

PLEASE CREDIT ANY EXCERPTS OR QUOTES FROM THIS NBC RADIO AND TELEVISION PROGRAM TO "MEET THE PRESS."

MEET THE PRESS
Produced by Lawrence E. Spivak

- - -

SUNDAY, FEBRUARY 3, 1963

- - - - -
: This is a rush transcript :
: provided for the information :
: and convenience of the press. :
: Accuracy is not guaranteed. :
: In case of doubt, please check:
: with MEET THE PRESS. :
- - - - -

MODERATOR: Ned Brooks

GUESTS: Senator Everett McKinley Dirksen (R., Ill.)
and
Representative Charles A. Halleck,
(R., Ind.)

PANEL: Tom Wicker, New York Times
Rowland Evans, New York Herald Tribune
May Craig, Portland (Me.) Press Herald
Martin Agronsky, NBC News

MR. BROOKS: This is Ned Brooks, inviting you to
MEET THE PRESS.

(Announcement)

MR. BROOKS: Our guests today are the two Republican
leaders of Congress, Senator Everett Dirksen of Illinois,
and Congressman Charles Halleck of Indiana.

We will start the questions now with Martin Agronsky
of NBC News.

MR. AGRONSKY: Senator Dirksen, it looks like the curtain is coming down on your Ev and Charlie Show. The Republican National Committee has cut off your funds, \$40,000 a year. You said you are going to try to raise the money elsewhere and continue it. Congressman Bill Ayres of Ohio has said if you want to speak for the party he doesn't think the party wants you to speak for it. That is both you and Congressman Halleck.

Can you tell us what is going to happen to the Ev and Charlie Show and how does it reflect on the leadership that you and Mr. Halleck exercise in the Congress today?

SENATOR DIRKSEN: Well, I think I can say to you that the Ev and Charlie Show as such will continue. I wish they'd call it the Joint Leadership Show, which it properly is. But we don't mind the appellation, because I think that we were tagged with it in the belief that perhaps they could laugh this performance off the air. But it has been going on.

I think I can say with certainty that it will go on and that, of course, individual members of the House and Senate are fully entitled to their opinions. And as for the financing, that should offer no difficulty.

MR. AGRONSKY: Where will it come from, sir?

SENATOR DIRKSEN: Well, I don't know that I ought to disclose that. I think I can say to you categorically that

it will be arranged.

MR. AGRONSKY: Then there is really an intent, then, despite the considerable criticism that has been voiced by members of your own party in both houses, sir, to continue with the Ev and Charlie Show and you feel then that you will continue to speak in that sense for the Republican Party in both houses?

SENATOR DIRKSEN: There is not only an intent, I think there is a determination that this leadership presentation which began in the White House under Eisenhower and which has continued through the 87th Congress will continue through the 88th.

MR. AGRONSKY: Senator, just this question: Do you feel, sir, that you and Mr. Halleck are the leaders of the Republican Party today in the United States?

SENATOR DIRKSEN: Excuse my modesty, Mr. Agronsky, but I think we have done a pretty fair job of speaking for the party and presenting the party views and the party policy.

MR. BROOKS: We will be back with MEET THE PRESS and more questions for our guests, Senator Everett Dirksen and Congressman Charles Halleck, but first this message.

(Announcement)

MR. BROOKS: And now resuming our interview, our guests today are the Republican leaders of Congress, Senator Everett Dirksen and Congressman Charles Halleck. You have

just met Martin Agronsky of NBC News. Our other reporters today are Rowland Evans, New York Herald Tribune, May Craig of the Portland, Maine, Press Herald, and Tom Wicker of the New York Times. Lawrence E. Spivak, our permanent member of the panel, will be back with us soon.

We will continue the questions now with Mr. Evans.

MR. EVANS: Congressman Halleck, last month when the Republicans met in the House to elect their leaders, your candidate for the position of Chairman of the Conference was defeated by Representative Ford of Michigan. Your candidate was Representative Hoeven of Iowa.

After that conference Representative Hoeven came out and said, and I quote, "They are not after me, they are really after Halleck."

Do you agree with this, sir? Do you think that this is the beginning of a revolt against your leadership in the House?

REPRESENTATIVE HALLECK: The answer is No.

MR. EVANS: How do you explain the unusual occurrence of ^{overthrowing-} _A

REPRESENTATIVE HALLECK: Could I just correct you just a little bit. It is true that I voted for Charlie Hoeven of Iowa. He had been the Chairman of our Conference. He had been the Chairman of our Conference for quite a while. I think he was Chairman of the Conference before I became leader. But in any event, let me just say this, that as

far as I was concerned it was understood that it was just simply a matter of Republicans in the House choosing somebody to be Chairman of the Conference, and that is what it was.

