

HERMAN TALMADGE

Sandy Springs
Reports From *Enterprise*

7-17-63

WASHINGTON

FOR MANY MONTHS now the federal government, especially the judiciary, has allowed—even encouraged—rowdy assaults on private property by mobs from the streets.

Racial agitators have been given the go-ahead by recent court rulings, and state and city law enforcement officers have had their hands tied. Hence, these troublemakers have gone unpunished for their invasions of private property.



Supposedly, they are demonstrating against what they allege to be unjust treatment. In other instances, when people have protested what they thought to be unjust, federal troops armed with bayonets have been called out.

There are lawful and orderly avenues open for redress of grievances of those who claim to have had their civil rights violated. There are plenty of protective laws now on the books, and no new ones are needed. However, the pressure is on—not just for so-called equality, but for equality-plus.

It seems to me that what we have is a revolution, with the government on the side of the revolutionaries, which I believe is unprecedented in the annals of history.

NOW AN ATTEMPT is being made, despite its unconstitutionality according to "the law of the land" on the books since 1883, to invade private property rights by federal statute.

This is the public accommodations section of the Administration's civil rights package, which would try to tell private

businessmen in practically every area of free enterprise now to run their affairs. Furthermore, the Attorney General would be vested with vast and potentially abusive power in the enforcement of the statute.

This would take the federal government into areas which eventually could lead to a police state and ultimately destroy everyone's liberties.

Individual liberties, which every citizen of this country is guaranteed by the Constitution, would be sacrificed in the name of equality. It would mean the end of our free society.

THE SUPREME COURT in 1883 made itself clear on the right of the Congress to legislate against the rights of private business, and its ruling is still in force. Referring to the Fourteenth Amendment, the Court said:

"It does not invest Congress with power to legislate upon subjects which are within the domain of State legislation . . . It does not authorize Congress to create a code of municipal law for the regulation of private rights."

Such a public accommodations law "steps into the domain of local jurisprudence and lays down rules for the conduct of individuals in society towards each other," the Court held. "It is repugnant to the Tenth Amendment of the Constitution," it added.

It has been a long time since the Supreme Court held something to be against the Tenth Amendment, which provides for states rights. It is almost as if this Amendment is no longer a valid part of our Constitution.

Herman E. Talmadge

(not prepared or printed at government expense)

Kennedy Rights Bill Dictatorial--Herman

Sandy Springs Enterprise
"Never in the history of free men and free women has a blueprint for a federal dictatorship more cunningly been contrived."

Thus declared U. S. Sen. Herman E. Talmadge in a recent television-radio report to the people of Georgia in which he discussed President Kennedy's proposed civil rights legislation. Said the Senator:

"Congressman Adam Clayton Powell of New York contends that he rewrote more than half of the President's civil rights message. Certainly certain provisions in this message to the Congress and in the act that is now pending before Congress indicates that someone as extreme as Congressman Powell did write the message.

"I favor the full enjoyment of every American citizen of all rights guaranteed him by the Constitution of the United States. I know of no citizen who contends a deprivation of rights that has gone into the very favorable courts of our country and has not had his rights granted to him in full.

"But in recent years there has developed a tendency or philosophy of some of the more extreme groups in our country that all other citizens ought to be denied their rights for the particular and special benefits of a certain privileged group."

Sen. Talmadge then read Title VI, Section 601 of the pending Civil Rights Bill. It states:

"Notwithstanding any provision to the contrary in any law of the United States providing or authorizing direct or indirect financial assistance for or in connection with any program or activity by way of grant, contract, loan, insurance, guaranty or otherwise. No such law shall be interpreted as requiring that such financial assistance shall be furnished in circumstances under which individuals participating in or benefiting from the program or activity are discriminated against on the grounds of race, color, religion or national origin or are denied participation or benefits therein on the ground

of race, color, religion or national origin."

"Nothing in the history of our country that extreme has ever been proposed," declared the Georgia junior Senator. "The Constitution of the United States vests the power to levy taxes in the Congress. The Constitution of the United States vests the power to expend federal funds in the Congress.

"Yet that provision of the law, if adopted by the Congress and signed by the President, would enable some little bureaucrat in some federal agency that has never been elected to any political office, and never could be, the right to withhold a grant from any state, the right to cancel a contract on any bank or savings and loan association, the right to cancel a contract or loan on any house or any other program, the right to cancel any insurance policies that was relating to the federal government, any guaranty or otherwise, that any individual may complain that he had been discriminated against.

"It would be so broad that if some citizen of California thought he had been discriminated against in welfare benefits, some bureaucrat could deny to the State of California all their welfare benefits. It would enable them, by the same token, to withhold highway funds to Arizona or any other state if some individual complained that he did not receive a job of cutting weeds on the highways of the State of Arizona.

"It would enable the bureaucrat, if he saw fit, to withhold funds from any state because they voted wrong and say that discrimination was the cause thereof. Never in the history of free men and free women has a blueprint for a federal dictatorship more cunningly been contrived.

"I feel that if the American people realized what was involved in this program they would wake up and strike down many of these iniquitous proposals. I have recited only one, but there are several provisions of this act that are equally as extreme, and I shall discuss them in the future."