THESE BILLS except the Jenkins-Keogh bill, which would permit self-employed individuals to set aside a limited portion of their earnings for retirement purposes without being taxed, are on the "must" lists of the political leaders of both major parties because they are considered to be vote-getting items.

MY MAIL REFLECTS very little South Carolina sentiment for any of this legislation except the Jenkins-Keogh bill. Some do favor the minimum wage and medical aid bills, but most of my mail on these subjects is against enactment of both proposals.

I VOTED AGAINST RECESSING the Congress until August because I could foresee a hectic session which would find both parties trying to out-vie each other in favoring unnecessary and/or costly programs. Had we adjourned sine die on July 9, it is doubtful that many of the bills which will be approved in August would have received final action. This would have closed out the 86th Congress, and all unattended legislation would have been forced to start all over again in the 87th Congress, which begins next January.

FROM LAST JANUARY 6 until June 30, three days before the Congress recessed, the Senate was in floor session for 936 hours and 19 minutes, more than twice the time for the House. These figures do not include many more hours of committee meetings, where most of the real spade work was done on the 761 measures approved by the Senate through June 30. Aside from the appropriations bills, the Cuban sugar bill, and the "civil rights" bill, very little of the legislation enacted into law by the Congress during this period was of a significant nature. Much time was spent in protracted debate over the "civil rights" bill, listening to miscellaneous speeches--many of a partisan nature--and acting on nominations and treaties. In fact, I believe that the Senate made more legislative progress in the final two weeks prior to the recess than in the preceding 23 weeks. A final evaluation, however, of the merits and demerits of the 2nd Session of the 86th Congress will have to await action on the pending proposals in either August or September.

IN MY NEXT REPORT, which will be on August 8, I will discuss my many objections to ratification of the Antarctic Treaty, the first order of Senate business in August.

Sincerely,

[Signature]
ONE OF THE LEAST publicized, but most important, matters now pending in the Senate is the proposed treaty on the Antarctic. This treaty, proposed by the United States, was signed in Washington on December 1, 1959, by the U.S., Great Britain, Russia and nine other countries. It is not now binding on our country or any other and cannot have the force and effect of a treaty until it is ratified by the Senate.

THE TREATY PROVIDES that the Antarctic shall be used for peaceful purposes only; calls for freedom of scientific investigation; bans military bases and nuclear tests in the area, with the right of unilateral inspections; freezes claims and rights to claims of sovereignty at their present status, without any provision for the recognition of claims of one contracting party by the others; and rules out any new claim or enlargement of an existing claim for the 30-year period of the treaty.

FROM A SUPERFICIAL appraisal, the treaty may sound innocent enough. Under careful analysis, it is at best a tool of appeasement; at worst, an unconditional surrender.

THE ANTARCTIC is a vast area—as large as the United States and Europe combined. It has untold mineral resources that will someday be tapped. It is strategically located within easy reach of three continents, Australia, Africa and South America.

BY ALL THE STANDARDS that commonly apply, the United States has the superior basis for claims to the better part of the Antarctic Continent. Probably the first man ever to see the Antarctic Continent was an American sealing captain, Nathaniel Brown Palmer, around 1830. In 1839, a U.S. Naval officer, Captain Charles Wilkes, first proved the existence of Antarctica by sailing thousands of miles along its coast, and making drawings of the coast as he went. Although Captain Wilkes' reports and drawings were ridiculed at the time, and Captain Wilkes himself was court-martialed upon his return, recent explorations have conclusively proved his drawings correct. Essentially, however, the explorations of the Antarctic stem from the efforts of one great American—Admiral Richard E. Byrd. He was responsible for the exploration of more than one million square miles of the Antarctic Continent. It was his example that inspired other Americans, such as Lincoln Ellsworth and Captain Finn Ronne, to continue his exploratory work.

