

Cantor em-1

AUTOMATIC RELEASE: 10:30 p.m. EST
Sunday, January 9, 1955

"FACE THE NATION"

a presentation of

THE COLUMBIA BROADCASTING SYSTEM

RADIO NETWORK

From Washington, D. C.:

Guest: Senator Everett McKinley Dirksen,
Republican of Illinois,

Ted Koop, Director of Public Affairs,
CBS Washington, Moderator.

William S. White,
Washington Correspondent for New York Times.

William Hines, Jr.,
Sunday Editor of the Washington Star.

Arthur Sylvester,
Washington Bureau of the Newark News.

Sunday, January 9, 1955

CBS Radio: 10:30 - 11:00 P.M. EST

MR. KOOP: How do you do. And welcome to Face The Nation.

Senator Dirksen, this week you heard President Eisenhower in his annual Message to Congress ask for unhesitating cooperation between the executive and legislative branches of our government. You also heard him call for some very controversial legislation: A new military training program; a rise in the minimum wage, amendments to the Taft-Hartley Act; lowering of tariff barriers and extension of the Reciprocal Trade Act -- to mention just a few.

As a leading spokesman for the so-called conservative wing of the Republican Party, you may have listened to some of these proposals with hesitation and a few reservations. Millions of Americans are wondering whether the Republican Party will split completely in the two years left before the 1956 Presidential Election.

To direct their questions to you, here is our panel of newsmen, Mr. William S. White of the Washington Bureau of the New York Times, Mr. Williams Hines, Jr., Sunday Editor of the Washington Star, and Mr. Arthur Sylvester, Washington Correspondent for the Newark News.

Now, for the first question, Mr. Hines.

MR. HINES: Senator Dirksen, do you think the President's State of the Union Message is a basis for a restoration of unity in the Republican Party?

SENATOR DIRKSEN: Frankly I think so. Of course, there

n3 will be differences from time to time. It would be strange with such diverse personalities as you will find in any legislative body that you wouldn't get some differences, but in the main I regard the President's Message as a very hopeful blueprint on a rather high spiritual and moral note that sets out a pretty good perspective of what is necessary in order to keep the union healthy, and I was deeply impressed by the message.

MR. SYLVESTER: Senator Dirksen, you have been talking, I believe, a good deal about unity, rather than victory in the last few days. I would like to get down to cases on this unity. Who will determine the unity and how will you go about it on such a thing as the Bricker amendment, for instance?

SENATOR DIRKSEN: Well, I think that relates to the answer I made a moment ago, Mr. Sylvester, and parenthetically may I say that on occasions I have said that it was probably an accident of antiquity that U came before V in the alphabet, meaning that unity comes before victory. But the Bricker amendment was before us before, and you remember pretty well what the vote was in the Senate. It lacked only one vote of securing the necessary two-thirds.

That represented conviction on the part of a great many members of the Senate, on both sides of the aisle, and it goes back to the reservation or exception that I just made, namely that there will be times, and there will be issues on which members have a deep conviction that may be something of a

em4
departure.

But I don't believe that that argues against essential and fundamental unity in the party and in carrying out pretty well the essence, the substance of the President's program.

MR. SYLVESTER: Wouldn't that mean unity against the President on the part of some Republican Senators, is that what you mean?

SENATOR DIRKSEN: You mean with respect to that particular issue?

MR. SYLVESTER: Yes.

SENATOR DIRKSEN: Well, I would rather let the matter speak for itself. I was for the Bricker amendment, and frankly, if the matter came on again, I think I would be for it all over again.

I was on the Judiciary Committee, and I believe I was the one Senator who heard nearly all of the testimony that went over a long period of time, and so my conclusions were based largely upon the testimony that we had and upon my estimate of how important it is to the well-being of our country both at home and abroad.

MR. WHITE: Senator, going to the President's own recommendations, and of course his Administration has opposed the Bricker amendment, and particularly the matter of Reciprocal Trade, is it conceivable that the Republicans, in view of their historic policy on tariffs, can possibly support the President

on the Reciprocal Trade bill?

