

Jesse L.
Ward, Jr.
mroc.

1

CBS NEWS
Broadcast House
Washington 16, D. C.
EMerson 2-9300

"FACE THE NATION"

as broadcast over the

CBS Television Network

June 21, 1959 - 5:00 to 5:30 PM

CBS Radio Network

June 21, 1959 - 9:30 to 10:00 PM

GUEST: THE HONORABLE EVERETT M. DIRKSEN
United States Senate
(Republican of Illinois)

MODERATOR: Stuart Novins

PANEL: William H. Lawrence
New York Times

Wells Church
CBS News

Warren S. Duffee
United Press International

PRODUCER: Ted Ayers

MR. NOVINS: Senator Everett Dirksen is the Republican Leader in the Senate. He is responsible for managing the Republican program, a program which probably will decide the political destiny of his party in the next Presidential election. He is here now to FACE THE NATION.

Senator, I suppose we could talk with you about almost anything from anti-missiles to zero hour at Geneva. Let's find out what this first question will be -- from Mr. Lawrence.

MR. LAWRENCE: Senator, every recent public opinion poll has shown that President Eisenhower's personal popularity remains very high, but that the popularity of the Republican Party, by itself, is low.

Now, does this mean in the absence of Eisenhower from your ticket in 1960 that you are going to have a tough time electing Nixon or Governor Rockefeller or whatever candidate you name?

SENATOR DIRKSEN: Well, Mr. Lawrence, I don't suppose it will be an easy time to elect either a Congress or a President on our ticket in 1960. But I believe, however, the issues with which we are dealing at the present time are going to make the case, and I feel reasonably confident that we are going to win in 1960 on those issues, because they have basic appeal to the people.

MR. CHURCH: Well, Senator Dirksen, carrying Bill's question a little bit further, it strikes me that everything

I've read seems to -- seems to say that the Democrats think they are going to make a complete sweep of this thing.

Could I be a little bit specific? How are you going to stop that? What legislation, what tactics are you going to use?

SENATOR DIRKSEN: Well, of course, we are a long ways off from the election in 1960; for the Presidency, there has to be a Convention, and then, of course, there will be the campaigning prior to November of 1960. In that time I believe all our candidates will go to the people and they'll ring all the changes on what I think are the basic things that do have a fundamental appeal, and I believe you will see a different score in November of 1960.

MR. DUFFEE: Well, now, Senator, right along that line you are talking about, that 1960 Convention, do you foresee any possibility that Vice President Nixon will not be the nominee?

SENATOR DIRKSEN: Well, of course, I never try to get into that speculative situation. I have a great affection for Dick Nixon. I know, however, that if one is anticipatory, or rather, premature in his speculations, he may have the results of the Convention fall on him.

I have no crystal ball. I do not know what the Convention is going to do, but I am confident, of course, they are going to be highly selective and pick us a good

candidate, and it could be Dick Nixon.

And I might say parenthetically that he would be a good candidate.

MR. DUFFEE: I gather by that, Senator, that Nixon is your first choice for the nomination.

SENATOR DIRKSEN: Well, I don't put it quite in that frame, of course, but I would be very happy if Dick Nixon were the candidate.

MR. NOVINS: As happy as if Mr. Rockefeller were the candidate?

SENATOR DIRKSEN: Well, I know him better, of course, and probably some of that personal feeling enters into it, although I must say that I have known Nelson Rockefeller for about 15 years, and I knew him rather intimately when he was on duty here in Washington.

MR. NOVINS: Which man could lead you, in your opinion, to victory more easily, Mr. Nixon or Mr. Rockefeller?

SENATOR DIRKSEN: Well, I am more certain, of course, about the general policies and principles that Dick Nixon pursues.

MR. DUFFEE: Senator, there has been some talk just this very week end by some of your Republican colleagues about the possibility of a Nixon-Rockefeller ticket, in that order, with the Vice President on top and Governor Rockefeller in the second spot.

How would you regard the chances of such a ticket, or would you favor such a ticket?

SENATOR DIRKSEN: Well, it becomes a question of consummating a ticket like that, and you know that when men have gone pretty far in the political field, that it would be difficult to tell off and have one settle for number one, and one settle for number two. If it could be done, I think it would be a very happy thing for the party.

