

CBS RADIO DIVISION

PEOPLE'S PLATFORM

Sunday, January 27, 1952
12:00-12:30 P.M.

ANNOUNCER: PEOPLE'S PLATFORM - with Dwight Cooke.

This week President Truman in his annual budget message asked Congress for 85.4 billion to run the government in the coming fiscal year. Reaction was sharp on Capitol Hill, all of which provoked the question in the minds of the people: Will Congress approve the President's budget? To discuss the question, Mr. Cooke has invited two legislators who have an extensive background in the problems of Government spending - Senator Burnett R. Maybank, Democrat of South Carolina, Chairman of the Senate Banking and Currency Committee and member of the Appropriations Committee; and Senator Everett M. Dirksen, Republican of Illinois, also a member of the Banking and Currency Committee.

Now, by transcription, we take you to the Senate Radio Gallery, where Chairman Cooke is waiting to begin the discussion.

COOKE: Last Monday President Truman sent to Congress his budget proposals for the year beginning next July 1st. This budget message was spectacular in many ways, and many of them need the same word - "biggest". It was the biggest peacetime budget ever proposed, calling for the biggest expenditure, eighty-five and a half billion dollars, anticipating the biggest receipts from taxes, seventy-one billion dollars, and foreseeing the biggest peacetime deficit, fourteen and a half billion dollars. And even these heavy figures, the President emphasized, were based upon two fairly optimistic assumptions. One, that there would be no war and, two, that there will be a truce in Korea. All these things being so, Senator Maybank, are you in favor of Congress passing that budget as submitted?

MAYBANK: It is my opinion that the budget should be reduced to a certain extent. As to how far we should go would be a matter for those in the Congress to decide after full hearings on the various appropriations bills that, as you

say, total over eighty billion dollars.

COOKE: And there are hundreds of pages of submitted figures to be gone thru and ...

MAYBANK: That is correct. And it's my opinion that there will be deficiency bills of considerable size sent up, particularly for atomic energy.

COOKE: Well, with the actual budget that we now have proposed, Senator Maybank, in order to cut much out of it you would have to go into one kind or another of the military expenditures proposed, wouldn't you? Don't they amount to most of the budget?

MAYBANK: Mr. Cooke, you're absolutely right. The military appropriations, that is, for past wars and for preparation of the country today amounts to seventy-two and a half billion of the total amount. If you cut the rest ten per cent, you'd only cut a billion, too. They should be cut, of course, the other expenditures, to a certain extent, but you could not balance the budget alone by cutting them only.

COOKE: All right, then, Senator Dirksen, what's your point of view on this, in cuts available and possible?

DIRKSEN: Well, Mr. Cooke, as a preliminary, first let me say how grateful I am for the chance to appear on this program with my old friend and my chairman, Senator Maybank, whom I esteem as an affable and very able member of the Senate. Secondly, let me say, so that your listeners may be clear, that if they have some rather elusive notion about the budget that the very word comes from an old French word meaning purse. So when we talk about the national budget, we mean the national purse - what goes into it, meaning taxes, what comes out of ^{it}, meaning the spending that is authorized by Congress. So they should have an interest in this national budget, for the thing we're talking about this morning is a book the size of an unexpurgated edition of Sears Roebuck's catalogue, with a thousand pages in it, which is nothing more than a blueprint of what we're going to spend and what we're going to extricate from the people's pockets. And so, just to round out the conclusion, I said

whimsically the other day that we're getting so now that we can run the country almost as cheaply in time of peace as we do in time of war, with an 85-billion-dollar budget. And I honestly believe, from long experience on the House Appropriations Committee, that the axe can go in deep, the axe must go in deep, and that billions of dollars are going to have to be taken out of that budget to bring it more nearly in line with the revenue, because a deficit will be highly inflationary and fall with great weight upon our people.

COCKE: Well, now, let's see, then, gentlemen, where this axe could be swung without bleeding the budget and the country. As Senator Maybank pointed out a minute ago, Senator Dirksen, most of the money is going to be spent for military appropriations. Are you in favor of swinging the axe a bit on the Pentagon?

DIRKSEN: I am, very definitely, because I think that our military services today, on the basis of disclosures by Senator Johnson's subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee and the Ebert Committee of the House, indicate the waste and the extravagance in military appropriations, and deep cuts can be made without impairing the efficacy of our military effort.