SENATOR DIRKSEN: Oh, I think so. Now, by way of background, let me say that the Reciprocal Trade was initiated in 1934, I was in the House, and as I recall, I voted against the bill, although I would have to check the record,

But, I intend to support the President's request for a three-year extension of Reciprocal Trade, and let me add, if I had a comment to make about it and if I were to suggest that there might be some weakness in it, it is probably in the review of the decisions that come from the Tariff Commission.

Now, it is really an instrumentality of Congress, but you have got seven members, they go into these matters thoroughly. If somebody gets hurt, I think there ought to be some kind of a review, both expeditious and fair and satisfactory.

And the chances are that possibly great unity could be developed, if such a device could be developed.

MR. WHITE: Senator, what has changed the atmosphere in this regard so much from the last session? I believe it was a fact that in the last session most of the Republicans indicated opposition to a three-year extension and to a grant of authority to cut, to make deeper cuts. Now the recommendation of the President is precisely the same this time. Why do you assume this time he can get a measure of Republican support he was unable to get before?

SENATOR DIRKSEN: Well, I would give you one or two or three reasons for it. First, that the world was a little more feverish and fluid than it is now. I think there is a little greater stability than we had before. That is one thing.

I think we are beginning to see more clearly, but the more important reason I believe is this: We have been wrestling with thing for twenty years. As I say, I voted on it the first time in 1934. Sooner or later we are going to have to give it an expanded trial and see whether it will do all that the proponents say it will do. If it doesn't, then of course the whole business will be up for grabs all over again.

But perhaps it deserves a fair trial on a more extended basis so that probably when they negotiate they will include not only those things that are in the duty schedules in the old Tariff Act, but other barriers as well, such as blocked exchange and all the other things that we have had to contend with in the whole field of the free flow of international

trade.

MR. WHITE: Senator, parenthetically one more question on this general point, please.

As you mentioned, this particular program was initiated by the Democrats in '34. I would like to ask you what your comment is on the fairly general Democratic claim of yesterday that the President had sent up a Democratic program in his message?

SENATOR DIRKSEN: Oh, I have no comment to make. Attitudes of parties must necessarily differ from time to time, depending upon what conditions are in the country and in the world, and whether somebody finds great comfort in putting a particular political tag on it doesn't mean a great deal in my book. With me it is a matter of principle, it is a matter of conviction and finally what is good for the country.

MR. KOOP: What parts of the message, if any, are you critical of, Senator Dirksen?

SENATOR DIRKSEN: Well, I can't say offhand that I am critical of any of them. I paid good attention, I made some notes, and I made a rather compressed report on TV and radio yesterday, and there may be some things to which I have exception, but I thought all in all it was an excellent document, and crammed with detail, and it will make an excellent reference work.

MR. SYLVESTER: Senator Dirksen does not the President's

suggestion for pay raises rather differ than what the Congress has ever done in the past? In other words, hasn't the Congress rather favored blanket raises starting at the lower level, whereas what the President is suggesting is to start in the middle and upper brackets and give raises there? How do you see the outcome of that?

SENATOR DIRKSEN: Well, there is nothing novel about that. I think we have encountered that before, and I have dealt with pay-raise legislation over a long period of time, and sat on some of the committees when the matter was under discussion, so it is another approach, but I don't think it is particularly novel.

MR. SYLVESTER: It is a different one than Congress originally had?

SENATOR DIRKSEN: That is right.

MR. SYLVESTER: And Congress usually likes to start right at the bottom and give it all the way, doesn't it?

SENATOR DIRKSEN: Yes, and I may supplement that answer by saying this whole matter was before the Post Office and Civil Service Committee when I was a member when I first came to the Senate, and I was rather familiar with all the testimony we had over a period of time, so different organizations and different groups have different approaches to the thing, but the hope is that we can work out something that is fair.

MR. HUNES: Well, Senator Dirksen, the legislation

has asked for a pay-raise bill which approximates 5 per cent across the board, and just this week Representative Broyhill of Virginia, a Republican, and Representative Dingell of Michigan, a Democrat, both put in proposals for approximately a 10 per cent pay raise across the board for Federal civil servants. Which one of these two percentages would you favor?