MR. CHURCH: Senator, would it be a happy thing for the party if it had a show-down in New Hampshire in the primary as between Mr. Nixon and the Governor of New York?

SENATOR DIRKSEN: Well, I do not know; that's highly speculative, of course, and anything could eventuate out of a situation like that.

MR. NOVINS: Senator, you said a moment ago that you felt confident that your party would win the next election. I wonder if we could break that down a little.

Did you mean to say that you would win the Presidency? What about the Congress?

SENATOR DIRKSEN: Well, I'm hopeful that we'll win the House. I'm not so sanguine about winning the Senate. First, as I assay the matter, note who is going to run in 1960, and how many we have on our side, it would certainly be an uphill pull for the Republicans to win the Senate in 1960.

MR. NOVINS: You said the --

MR. LAWRENCE: Well, then, ---

SENATOR DIRKSEN: Over in the House, however, it's quite a different thing.

MR. NOVINS: Mr. Lawrence.

MR. LAWRENCE: The truth is, isn't it, Senator, that in the wake of the big Democratic sweep in '58 that the arithmetic of the Senate in 1960 is almost completely against you?

SENATOR DIRKSEN: Well, Mr. Lawrence, you oughtn't to be quite so, shall I say, brutal to me, because having been the Chairman of the Senatorial Campaign Committee for four years, I always had to deal in the verities of arithmetic, and I'm afraid you are right when you invoke arithmetic in this case, as I so well know.

#2 fls.

(2)
1 dm

MR. LAWRENCE: Senator, if I may refer back to an earlier question, you suggested that there were basic issues that made the Republican Party popular with the people. Are these issues of which the people are now unaware, because, face it, sir, the polls show the Republican Party is not popular.

SENATOR DIRKSEN: They are not dramatic as yet, I would say, but the people are aware of them. And they have to be dramatized and brought home. I doubt whether there is a more compelling issue before the country today than the issue of inflation. And the way you dramatize it, of course, is in the manner of what Russell Magill did in an article in Readers Digest. I think the title was, "Are We on the Way to a 10-Cent Dollar?" That of course people can understand. I think it's one of the reasons why the President puts constant emphasis on dollar erosion and a sound dollar, because in proportion as it buys fewer pork chops and fewer things at the store and the market, that issue you can dramatize as never before.

MR. LAWRENCE: Well now, let's take this problem of inflation. What causes it? Is it big Government spending among other things, to a large extent?

SENATOR DIRKSEN: Well of course your unbalanced budget, or borrowing money in order to meet current bills simply heightens those inflationary fevers and moves you further and further down that torturous road.

MR. LAWRENCE: Who has the biggest peacetime deficit in the

dm2

history of the Republic? This Administration?

SENATOR DIRKSEN: This Administration, and that's another thing to be dramatized because 93 per cent of this whole debt was accumulated under Democratic Administrations, not under Republican Administrations.

MR. LAWRENCE: Oh come now, Senator --

SENATOR DIRKSEN: Indeed so.

MR. LAWRENCE: The President sent this budget to the Congress.

SENATOR DIRKSEN: Look at your World War II debt, look at your Korean debt --

MR. LAWRENCE: No, no, I am not talking about debt. I am talking about this year's deficit, this current year, this fiscal year, the greatest peacetime deficit in the --

SENATOR DIRKSEN: Fiscal Year 1959?

MR. LAWRENCE: Yes, sir.

SENATOR DIRKSEN: Yes.

MR. LAWRENCE: The biggest peacetime deficit in the history of the Republic.

SENATOR DIRKSEN: Quite correct.

MR. LAWRENCE: Proposed by the President and voted by a Congress and spent by this Administration.

SENATOR DIRKSEN: Much of it not proposed by the President, and much of it of course in the nature of those back door approaches to the Treasury that finally piled it up as high as

dm3

it did, plus one other fact, and that is that we had a recession which began and I think it had its well spring late in 1957, moved very deeply in 1958 as you well know, all the way up to 1959 and to some extent at least that accounted for some expenditure. But when all is said and done, it's the Congress that authorizes, and it's the Congress that appropriates, and it's the Congress that has exclusive power over the purse, and it's the Congress that must share primary responsibility for whatever happens on the 30th of June, the end of the fiscal year.