MAYBANK: Well, Mr. Cooke, let me express my deep appreciation also at being here with you and with my good friend Senator Dirksen. It is my opinion that the military can be cut some, but I don't think that the waste and extravagance would be sufficient enough to balance the budget if we cut it all out. And I hope and pray we will cut it all out. And I do think Senator Johnson's subcommittee of Armed Services is doing a good job.

COCKE: Well, now, is it possible this early in the day of surveys of the budget to suggest any possible figure of cuts in the military side? Did you have any figure in mind, Senator Dirksen?

DIRKSEN: I have no definite figure in mind. I have seen some estimated figures by different members of the House and Senate. I see a figure the other day by Senator George. As a matter of fact, I think we can probably exceed that figure. And as I do so, there is in my mind a cumulative estimate that

goes, first of all, let me say, to the Foreign Aid Program; secondly, to the military program; third, of course, to the general program of expenses for the operation of Government, and then for some of the new items that are proposed. I see 339 million for civil defense. I'm not swept away by the extreme and passionate language that was employed in the State of the Union message. I see there are sundry hundreds of millions now for Aid to Education, and, just drawing on recollection here, a good many items. And I know, of course, that the cumulative total doesn't reach what you hope, but at least it will be very, very substantial and will run into billions of dollars.

MAYBANK: Well, Mr. Cooke, I merely want to say this, that it would be impossible, as I see it, to raise taxes and I don't think they should be raised, and therefore we're going to have to cut and particularly we're going to have to cut foreign aid. It'd be my judgment that the Foreign Aid Program will be cut substantially; that is, we can't afford to spend ten billion dollars on foreign aid and keep running up a deficit, devaluating our money and losing our prestige in the economic world, which is so essential in this bitter struggle with Communists at this time.

COOKE: Well, then you think, Senator Maybank, that in the military the likeliest biggest cut would be in this foreign aid suggestion of ~~Frank~~ President Truman's of \$10,800,000,000?

MAYBANK: I do think that -- and I think further than this. As far as I'm concerned -- and I think the Senator feels as I do, because we're both on the Banking and Currency Committee and we know the dreadful shortage of steel, aluminum, copper and other critical materials that have stymied business development and stopped many manufacturers from expanding -- I'm not going to vote for any money unless I'm certain that that money can be used ... that there is available for that money the strategic material that is necessary. There's no use to vote for a lot of money to buy things that you can't buy.

COOKE: Well, now, there's something like fourteen billion for new planes, which consume a lot of those materials, and I notice that some of this material

has just been shifted back to civilian production in Detroit. Does that mean, Senator, that you would like to pull down about twenty billion that the Air Force is going to get?

WYBANK: No, I didn't suggest that, but I just want to make certain that there is sufficient strategic materials for the money that we appropriate; and, naturally, we're going to have to supply the civilians with some critical materials because we cannot stop the industry of this country and make the wheels all stop, when they are the ones who pay the taxes and pay the billions that the armed services are going to use.

DIRKSEN: Mr. Cooke, I'd like to say something that may be of particular interest to the folks who do us the honor to listen today. First, I've observed Senator Wybank on the Senate floor many times since I've been here, and I know the ~~firm~~ fidelity and devotion that he brings to this business of trying to economize, knowing the burden that falls upon the taxpayer. He is on the Senate Appropriations Committee and I'm sure he has thought of this a number of times. I think I extracted from Senator Mahoney last October or some time last year the admission on the Senate floor that the Senate Appropriations Committee was armed with only one man who was trying to familiarize himself with the military budget. It is an inadequate approach to the thing, and I have suggested time and time again, Congress ought to spend millions upon itself and secure career men who are expert in the field and they must live in these departments and agencies, and then when those who ask for the money and who will also spend the money come before the committee and make their case, here at least you've got a prosecuting witness in your corner ~~xxxxxx~~ ^{who's} familiar with it and say "ask him this, ask him that", and then, finally, you get the whole story.

COOKE: You mean, in effect, Senator Dirksen, special investigators for the key committees, who will go into all the executive departments and search out what the money is proposed for, how they would spend it, and come back to report to you, the committee-members?

DIRKSEN: Indeed so. And it's not a case of being down there in the agency for a month or two months. They've got to be there the year 'round, and they've got to be men of capacity, so well paid that they'll resist the blandishments of the departments, and then you've got somebody in your corner who really knows and who's been thru the lesson book. And if we were to do that, I think we could come pretty close to getting this whole budget in line in fiscal 1952.