SENATOR DIRKSEN: I don't know, as a matter of fact. I think probably more testimony is necessary, and then, too, every increase finally has to be related somewhat to the budget.

Now, I know how I get scolded about thinking about the budget, but having served twelve years on House Appropriations, being on Senate Appropriations now, I do have some regard for the budget because if the fires of inflation were to be stirred again, you could vitiate the benefit of a pay raise, and so we must necessarily relate it there.

But if 10 per cent is too high and 5 per cent is too low, I know, of course, how the legislative mind works, and out of it will probably come a compromise proposal that will be reasonably acceptable to every party in interest.

MR. HINES: You are a great compromiser, of course, Senator Dirksen. Now perhaps you can compromise with us.

We have been trying for a long time from the executive branch to get a little advance jingle on the budget, but they are tied down by secrecy. You are not. Can you tell us what you know, if anything, about the budget?

SENATOR DIRKSEN: Frankly, I haven't seen the new budget for fiscal 1956. Nor have I talked about it.

I had a rather casual discussion with the director of the Budget the other noon at the White House, and I had a very modest discussion with the Secretary of the Treasury, but we discussed no figures, nothing that is very tangible, and so the answer is at the moment, I do not know.

MR. SYLVESTER: Senator Dirksen, you probably noticed there was no mention in the President's message yesterday of a balanced budget. What is your reaction to that?

SENATOR DIRKSEN: Well, first I must express my hope. I campaigned all over the country from '52 and again in 1954 as Chairman of the Senatorial Campaign Committee. I ventured the hope that somewhere along the line we might approximate a balanced budget.

I still hope we can, because the longer you go along on a deficit spending basis, the greater your danger, of course, that the wells of inflation may be opened again.

Now, I know the difficulties, because as new needs arise from time to time all over the world, which includes, of course, foreign aid and domestic spending, that it is a matter of some difficulty, but it is a rich prize and a great objective toward which we have got to work and of which we must be thinking constantly.

MR. SYLVESTER: Can you give me a raise when the budget is

out of balance?

SENATOR DIRKSEN: It depends on what your revenues are finally. Now, if your revenues diminish, well, you will be further out of balance. If there is a hope that your revenues may improve during this next calendar year or part of the calendar year, why, it puts you in a little bit better position.

MR. HINES: There is no doubt, is there, that the budget will be out of balance?

SENATOR DIRKSEN: I am reasonably sure that it will, unless a miracle takes place.

MR. KOOP: How about the military budget, will you go along with the proposed cut in the ground forces?

SENATOR DIRKSEN: Well, I have said over and over and over again that I have great confidence and great faith in the President. After all, he led the greatest offensive in the history of mankind. He is a military man, has been his lifetime, and certainly his judgment must be good if anybody's judgment is good, as to what our military requirements will be, and while that may sound like a blanket endorsement of everything, I do say that, generally speaking, I think great weight must attach to the views and opinions of the President, because of his background in that field.

fls mh

MR. WHITE: Senator, may I go back to another one of these major issues, and that is the farm subsidy, the farm price support plan.

It is clear, of course, that the Democrats and some of the Republicans, at least, will try again to return to what they call the old high rigid support. Where will you stand in that regard, and secondarily, if I may make two questions in one, how, as a practical matter, would one promote unity in the Republican Party on that issue?

SENATOR DIRKSEN: In response to your first question, let me say that I shall support the President, and I shall oppose a return to high mandatory levels for parity, because it seems to me the present program is the only hope we have of reducing these unmanageable surpluses that we have which serve as an overhang and jeopardize the future of agriculture in the country.

Now, you say how do you get unity. Why, I never saw the time when you didn't have disagreement on a farm program. I served for many years, 12 years, I think, on the Subcommittee on Agriculture Appropriations in the House, and in the 80th Congress I was the chairman of the subcommittee.

I don't know that we ever had complete agreement, and so you will probably find some disagreement, but in proportion as they see the value of this program, I think the larger share of members will support the President on it.