MR. LAWRENCE: But the Congress cannot compel the Executive to spend money, sir.

SENATOR DIRKSEN: Well, not in that particular way. Yet, when they enact legislation which for all practical purposes becomes a mandate, to what extent can the Executive resist the Congress in these activities that have become -- seemingly an essential part of Government today?

MR. DUFFEE: Senator, along that same line though, about the Congress and spending, now your Democratic colleagues in Congress contend that up to to date I believe they have cut the President's budget request by a total of about \$800 million. Now, you tend to put the blame on the Democrats for this. You talk about back door spending but so far I think you will find that of the appropriations bills that have cleared both Houses, they have been cut over the President's original request.

cm4

Cite some of this back door spending for us. Are you referring to the foreign aid bill or what?

SENATOR DIRKSEN: Well, foreign aid is one, that was handled by direct appropriation heretofore. The Senate bill will now propose of course a long-term program for economic development loans where you borrow from the Treasury instead of appropriating the money. There you have an example of course of back door spending.

Now there are some things in the budget and offhand I can't tell you how many that are after all just a little on the spurious side. Now, I will give you an example. We had the agricultural appropriation bill on the Senate Floor not so long ago. I was going to move to restore a hundred million dollars for this reason: The losses on surplus farm commodities, either given away or sold, has been ascertained and was incurred over a year ago. It has been reported to the Treasury. The Commodity Credit Corporation is a corporation under the law. It makes its report, and yet its request was cut by a hundred million to let that appropriation bill look just a little bit better and yet here is an absolute obligation of the Government. The loss has been incurred and it must be paid.

MR. DUFFEE: All right, so much for the moment, Senator, on this inflation-budget battle which seems to go on week after week.

dm5

What are some of these other issues that you are going to take to the people in 1960 and win the election on?

SENATOR DIRKSEN: That will be the basic issue, of course because --

MR. DUFFEE: Yes, but what else?

SENATOR DIRKSEN: Everything goes back to it.

Now then, from the standpoint of the economy, I think we are in pretty good shape. The last report on employment and unemployment was quite encouraging, was quite heartening I would say. I think it is a testimony to the soundness of the Administration's approach and its resistance to every effort to knock it off the perch and go in and embrace some of these monumental spending proposals that have been bouncing around here since we came into session in January.

MR. CHURCH: Senator Dirksen, you spoke of the necessity of dramatization of these issues to reverse this, what we will call a Democratic trend. Had you been completely satisfied with the active leadership of the top of the Republican Party in this particular aspect of the fight?

SENATOR DIRKSEN: Well I suppose under every circumstance, one who has been in this political arena in the Nation's Capital for 25 years develops some of his own ideas and always thinks that something is wanting. I would say as a general matter that dramatizing and certainly more publicity for these basic objectives and achievements is a result devoutly to be

dm6

desired because I do not believe we have adequately told our story.

MR. CHURCH: It must be a little bit difficult for you as the leader of the Republican Party in the Senate to call them spenders one moment and have to justify high budgets the next, is that true?

SENATOR DIRKSEN: Well I never have any difficulty in that field, I may assure you.

MR. LAWRENCE: Well, why not, Senator?

SENATOR DIRKSEN: I know of no reason why I should. I have considered myself as the one who carries the flag for the Administration, and I proceed to do it and to justify it as best I can and I think under every circumstance it can be justified. In this particular instance, speaking now of this first session of the 86th Congress, I didn't think it was too difficult a job to justify the things that the Administration wanted and the things that the Administration will resist and has resisted.

MR. NOVINS: Senator, a moment ago when you were talking about deficits, you also talked about spending. Now it's a fact that a deficit occurs not only because of spending but it's the relationship between spending and income.

SENATOR DIRKSEN: Oh definitely.

;)fls

01 MR. NOVINS: Well, now, would it be possible, do you suppose, for your party to move in the direction of increasing revenue to the Government in the form of increased taxes to pay for some of this spending?

SENATOR DIRKSEN: I fancy that when the report is made on the 30th of June, you will see a rather encouraging increase in the revenue estimates, and of course that's going to be rather helpful.

Now, that was one of the difficulties in fiscal 1958. You look at an analysis of the Budget, and you discover that probably half, maybe not quite half, resulted through diminished income, and the other half, of course, came about through spending.