WAYBANK: Well, Mr. Cooke, as a member of the subcommittee on military appropriations, I want to thoroly agree with the distinguished Senator from Illinois. We do lack information and we do not have someone on the job all the time, and I don't know how the Senator feels about it, but I think it's far more important for the Appropriations Committee, where all the money is spent and where all the money is appropriated, to be more of a watchdog committee than some of the investigating committees, who can only investigate. After all, it's the Appropriations Committee that appropriates the money and, after all, we should have someone in these departments all the day and at all times.

DIRKSEN: Mr. Cooke, I agree thoroly with Senator Waybank, and it has been one of the distressing things in my life. It wouldn't be too much for Congress to spend five million dollars for a career staff and particularly with reference to the Appropriations Committee, because that is where the money is finally committed. There is a ratification ceremony usually on the Senate floor, sometimes we go in for a little cheese paring and take out a little here and a little there, but at least the members of that committee have had the benefit of the testimony, and I speak from long experience on the House Appropriations Committee. So if that could be done, why, certainly we could put the axe in and put it in deep and we would have the satisfaction of knowing that it's not a meat-axe technique that you bring to this job but you do a scalpel job. There is a fine deftness about it when you're equipped with the necessary facts. And my friend Senator Waybank knows full well that we're in a very distressing position, when you sit on one side of the committee; they

say, "we want a billion for this"; all right, gentlemen, justify it; and how can you go well behind their testimony unless you've got the facts on which to predicate a conflicting view?

COOKE: Well, I'm a little baffled here, because you two gentlemen are well-known members of your own party and not without power in each of your parties; you both believe this should be for the good of the country and should be done; what's the log-jam? Why hasn't it already been done?

MAYBANK: Well, Mr. Cooke, I can only say this that, as the Senator says, we confirm these appropriation reports -- when I say confirm them, I mean the Senate passes them, usually with some minor cut or some meat-axe job; that should not be -- and, as the Senator so ably stated, we have the hearings, Mr. Cooke, but we don't follow up the hearings and we should have the staff to follow up the hearings. The Senator remembers well, last year when he introduced an amendment to cut the appropriation to foreign aid of some five hundred million dollars, I recall that I supported the Senator, even tho I was a member of the Appropriations Committee.

COOKE: But why haven't you got those investigators? Why can't you get them? What's involved here?

DIRKSEN: Well, permit me to make a little comment on it. I endeavored over a period of five years, when I was busy on the legislative budget over on the House side and served on the joint committee with six very distinguished Senators, when I was a humble member of the Congress, trying, of course, to get that idea over. Well, in part you have a bit of the political factor; secondly, you have a timidity in Congress today that should not be. They're afraid when they go home that the constituents will get in their hair and use an axe on them because they've spent a little money on themselves. I've never had any difficulty defending that viewpoint before the people in my old constituency, (sic) nor do I doubt that I'd have difficulty in defending it before the people of Illinois, for if you can show them that for a substantial sum spent on investigatory services you'll save twenty, thirty, forty times that outlay and maybe

more. That certainly would recommend itself to the business sense and to the economy complex of our people. And I'm sure Senator Maybank shares that viewpoint.

MAYBANK: Mr. Cooke, the Senator is right. The Congress denies themselves everything and appropriates everything for agencies. There is a timidity, such as was the case last year in the resolution, I think, proposed by Senator McClellan, which, by the way, I understand will be called up this year shortly after the statehood bills are over, in which he proposes to set up a joint committee to do similarly to what Senator Dirksen spoke about. He had a long meeting in the Appropriations Committee on Tuesday to discuss this resolution, and I'm certain and hopeful that it will pass. But there has been this fear that we spend too much money on Congress - and it's an unjustified fear.

COOKE: Perhaps we can anticipate a Maybank-Dirksen resolution, if necessary, to help give you that ...

(SPEAK SIMULTANEOUSLY)

MAYBANK: Yes, I'm going to support the resolution that's now before the Senate, that the Senator's well familiar with; it was introduced last year.