MR. WHITE: Senator, would you say --

2 SENATOR DIRKSEN: And I should add I don't know that that has any particular effect upon the unity of the party as such. Unity is partly moral, it is partly spiritual. It is a cohesive force, after all.

You are going to get some diversions, of course; and those are to be expected.

MR. WHITE: You spoke, Senator, of the fact that you had been the chairman of the senatorial, Republican Senatorial Campaign Committee, and maybe this goes back a little way, but I would like to ask you if you think the Republican record on the farm bill in the last election was helpful or hurtful to your enterprise?

SENATOR DIRKSEN: Well, I don't think it hurt, as a matter of fact. I would take as a prize state, that while the farm vote in Iowa was reduced somewhat, yet Tom Martin won in Iowa against one of the most popular Senators who ever sat in the United States Senate, and with whom I even served in the House years ago, namely, Guy Gillette.

MR. WHITE: Mr. Neek lost in Illinois to Mr. Douglas.

SENATOR DIRKSEN: There are other reasons that might be ascribed, in fact a number of reasons.

MR. HINES: Go ahead and enumerate those, please.

SENATOR DIRKSEN: I was going to say that downstate is regarded to a considerable extent as agricultural, except that of course for such cities as Lincoln, East St. Louis, Danville,

and Springfield, that are industrial, but in the main I thought Mr. Meek did reasonably well in those areas.

MR. HINES: Senator Dirksen, here in Washington we hear legislators falling over each other to deny that they are conservatives, so I will put the question this way: You are listened to as a conservative, even though you don't necessarily speak as one. I would like to ask you about these aspects of the President's Message: Housing, aid to education, health insurance.

What is your stand on those points?

SENATOR DIRKSEN: First, if you will indulge me one comment, and if the time will permit on labels that are attached to people, once I was called an isolationist. I have been called a good many things in the more than twenty years that I have served in Washington. Labels don't mean too much to me, but I do like to regard myself as a moderate.

And if you will ever look up the word some time in Webster, you will find that a moderate is one who avoids both extremes. And so I try to avoid the extremes. So now, responsive to the three questions, if I can remember them --

MR. HINES: Housing, aid to education, health insurance.

SENATOR DIRKSEN: That's right.

First, with respect to housing, I presume there is a field for public housing, and particularly in our metropolitan centers. How far it shall go in terms of units is another question.

em4

But, in the main, the whole housing concept, I think, is here to stay. Maybe it requires some modification, but in the main I shall go along with a reasonable housing program.

Secondly, you ask about health insurance, and I presume you are referring particularly to the so-called health re-insurance bill.

I appeared before the Furtell Committee last year, and supported it, and I shall support it again. Maybe it requires a little bit of modification, but I should get a chance to put in this little plug. I am afraid there was a very considerable misconception about that program.

I talked to one of the presidents of one of the health insurance companies just before I came back to Washington, and while we were discussing it, I could see that there was some misunderstanding as to what the bill really was. And, so if a better public relations job is done on it, it probably will meet more ready acceptance.

And now you ask about schools. Way back I served once on a joint committee on this subject of aid to education. I share the same apprehensions that most do as to whether the Federal Government will move in and control education, which, in my judgment, should remain in the hands of the states, but I believe we can meet the controversies there by doing something for the states in the field of school construction, because it doesn't involve any control or supervision or surveillance over teachers,

em5 curriculae, and that sort of thing, and certainly a program can be worked out to meet the emergency that I think is before the country today, because the number of children presenting themselves for education in September of every year is increasing year after year, and there must be adequate classrooms and adequate schools for them.

I hope we can work it out.

MR. HINES: Senator, one thing on the matter of aid to education, it has been suggested that the government frequently attaches strings to its matching grants. What would you think about a string attached along this line: That every state to receive grants-in-aid from the government must comply with the Supreme Court's anti-segregation directive?

SENATOR DIRKSEN: Well, I doubt very much whether that might work out practically, because the net result would be that in some States where there is some deep feeling about it, they may be denied the benefits of government largess when their need for additional classrooms is exactly the same as in any other state.