MR. LAWRENCE: Senator, I've noticed over the last few years, both as a newspaper reporter and as a newspaper reader, that we have sort of an annual story, that the President is going to take his case to the country and over the head of Congress, and so forth.

I must confess that in the previous years I've read this, I've scarcely been aware when the appeal was taken.

Now, is there something more concrete this time, or is this just another what we might call hot weather story?

SENATOR DIRKSEN: Oh, I think the President will be quite specific if he goes to the country.

MR. LAWRENCE: If he goes?

o2

SENATOR DIRKSEN: Yes.

MR. LAWRENCE: That's what I'm getting at. Do you think he'll go, any more than he ever has?

SENATOR DIRKSEN: Well, there has been some speculation about it. I am frank to say that it was discussed at the leadership conferences a time or two, but it's a decision that the President and his advisers must make for themselves.

MR. LAWRENCE: But in the presence of the leaders, you have no definite commitment that this is going to take place -- right?

SENATOR DIRKSEN: No. I have a fond hope that it will take place, because I think there are many things about which the President can talk, and because he is always front-page, as you well know, he'll get a very respectful hearing from the country, and if he can put some of these things in concrete packages, he is going to have a very earnest listening audience.

MR. DUFFEE: Senator, let's shift scenes here for a moment. This Capital City has been reverberating for weeks actually, and especially in the last couple of days, over the rejection by the Senate the other night, the other morning, I should have said, of Lewis Strauss for Secretary of Commerce.

Now, there have been statements from Senators from both sides that this action, which most of the Democrats voted

o3 against Mr. Strauss, is going to bring on an increased period of tension between the two parties, and between Congress and the President.

 Does your party, the Republicans, do you plan to make this a political issue in 1960?

 SENATOR DIRKSEN: I have no intention of making it an issue, and for a very good reason: First place, I think the President has a right to feel chagrined and disappointed, because a President does not select a Cabinet Officer unless he is quite sure of his competence, his character, and his background. And when he sends his name to the Senate, he sends it with a degree of confidence in the man whom he named.

 Now, on the other side, of course, I recognize the right of the Senate not to consent and not to advise on a nomination, and I do not quarrel with individual Senators who may see it differently from myself. And I make no issue of it, as such. I just say that I was quite disappointed, myself, that we failed to secure the necessary votes to confirm.

 MR. CHURCH: Senator, have you figured out in your own mind what the basic reason for the defeat of Mr. Strauss was? To put it another way, perhaps, if he had been as blunt in his answers as we have sometimes heard, oh, Harry Truman, for example, speak, would he have been confirmed?

 SENATOR DIRKSEN: It's hard to tell. Now, the Committee

o4 Report, of course, mentioned that they turned in an adverse judgment partly on the evidence, and I suppose mainly on his demeanor before the Committee. But I noticed also, of course, that public power, as such, got into this a little bit; his possible attitude on TVA, although I didn't know that he actually had an attitude on that subject, and the Dixon-Yates controversy. There was a great admixture here, but it was rather refreshing to see that the Committee thought that his demeanor before the Committee had a good deal to do with his rejection, because that was the concluding thought in the Committee Report.

MR. LAWRENCE: Is it fair to say, Senator, that when this nomination went to the Capitol, and before the hearings began, that there was an undoubted large majority for the confirmation of Admiral Strauss?

SENATOR DIRKSEN: It was so said, but whether that was correct or not --

MR. LAWRENCE: Well, certainly the leadership took polls, sir. Really, now!

SENATOR DIRKSEN: Well, it was up to the Committee in the first instance, of course, to report him.

MR. LAWRENCE: I know, but I'm talking about the Republican Leadership surely had an opinion as to whether or not this man could --

SENATOR DIRKSEN: We had a hope, of course, that he

o5 would be confirmed, and that we would have some votes to spare.

MR. DUFFEE: Did you have a doubt --

SENATOR DIRKSEN: I'll be very frank in saying that. I thought we would have no real difficulty in effectuating his confirmation.

MR. DUFFEE: Did you have any --

MR. LAWRENCE: Well, sir, --

MR. NOVINS: Mr. Lawrence,

(4)
dm

MR. LAWRENCE: Just for a moment -- you said a moment ago that you had no quarrel with any individual Republican, with any individual Senator about how they voted on this, it was up to them.