DIRKSEN: Now, Mr. Cooke, since we're off the budget beam just a moment, I think in addition to that suggestion, in which I concur heartily with Senator Maybank, that the ... the Committee on Expenditures, of course, is continuing its hearings on the recommendations of the Hoover Commission. I've said on occasion that I thought probably those recommendations were one of the most constructive pieces of work that had been done in Washington in the last fifty years. One weakness perhaps in the whole setup was that some particular person was not armed with authority in the Executive Branch to beat the administrators over the head -- and I mean to beat them over the head -- including members of the Cabinet, in order to secure the adoption of some of those recommendations. For, if they are finally articulated and we get greater efficiency, a better work disposition in all executive branches, I feel reasonably confident that the estimate of the commission in the first instance that savings aggregating

as much as three billion dollars can finally be effected, or just as soon as the thing is in operation and working smoothly. So we ought to take countenance of that factor also.

MAYBANK: Well, I'm certain that this year we will probably cut the budget in the neighborhood of three billion dollars. But there's another great trouble that the Congress is up against, as the Senator well knows, Mr. Cooke, and that is this - the everybody wants economy except for themselves. The advocates of the school program want economy elsewhere from the schools, the advocates of the hospital programs want economy other than the hospitals, and so on it goes, and the pressure groups on the Congress are really terrific. I think on the whole that Congress with all that it has to contend with does a pretty good job.

COOKE: Well, are you saying, Senator Maybank, then, that you anticipate not more than approximately three to four billion dollars cut out of this eighty-five and a half billion, in other words, we'll still have over eighty billion dollars in the budget when the Senate and House finishes with it?

MAYBANK: In my judgment the cuts will be over three billion dollars. I said "at least three billion dollars". Now, as to how much farther they go will depend largely, in my opinion, on the critical materials that are available. For instance, the highways - Mr. McDonald testified the other day he could not get the steel; there's no use to appropriate a great deal of money for the highways unless they're going to be able to get the steel. A great project in ... (unintelligible) Ohio, as the Senator well knows, has been held up for the lack of steel. There's no use to make these appropriations unless you have the materials. And, in my judgment, a lot of worthy projects, such as that project to get the people to and from work in the big industrial areas of Chicago and Detroit, worthy as it may be, has been held up for lack of materials, and there's no use to appropriate this money when you can't turn the money into the bridges and into the highways and into the hospitals that the people need.

COOKE: Well, one other question there, Senator Maybank, while I'm asking

you. Do you foresee any possibility of cutting up to fourteen billion dollars, so that we would have no deficit? Do you think that's in the realm of probability or possibility?

MAYBANK: Well, I would like to see it. But, Mr. Cooke, you want my frank opinion - I doubt it.

COOKE: Senator Dirksen?

DIRKSEN: First, let me say before I get to that question, I don't want to lose sight of one suggestion that Senator Maybank made which I think is both timely and very fruitful and ought to be directed to the people who are listening this morning. This is, after all, a concerted effort that requires a great degree of cooperation on the part of the people of the country. Now, if we're pressured into a lot of things and the spirit is willing but the flesh becomes weak, obviously your budget figures go up. So those things that are dispensable things, we've got to do without. But I'm not insensible of the fact that over the years, a state, a congressional district will put a good deal of pressure on their representative down here and we've got to resist that the best we know how.

MAYBANK: I ~~may~~^{might} add this - and I think the Senator'll agree with me - the state governments of the United States are so much better off financially than the National Government is itself that a lot of this state aid could be transferred back to the states in many instances.

DIRKSEN: That's quite true. Now, the second thing you have to keep in mind always is this: It's easy to be hoist by your own petard, as they say, and suddenly you embrace a conclusion and a whole new string of events comes trotting out of history's cornucopia and we don't know what to do with it. Let's assume, for instance, that there's failure in Korea; let's assume we start in for a big push out there; well, we know very well, then, that nearly every conclusion you've embraced just simply goes overboard. And until we can see more clearly and this thing ~~it~~ takes a turn one way or another, everything we say is just a little fluid and speculative. But I'm still hopeful that by using the scalpel

deftly but firmly that we can make a far more substantial cut in the budget estimates than has been suggested. Whether we can get up to fourteen billion, I do not know. I doubt it, as a matter of fact. I rather share Senator Maybank's viewpoint on that.

COOKE: Anything that you have in mind, Senator Dirksen, as an approximate figure? I know it's too early to get anything definite, but ...