I would more nearly put it on the ground and on the formula that we worked out in connection with aid to highway programs. There we put it on a matching basis. I think in the field of school construction, to keep all policy out of it we could do pretty nearly the same thing.

MR. SYLVESTER: Senator Dirksen, I would like to switch away

6 from this just a minute and ask you this question:

There have been news stories in the last day and a half that Secretary Stevens of the Army is about to leave.

On the basis of your experience as a member of the Army-McCarthy hearing committee, would you consider that a great loss or not?

SENATOR DIRKSEN: Well, let me just answer by saying I like Bob Stevens very much.

MR. SYLVESTER: As I recall, some of your remarks in the executive hearings would indicate that, but that you had question about the handling of his department by him and his counsel, John Adams, and I got the impression that you would be willing to swap Mr. Cohn, maybe, for Mr. Adams, and maybe Mr. Stevens for somebody else.

SENATOR DIRKSEN: The time will probably never come when I can't find a little exception with some Cabinet member, or some administrator in government, but it doesn't diminish my affection and esteem for him.

MR. KOOP: Do you expect to continue to serve on the Government Operations Committee?

SENATOR DIRKSEN: That is wholly in the hands of the Committee on Committees, and I presume that since we are in a minority status, the 19 Republicans who are serving on three committees in the 83rd Congress will in whole or in part have to forfeit membership on a third committee. What has been done

em7

there I do not know.

MR. HINES: You do have to, don't you? Isn't it the law that the minority has only two committees, and certain majorities have only three?

SENATOR DIRKSEN: That's right, but in order to work out the ratios, sometimes it has to be modified just a little, as we did in the 83rd Congress.

MR. HINES: A man of your eminence, sir, has a certain amount of say-so as to where he will serve. Now, you are on Judiciary, Appropriations, and Government Operations. If you had your "druthers", which one of the three would you drop?

SENATOR DIRKSEN: Well, let's put it the other way around. Which would I prefer to serve on?

MR. HINES: Which two?

SENATOR DIRKSEN: Yes, and I made that manifest where the inquiry came. Appropriations is my first love. I like to be where the spending goes on.

MR. WHITE: It is the important place to be, isn't it, Senator?

SENATOR DIRKSEN: Indeed it is. And secondly I like the work of the Judiciary Committee, so there are two major committees. Beyond that, it is a matter for the Committee on Committees to determine.

MR. SYLVESTER: In view of your experience on that committee and your friendship with Senator McCarthy, what sort of procedure

em8 do you see him following in this coming year? Where would he fit into your idea for party unity?

SENATOR DIRKSEN: Oh, I am confident that he will go along with the party essentially. I see no reason why he shouldn't. As to what he may have in mind, I haven't the slightest idea.

MR. SYLVESTER: Do you feel as he did, or sorrow, as he did, that the President made no reference to the American flyers in the hands of the Red Chinese?

SENATOR DIRKSEN: I made no comment on that whatsoever.

MR. HINES: Would you make such a comment now?

SENATOR DIRKSEN: Well, it could come as something of an aftermatter and probably there would be no point in it, and there are many things that I do not condone, but I don't say them in headlines, particularly.

MR. HINES: Certainly you have some position on the Chinese Flyers. I mean, we can't take an aspirin and they will go away. What is your feeling about the President not emphasizing that matter?

SENATOR DIRKSEN: Well, the director, or Secretary-General of the United Nations is in China right now. I see a rather fascinating headline, I believe it was in your paper last night, to the effect that Hammarshjold and Chou have gotten up to that point. I thought that was a great headline.

Now, Cabot Lodge has admonished us not to rush into print and make too many comments until we see what the outcome of the

conference will be, so, being a good soldier in the party and always having been amenable to discipline, I will subordinate my views for the moment.

MR. WHITE: Senator, is this an example of the Republic unity that you just spoke about?

SENATOR DIRKSEN: Oh, indeed it is. I try to live by the book.