FOR SOME UNKNOWN REASON, the United States has never asserted any claims in Antarctica. The proposed treaty would renounce the right to assert our claims for 30 years, assuring that they could never be recognized, for it is an historical fact that such claims grow increasingly more feeble with age.

RUSSIA, PRIOR TO LAST YEAR, had no basis for claims in Antarctica whatsoever; and if any now exist because of the Soviet Union's activities there during the International Geophysical Year, they are slight in consequence.

THE SOVIET UNION is greedily anticipating the ratification of the treaty by the Senate, for it is an all-to-gain, nothing-to-lose matter for them. None of Russia's satellites are parties to the treaty, so Russia is free to do through them what the treaty would prohibit by Russia in her own name. The Soviet's record of breaking 50 of 52 major treaties since World War II would be sufficient ground to avoid such a treaty, even were the treaty to call for the relinquishment of something of value by the Communists. As it is, it will be a tragedy for the United States to consent to such a giveaway.
WHAT HAS BEEN appropriately called the "bob-tailed" session of the Congress is now in full swing with the Senate meeting early in the day and staying until late at night. The air is already proving to be supercharged with presidential campaign politics, as is evident from the brief-lived flurry over "civil rights" and the political sparring over the President's special message calling for enactment of 22 items in the short session. All of the talk about passing a "civil rights" bill during the short session is just political hokum because the leaders of both political parties realize that a "civil rights" fight would tie up the Congress through the final adjournment date. Once again this illustrates that this whole issue is tied to one goal, political maneuvers to win the minority bloc votes outside the South.

MAJORITY LEADER JOHNSON has indicated that he wants to push through five major pieces of legislation and some less important bills and adjourn by Labor Day. He listed medical aid for the elderly, foreign aid, federal aid to education for school construction and teacher pay supplements, increased pay and coverage under the minimum wage law, and an omnibus housing bill which includes additional socialistic public housing authorizations.

I AM UNALTERABLY OPPOSED to some of these proposals and I have serious doubts as to the wisdom of enacting into law any of the others in the form proposed by their advocates. The problem of caring for our elderly in these times of high drug and medical costs is of concern to all of us, but congressional action at this short session would be premature and politically-motivated. If we pass the Forand bill as the answer to this problem we will be merely creating more problems by moving toward socialized medicine and all its inherent evils and also we will be placing in serious jeopardy the fiscal solvency of the entire Social Security system.

IN THE FOREIGN AID program, we find the leadership of both major political parties moving toward increasing expenditures in this maladministered program at a time when, after more than 12 years of foreign giveaways, we should be tapering off on these grants, particularly in the area of economic aid.

THE FEDERAL AID to education bill not only calls for unconstitutional action, but, through the control which inevitably accompanies federal funds, embodies the potential destruction of all vestiges of freedom remaining in our land. This is one bill which must almost be rated on a par with the "civil rights" proposals as to the adverse effects its passage would have on constitutional government.

MOST SOUTH CAROLINA INDUSTRIES and business establishments which can afford to do so are already paying a minimum wage of $1.25 or more per hour. There are many more establishments in our State, however, which would be forced to either go out of business or cut back on employment in order to meet this proposed federal wage level. There is also the consideration of the effect such an increase would have on the cost of living.

QUITE ASIDE FROM the fact that I cannot see why the national government should have anything to do with setting wage scales in private industry, I do not feel that it would be in the best interest of our economy or our people to force this wage level on these establishments or to expand its coverage to others, most of which fall in a segment of our economy--small business--which is already suffering enough from bankruptcies.

Sincerely,

Strom Thurmond
The Presidential Election

SINCE THE NATIONAL political conventions have been concluded I have received a number of letters from South Carolinians seeking my advice as to how they should vote in the presidential election on November 8. In answer to these queries, I have offered this advice to my fellow South Carolinians: Follow the election campaign closely, watch the television debates, study the platforms of both parties, weigh carefully the election statements of the candidates, consider the ability, experience, and the prior records of public service of the candidates, and then vote your own conscience. Many developments may still unfold in the campaign which could easily affect the thinking of the voters.