Now does this go also for the two Republicans who voted against confirmation?

SENATOR DIRKSEN: Very definitely so. I can say that I would hope that they could see fit to vote for him, but I do not quarrel with the motivation of any Senator because they share prerogatives and privileges and rights that are equal to my own and in proportion, as they never question my motivation, I don't believe I should question their's.

Now I should add one thing to round that out, and that is this: You hear about resolutions, you know, of censure or criticism for departing from what they thought was the Party stance. Well I have encountered that before too but I have mentioned so often, even on some of these programs, that the Republican umbrella is a pretty large umbrella for all shades of opinion and I have had no occasion to retreat from that position and therefore I do not quarrel when they depart from a majority position.

MR. LAWRENCE: But there was no position by the Republicans making this a party policy, that you had to vote for Admiral Strauss?

SENATOR DIRKSEN: Definitely we tried to avoid making it

dm2

a policy party issue as such.

MR. DUFFEE: Senator, do you feel as has been charged in some quarters that the -- your counterpart in the Senate, the Democratic leader, Senator Johnson was primarily responsible for the defeat of Admiral Strauss, that he took the lead in lining up the votes to reject him?

SENATOR DIRKSEN: Well I had heard on occasion that there was nose counting and one thing and another.

MR. DUFFEE: Do you think that he took the lead though?

SENATOR DIRKSEN: Well, he made no speeches on the subject, as you well know. He made no concluding remarks late in the morning when we finally got around to a vote.

MR. CHURCH: Could that be because he didn't think it was necessary?

SENATOR DIRKSEN: Well, that could be possible, of course. But in all his utterances and his demeanor on the Senate floor, he gave no hint that he was campaigning one way or the other for the defeat of Admiral Strauss or for his confirmation.

MR. DUFFEE: Well, as we know, Senator, --

SENATOR DIRKSEN: And I want to do full justice by the Majority leader by saying that he has never campaigned me, he has never told me about any campaigning and I heard nothing to that effect on the floor from him.

MR. DUFFEE: As we know, Senator, he doesn't always operate through speeches.

dm3

SENATOR DIRKSEN: Well I understand that, of course.

MR. DUFFEE: Along that same line Senator, you are a shrewd, experienced political -- and successful political practitioner for many years. Do you honestly think that the Democrats hurt themselves or that your Republican Party was helped by the outcome of the Strauss thing?

SENATOR DIRKSEN: Well let's put it on a little larger ground, Mr. Duffee.

MR. DUFFEE: All right, put it as large as you want to.

SENATOR DIRKSEN: I do not believe that the Senate as an institution helped itself because I know Admiral Strauss. I think highly of him. The President thinks highly of him. He served with Herbert Hoover, he served under Franklin Roosevelt, and under Harry Truman and now has served in various capacities under Dwight D. Eisenhower. A man doesn't change his character, his complexion, his outlook overnight. And if he brought that competence to his job that gave him such breadth of service the Government --

MR. DUFFEE: Can I --

SENATOR DIRKSEN: Why, it seems to me that the Senate should have looked a little longer and a little more carefully before turning down his nomination.

MR. CHURCH: Senator, may I go back for a moment to the question of the two Republicans who voted against Mr. Strauss.

United Press International says that the Young Republican

dm4

meeting out in Denver I believe it was, by a voice vote overwhelmingly passed a resolution to censure Margaret Smith and Senator Langer last night. Would you agree with -- what would you have voted had you been at the Young Republican meeting?

SENATOR DIRKSEN: Had I been there I would have counseled them not to do it.

MR. NOVINS: Senator, I wonder if we could change fields just a little bit. We have been talking about domestic politics and I want to get into international affairs for just a moment.

In view of what has happened at Geneva, in view of this recess now until July 13th, what is your feeling about a possible summit meeting regardless of what may happen with the Foreign Ministers?

SENATOR DIRKSEN: It still remains a glowing hope, whether it will be consummated is quite another question.

MR. NOVINS: What would you consider to be a prime requisite for a summit meeting at this stage?

SENATOR DIRKSEN: Well, the President laid down a format. He thought there ought to be specific concrete and basic things to engage the attention of a summit conference.