MR. WHITE: Senator, may I ask one question, going back a little bit to the so-called McCarthy Committee. Now, as you know, there have been a lot of proposals made around for reforming procedures for investigating committees. Without asking you to commit yourself to any detail on it, do you think in general these procedures should be reformed, or do you think not?

SENATOR DIRKSEN: Well, your question isn't very specific. If, for instance, by "procedures" you mean whether there should be --

MR. WHITE: The rules having respect, regard to witnesses, the rights of witnesses.

SENATOR DIRKSEN: Yes. Well, let's take the question in two parts, and we might go to this question of consolidation of the investigatory function.

I made a suggestion last year that at least it was worthy of exploration. Should we have Judiciary in the House and Un-American Activities Internal Security, have Judiciary and the

am10 McCarthy Committee all working in the same field? Should there be consolidation?

Well, at least it is worthy of consideration, because I know this: That if you can get a united effort, you can spend a little more money, you can get a better staff, and sometimes you can do a better job. But I am not unmindful of how jealously the House regards its own prerogatives, and with equal jealousy we regard our own, and so that is in the contemplative stage.

Now, going back to procedure, I made some suggestions at the time the Army-McCarthy controversy was on, with respect to procedure. I see that the Rules Committee has suggested that they did not go along with the recommendation for a single member taking testimony. I thought perhaps as a practical matter it might be well to have two.

You couldn't very well join up and say one minority and one majority member, because in that case the minority can every time stymie what the majority would like to do.

And then I am fully aware of the Christoffel decision in the Supreme Court where you will have to establish, if you ever get to a contempt proceeding to prove, and the burden of proof is on you to show that you had two members there. One may have gone out to get a drink of water and suddenly you will find yourself failing in court.

So I think, as a practical matter, and for the assurance

emll

and comfort of people and the witness that is there, it might not be a mistake to have two people.

MR. WHITE: Senator, about the matter of the rules themselves, and by that I mean the rules as they apply to the rights of a person being interrogated, do you think they should be altered in any way?

fls

SENATOR DIRKSEN: Well, isn't it a question of a little discipline on the part of the members? At the end of every interrogatory proceeding I used to say to the witness, "Did you get a fair hearing?"

"Yes, sir."

"Did we take unfair advantage of you?"

And if the witness says, "You did take unfair advantage," then reopen it right there and make sure that no witness has ever received unfair treatment.

I think every citizen who comes here comes with some fear and trepidation under those circumstances, and is deserving of being reassured. This is, after all, a republic. This country belongs to the people, and I would be the last to take unfair advantage of any witness even though -- what my pre-conception of his guilt might be under those circumstances.

MR. HINES: Senator Dirksen, one brief question about the Peress case. You have signed a resolution along with about twenty-seven others asking for a study of the Peress case. Don't you know by now who promoted Peress?

SENATOR DIRKSEN: Well, I have a pretty fair idea, I think, about it, but I was willing to go along with that resolution for a reason other than the Peress case, and that is this:

It occurred to me after action was denied on that proposal submitted by Senator Byrd and Senator Daniel in the

mh2

special session that there are people who might get the idea that perhaps the Senate, after all, wasn't interested in a vigorous and diligent investigation, and to make sure that that concept is cured, I was willing to go along with this new resolution.

MR. HINES: Well, we are getting a little bit toward the end. I wanted to ask you one thing.

Senator Knowland has been giving President Eisenhower a little trouble lately, and there has been some talk that he might be released, so to speak. If that came about, would you consider yourself available as Minority Leader?

SENATOR DIRKSEN: Oh, I would rather not speculate upon my availability. I was for Bill Knowland when we had our conference, and I am still for Bill Knowland.

MR. HINES: May I ask you one other question then. You were not notably and conspicuously for Eisenhower in '52. Would you oppose his renomination as vigorously in '56?

SENATOR DIRKSEN: I am glad you ask it because I get some letter on the point, and more than two months ago I expressed myself on television in favor of President Eisenhower.

MR. KUCER: Thank you, Senator Dirksen, for facing the nation and answering the questions being asked today by Mr. William S. White of the New York Times, Mr. William Hines of the Washington Star, and Arthur Sylvester of the Newark News.