VICE PRESIDENT NIXON and Senator Goldwater, who is campaigning for the Vice President, and Senator Johnson definitely plan to speak in South Carolina. Senator Kennedy and Ambassador Lodge may also visit our State. I am glad that by our apparently uncommitted attitude South Carolina is not being overlooked by the candidates in this presidential election year, as we have in the past. The resolution adopted by the State Democratic Convention recognizing the right of South Carolina Democrats to vote as they please in the presidential contest without affecting their State party standing should cause the candidates to give even more consideration to our State in devising their campaign strategy and in making their campaign utterances and promises.

I HAVE NEVER FELT that we could gain anything by being "in the bag" for either major political party. Even the leaders of the NAACP have had enough good judgment to refuse to commit the leadership of their organization to either major political party. Evidently they want to determine which party will woo their indorsement more and will make more convincing promises to help them attain their goal of complete integration of the races sooner than possible.

RECENTLY ON A TELEVISION program, Martin Luther King, leader of the sit-inners, the wade-inners, and now the kneel-inners, indicated that this was the strategy he and his followers had mapped out for the presidential election.

THE PRIVILEGE OF VOTING is a very important one because it is by the vote that the people govern themselves and thereby determine the destiny of their country—and in these days, the destiny of the world. It was Thomas Jefferson, more than anyone else, who convinced the delegates to the Constitutional convention of the wisdom of vesting the power of government in the people themselves. Jefferson's persuasiveness stemmed from conviction, and his personal conviction was based on the premise that all of the people could and would be educated.

IT IS ONLY BY A PROCESS of thorough study and consideration of the issues, the platforms, and the candidates that we can fulfill this great responsibility which we take upon ourselves when we exercise the privilege of voting. There is plenty of time prior to November 8 for every qualified voter to become adequately educated on the issues and personalities of this campaign so the voters, with their individual viewpoints on so many matters, can determine who or what party will lead our country and the free world in the perilous years that lie ahead.

Sincerely,

Strom Thurmond
DURING THE PAST WEEK the U. S. Senate scored a very refreshing and surprising victory—especially in a presidential election year—against socialism when it rejected by a 51-44 vote the compulsory Forand approach (the Anderson-Kennedy amendment) for providing medical care for the aged. I spoke and voted against the effort to place this plan under the Social Security program for a number of reasons: (1) the proposal is socialized medicine, for it would be compulsory and would provide not the funds with which to obtain medical care, but it would have the government provide the medical service itself; (2) it would have jeopardized the solvency of the entire Social Security program by increasing disbursements from the Old Age and Survivors Disability Insurance program, which last year ran a deficit of $275 million in disbursements over contributions; (3) it would have led to increased Social Security taxes which are already scheduled to reach 9% of the first $4,800 of wages; (4) it was designed to make a political campaign issue; and (5) it would have been premature since many more facts will be brought out at the White House Conference on the Problems of the Aged next January.

THE SENATE DID FINALLY APPROVE the version recommended by the Finance Committee. Like the House bill, it would set up another federal aid program for the States at an initial per annum cost of approximately $325 million. Only two of us, Senator Goldwater and I, opposed final passage.

THE COMMITTEE BILL WAS PREFERABLE to the Forand proposal, but it violated a principle which has been trampled upon all too often in recent years by the do-gooders, the radicals, and the advocates of an all-powerful central government. This important principle, local self-government, is one of the two main principles which the Founding Fathers built into the Constitution to insure that Americans would be forever free. Those of us who hold fast to the right of the States to exercise those powers they refused to delegate to the central government cannot with any degree of consistency advocate one program which disregards this principle and oppose some others, such as federal aid to education and so-called civil rights legislation.