MR. NOVINS: Would just the removal of the Berlin threat be specific and tangible enough?

SENATOR DIRKSEN: I am not so sure whether that would be true or not.

dm5

MR. LAWRENCE: Senator, you said that the summit remained a glowing hope. I am unaware, and this Government --

SENATOR DIRKSEN: Oh, I said I have a glowing hope.

MR. LAWRENCE: Well yes, that is exactly what I was getting at, sir. I am unaware in the Government there has ever been a glowing hope for a summit. I thought that rather reluctantly we might go if there was some progress at Geneva but there hasn't been.

SENATOR DIRKSEN: Well Mr. Lawrence --

MR. LAWRENCE: Surely the President --

SENATOR DIRKSEN: Mr. Lawrence, of course that doesn't prevent a person from hoping and hoping that something might still eventuate, that Mr. Gromyko and Mr. Khrushchev might relent a little in some of the positions they have taken and that we'll continue a firm stand and that out of the clash of opinion that will come still after the 13th of July, that it will be no other deadlock but that certain things will be spread on the agenda into which a summit conference can get its teeth and out of which we may still hope for something.

What else is there, I ask you, if we don't hope and continue to labor and show a rare kind of restraint? The other end of it of course is a continuation of the cold war and whatever may go with it.

MR. LAWRENCE: Well sir, I suggest this is not a question you should address to me but which you should address to your

dm6

own Administration. I do not disagree with you that perhaps there should be a glowing hope for the summit. But all I was trying to point out was that within the Government there was not such a hope.

SENATOR DIRKSEN: Well, until they lower the boom I must continue to hope, that goodwill will continue to manifest itself and have its impact upon those who still will sit around the council table at Geneva and we might have something yet.

MR. NOVINS: Senator, even though the Geneva Foreign Ministers talks failed to produce any agreement so far, at least in the problem of Berlin, do you consider it a possibility that a summit talk if it should occur might take up other subjects like nuclear test control, that sort of thing?

SENATOR DIRKSEN: Well, is there enough to engage a summit conference?

MR. NOVINS: That's my question to you, sir.

SENATOR DIRKSEN: Yes. I don't know. And I don't believe anybody can tell until we see what comes after the 13th of July. This may be a stalemate, I don't know.

MR. CHURCH: Senator, you seem to be putting yourself up along with Senator Fulbright and the British Foreign Office in plugging almost for a summit meeting. This is in opposition if I am not mistaken, to the Administration stand. How come?

(5)fls

01

SENATOR DIRKSEN: Here are two ideologies, let us say, for simplification, in the world, and they have been in a state of constant clash more or less for a long period of time. How shall the issue be resolved, particularly when the cold war is sharpened in the economic field? Is that all there is for our people to look forward to, or are we going to continue to nurse our hopes and struggle as best we can? I always go back to a definition that was put in, in Admiral Mahan's book on Sea Power, as I recall. He said war is a form of political action.

Well, anterior to war, of course, there is constant political action in the form of negotiation in the hope that this ultimate can be avoided, and that's the best I can say, as a result.

MR. NOVINS: Well, do you feel any optimism in the fact that the May 27th deadline has come and gone without any serious incident?

SENATOR DIRKSEN: I think we have to be optimistic. Shall we announce to all the world through a megaphone that nothing except grim pessimism suffuses this country, its people, its leaders, and its negotiators? If that's the case, then we'd just as well have no summit conference and Mr. Khrushchev might walk off with the laurels.

MR. NOVINS: Senator, I don't think anyone could call you an international prophet of gloom and doom.

o2

SENATOR DIRKSEN: Indeed not.

MR. NOVINS: Thank you very much, indeed, sir, for coming here to FACE THE NATION.

Thanks also to our panel of newsmen:

To Warren Duffee, of the United Press International;

Wells Church, of CBS News; and

William H. Lawrence, of the New York Times.

This is Stuart Novins.

We invite you to join us next week at this same time when our guest will be Admiral Arthur Radford, Special Consultant to the Secretary of Defense, and former Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

Our program today originated in Washington.

— — —

Produced by Ted Ayers.

Associated in production, Nancy Hanschman and Bill Kobin.

Directed by Clark Pangle.

Announced by Hal Stepler.

— — —