DIRKSEN: Well, speaking for myself, I think I shall pursue maybe an indefinite objective but somewhere around seven or eight billion dollars, I hope. Because I've been home, and so have other Senators and Congressmen. They've been hearing from the people. They begin to understand now what this tax burden does to the spirit of risk and to the element of human incentive, which is, after all, the mainspring of the country. And when you cut out the heart of a fellow's thrust and goal, when he wants to do something, establish a new little plant, engage in a new venture, and he says, "well, Mr. Whiskers, Mr. Uncle Sam is going to take it all anyway," it just takes the very life out of the effort. And so we are confronted with one of the most serious responsibilities we ever had, and I make so bold as to say that the spending, taxing issue today is probably right up in the forefront as one of the great challenges before the country.

COOKE: Well, then, Senator Dirksen and Senator Maybank, you've both expressed the suspicion, at least, that no matter how deftly and how deeply cutting instruments go in the budget, you're not going to be able to balance it. Does that mean, then, that you are in favor of new taxes or more deficit?

MAYBANK: Mr. Cooke, of course, I expressed that opinion on the basis of the world of today. Anything can happen in Korea before the Congress recesses next summer. No one knows what will happen in April and May. But today I would think there would be no new taxes and we would have a small deficit.

DIRKSEN: Well, my position and my viewpoint is very simple and very clear. First, I want to see what we can do; how deep the knife can go in or how far we can discount its rather extreme language that usually accompanies a budget

message, and then, when we've come down to a residual conclusion, what is the maximum we ~~can~~ could^{do}/in that field, what is the maximum revenue, the maximum take of the Government, then you're confronted with a conclusion; then the question is: what do you do? Do you write it on as a deficit, which is manifestly inflationary in its effect, or do you say, "well, sorry, that's the best we can do, so come now with more taxes." That's going to be a very unhappy result for the country. But I want to exhaust every possibility, large and small, before I get around to that conclusion.

MAYBANK: Mr. Cooke, I certainly intend, as a member of the Appropriations Committee, to exhaust every reasonable means of reducing the budget. And I appreciate, as you do and as Senator Dirksen, that it's a funny situation in America to have a control [?] to control inflation and then turn it around and create a deficit to increase inflation. There's nothing worse than deficit spending, there's nothing worse than inflation, there's nothing worse than to continue in devaluation of the dollar. It's even worse than the terrible taxes that are taken from the people's pockets.

COOKE: So we're all faced with a choice of unhappy paths, rather than any optimistic, cheerful path which is nice and clear, where we can clean everything up.

MAYBANK: Well, Mr. Cooke, I'd say, with the world situation as it is today in the Orient and as it is in the Middle East, it's not a very bright prospect.

DIRKSEN: Now, Mr. Cooke, we still have a little time, and I want to make one or two other observations. Over the years, as my good friend Senator Maybank so well knows, we have authorized what euphemistically we call permanent and indefinite appropriations. You authorize a continuing appropriation year after year that becomes almost automatic. It may be a grant of aid to a state; it may be in the field of vocational education or agricultural education; oh, the list is fairly legion. And those are on the books. You have no chance to survey them, because they're automatic. As Senator Byrd said not too long ago,

nearly two-thirds of our budget has gotten into a position where it's hardly subject to annual review anymore. Now, I know the tremendous job it would be to go back and comb thru all that authorization legislation. But the fact of the matter is, it would be a very felicitous thing for the country if we went back and revealed a lot of it at least and then started all over again and reappraised these needs and the relationship between the Federal Government and the various states and then saw what we could do. We could save some money in that field.

COOKE: In an election year, Senator Dirksen?

DIRKSEN: Definitely so. You cannot let an election year stand in the way. Now, I'm just as politically sensitive, I think, as nearly anybody, and coming from a state like Illinois I ought to be. But that shouldn't stand in the way, because this time it's not the destiny of a political party with which we're concerned, it is the destiny and the ~~fast~~ fate of a republic. And if the people are not fully sensitive of how important it is, it's our responsibility then to bring that message to them and dramatize it the best we know how.

MAYBANK: Well, Mr. Cooke, I must agree that the authorization bills are quite unreasonable at times. I've voted against some of them, voted for some of them. But ~~in~~ in the old days, when you had your authorization and appropriation simultaneously, as the Senator well remembers, we were much more economical. Because if any of those authorization bills was the actual amount of money, instead of guesswork, on many ~~in~~ occasions many of them, in my judgment, would never have passed.

DIRKSEN: I agree with Senator Maybank. And that's all the more reason why we should have a staff, we should comb thru all these permanent and indefinite appropriations, which are, after all, commitments that we cannot survey and one sits there like a bump on a log and says, "well, we can do nothing about that." So they need appraisal to do it.