THE STATES HAVE NOT IGNORED the medical and financial problems of its elder citizens, nor have many employers. Forty States have some form of medical care provisions in their old age assistance plans, and 16 States have direct money payments for all essential items of medical care. South Carolina has a program which provides for direct payments for hospital and nursing home care.

BY 1965, PRIVATE PENSION PLANS for workers are expected to rise from present assets of $40 billion to $70 billion, and the Health Insurance Association of America reports that 43% of all Americans over 65 are now covered by some form of health insurance.

ASIDE FROM ALL THIS, the national debt of $290 billion, plus the future commitments and c.o.d.'s of the national government—which altogether total $750 billion—proves that the national government has already committed itself to all the non-defense programs it can handle.

MY POSITION ON THIS ISSUE is not taken with any degree of insensitivity or callousness to the plight of some of our elderly citizens. I feel that the national government can grant income tax relief to the aged and to those who help them with their medical costs—the Congress passed such a bill earlier this year—but insofar as government grants and benefits are concerned, the people of the individual States must look to their own State governments for solutions to problems within the scope of State jurisdiction and responsibility. Medical care falls in this category.

Sincerely,

Strom Thurmond
Committees: Armed Services
Interstate & Foreign Commerce

THE SMOKE HAS NOW CLEARED from the political battleground of the "bob-tailed" session of the Congress, and there is little question about the fact that the conservative Southern Democratic-Republican coalition emerged with a very decisive victory over the forces of radicalism and socialism. Of the five major "must" items declared to be so essential for political and welfare purposes, three died on the legislative vine and the other two were modified before final passage.

EXPIRING WITH THE CLOSE of the session were three legislative items which had already passed both houses of Congress but either could not get to a joint conference committee or could not get out of the conference committee. These proposals were: (1) an aid to education bill which would have put the federal government into the State-reserved area of education on a grandiose scale; (2) legislation forcing a minimum wage level of $1.25 and extending coverage under the law to many local businesses by further stretching the interstate commerce clause of the Constitution; and (3) an omnibus housing bill authorizing "backdoor spending" for construction of many more units of socialistic public housing.

MODIFIED BY CONGRESSIONAL action were the medical care for the aged and foreign aid bills. I reported to you last week about the 51-44 vote whereby the Senate rejected the socialistic and compulsory Forand (Anderson-Kennedy) approach for providing medical care for the aged. After passing a less objectionable medical aid bill, the Congress then turned to the foreign aid appropriations bill and chopped off approximately $½ billion of the amount requested.

ANOTHER ITEM WHICH WAS pushed very hard by union bosses was also left stranded in the short session. This was the Kennedy bill to authorize "common situs" picketing or secondary boycotts at construction jobs, even where vital defense and space exploration projects could be adversely affected. This bill would have exempted the building trade industry from provisions in the 1947 Taft-Hartley Act and the 1959 Labor Reform Act which prohibit a labor union from punishing an innocent party in order to bring an employer to union work terms.

THE HEAVIEST IMPACT of the bill would have fallen on our defense effort, where work stoppages caused by labor disputes in fiscal year 1960 cost us 78,469½ man days just on missile projects alone. One can imagine how much more this figure would multiply if secondary boycotts on construction projects were to be sanctioned by law. It also isn't difficult to imagine the effect this could have on our South Carolina economy. Every time a South Carolina truck driver, not a member of the Teamsters Union, would try to haul a load of South Carolina non-union building materials onto a construction job, the union on the job, by use of a secondary boycott, could force the contractor to use only materials hauled and manufactured by union labor from elsewhere.

CONSIDERING THE FACT that the political fever was so rampant in the brief session, I think the conservative coalition performed most admirably to close the session without passage of the federal aid, minimum wage, housing, Forand and picketing bills. This record of holding the line against socialism should give new hope to the many Americans from all over the country who have expressed to me their deep interest in a return to the sound conservative principles of government which have made our country the greatest nation on the face of the earth.

Sincerely,

Strom Thurmond