MAYBANK: One committee authorizes expenditures on something, then, later on, they come to the Appropriations Committee for the money. We have no choice

except appropriate the money for which some other committee had previously made a tremendous authorization. And that's one of the things that should be, in my judgment, carefully studied, with the aim that we would at least, when we pass the authorization bill, know the exact cost of what that authorization bill meant and not wait until it gets before the Appropriations Committee and there's little we can do about a law of Congress.

DIRKSEN: That's correct.

COOKE: Would it be practical, Senator Maybank, to attempt to have some kind of a joint committee arrangement, where it's all done at one fell swoop, by one committee?

MAYBANK: I have thought about that. I have no bill in mind, but it would be far better. It could not all be done by one committee, but it could be done by the Authorization Committee and Appropriation Committee simultaneously. Something of that kind might be able to be worked out.

DIRKSEN: Now I want to make one other suggestion. It runs in my mind that in a period of twelve years that I've served on the Appropriations Committee of the House that we had only a single session with the Ways and Means Committee, which is empowered with jurisdiction over revenue. Now, it seems rather strange that two of the most important committees in the House of Representatives, where revenue legislation originates, have not taken the trouble to somehow articulate and integrate their jobs. One is the Spending Committee, the other is the Taxing Committee. And there ought to be more frequent occasions when they get together and survey what one is going to do and what the other's going to do to harmonize the ultimate result. Same thing could be done on the Senate side and then in addition thereto there certainly ought to be more frequent conferences between the appropriate Spending and Taxing Committees of the both bodies, because, it seems to me, only then will we have a better and more tangible idea of what we're trying to do and certainly developing a balanced budget at every stage of the proceeding.

MAYBANK: Well, Mr. Cooke, I've been on the Appropriations Committee since

I came here in 1941, and I can't recall that we had any meeting with the Finance Committee, but we did have some meetings, for instance, with the Foreign Relations Committee, who, as the Senator well knows, passes these authorizations for Marshall Plan, FCA, and various other foreign authorizations. Well, we've had some meetings with them at times, but we haven't gotten very far with it. And the same thing is true of the other committees of Congress who pass these authorizations, vote for various things without consultation with Appropriations Committee and, of course, they shouldn't under our rules and laws consult with the Appropriation Committee. We have no law that way. But if there could be some joint arrangement worked out, it certainly, to the best of my judgment, could do no harm.

COOKE: So you feel, gentlemen, that you cannot foresee a budget probably cut down so there's no deficit whatsoever. You do not foresee new taxes. You do foresee, however, many ways in which the machinery of your examination and scrutiny of bills before you could be improved so that you could then cut them in the most efficient manner and save us money in the process.

MAYBANK: And I might say, Mr. Cooke, that, in my judgment, they will be cut and out as much as we possibly can.

DIRKSEN: If there's any difference between Senator Maybank and I it's only one of dimension. We both favor economy, but the question is how much can we reduce this ...

MAYBANK: How can we do it?

COOKE: And I think both of you show, gentlemen, your dimension as experts in this field of economy and the budget. You both mentioned foreign aid and the possible cuts in the foreign aid suggestion of President Truman's of 10,800,000; you'll be interested to know that on the PEOPLE'S PLATFORM next week at this same time your distinguished colleagues Senator Ellender and Senator Saltonstall will take up very specifically the foreign aid suggestions - how, where, and if they should be cut. I think, if you have a chance from your many duties, you might be interesting^{ed} in hearing them.

DIRKSEN: Thank you, Mr. Cooke.

MAYBANK: We will, Mr. Cooke. Thank you so much for being with you.

COOKE: Thank you very much for joining me on the PEOPLE'S PLATFORM today.

ANNCR: From the Senate Radio Gallery in the nation's capital, PEOPLE'S PLATFORM has brought you transcribed a discussion of the question: Will Congress approve the President's budget. Joining Dwight Cooke on the broadcast were Senator Everett M. Dirksen, Republican of Illinois, and Senator Burnett R. Maybank, Democrat of South Carolina.

Next week, PEOPLE'S PLATFORM will examine the question: How much U.S. aid for Western Europe now?

PEOPLE'S PLATFORM is a regular presentation of the CBS Radio Department of Public Affairs.

(BROADWAY PLAYHOUSE ANNOUNCEMENT)

This is the CBS RADIO NETWORK.

Ediphone trans./E. Scheiner