MR. EVANS: Congressman, you don't think that implicit in that action was a sense of dissatisfaction with your leadership in the House?

REPRESENTATIVE HALLECK: You know, could I say, Mr. Evans, that we were introduced, Senator Dirksen and I, as the guests on this show, and you are the guest -- I mean we are the guests until the first question is asked, and that is the way it ought to be.

Now then I said to you that I do not see anything at all in the way of a threat to my leadership. Just let me say this: You asked about the joint leadership meetings. Senator Dirksen replied that they are joint leadership meetings. As far as I am concerned it is no show. It is a joint leadership meeting of responsible people, started by President Eisenhower, carried on under the chairmanship of the National Chairman in our meetings. I think many, many times we have pointed out things that were good for the country. Now it just so happens that I am the leader of the Republicans in the House of Representatives and so far as I know, Mr. Evans, there is no substantial opposition to my situation in that regard.

MRS. CRAIG: Senator Dirksen, you have advocated an examination of Communist Cuba by Senate Republicans. Do you believe with some of your colleagues of both parties in the Senate that it is militarily stronger today than it was six months ago?

SENATOR DIRKSEN: Do you mean that Cuba is stronger?

MRS. CRAIG: Yes.

SENATOR DIRKSEN: Well, I haven't seen the authentic reply from our military leaders, but a good deal of information and data has been adduced that gives one some reason to believe that they might be stronger, except, of course, for the missiles that allegedly have been removed. I haven't examined the whole matter. The thing I presented to the Policy Committee was actually an exploration of the Bay of Pigs fiasco. I notice of course there was some criticism to the effect that this was a one-man, one-party investigation. Actually it wasn't at all. I indicated my interest because of the Attorney General's statement, twenty months after the Bay of Pigs and I thought probably in the interests of authentic history the matter needed further attention. So I have been assembling data and believe me when I say I have assembled a good deal from a great many sources all over the country.

But it will be presented to the Policy Committee and then they will make a recommendation as to whether we ought to seek a formal investigation.

MRS. CRAIG: Yes.

Senator, the President has said that since we can't get on-site inspections in Cuba that we are having daily scrutiny of Cuba by air surveillance. Do you think that is adequate and what happens if they shoot down one of our surveillance planes with what are known as defensive missiles?

SENATOR DIRKSEN: Frankly, I do not believe that air reconnaissance is enough because it is easy to conceal missiles, particularly in the many caves of Cuba. And in my files are some reports to the effect that missiles are still there. I have no way of knowing whether they are. But certainly by air reconnaissance you cannot develop that point and you can't tell. Now when that question was directed to Mr. Sylvester, the Deputy Director of Defense in New York in December, he simply said "We do not know whether there are missiles in the caves of Cuba," and you cannot know fully unless you get on-site inspections.

MRS. CRAIG: Then in your opinion have we accepted Communist Cuba in this hemisphere and what has that done to the Monroe Doctrine?

SENATOR DIRKSEN: Well, you say whether we have accepted it. I have not accepted it and I would like to go back to the residual problem, and the residual problem is Castro and communism as a stooge of the Soviet Union in the Western Hemisphere and it comes perilously close, I think, to being an

invasion of what we conceive of the content of the Monroe Doctrine.

MR. WICKER: Mr. Halleck, there is always a good deal of talk and debate about the responsibility of an opposition party. How do you see that responsibility in a specific case like Aid to Education? The administration in many ways gives the impression of seeing no way out of the deadlock that developed in the last congress. Shouldn't an opposing party step in with an alternative at about this point?

MR. HALLECK: Mr. Wicker, if I could preface my answer to that question -- and I will be happy to answer it -- by a further reference to our total operation, we Republicans in the House and Senate, and particularly on the House side, we have had under consideration for a long, long time, ever since we got this operation going, our Joint Leadership Meetings, the matter of bringing in more Republican people, like governors, bringing in more legislative experts. That we hope to do.

Now with specific reference to your question about the Aid to Education program, it was my privilege upon the invitation of our members on the Education and Labor Committee, the Republican members, to sit with them in a press conference the other day. There they developed -- I didn't develop it -- an alternative program that can be accomplished. It would include Aid to Higher Education for brick and mortar, for private and public colleges, in substantial amounts.

As a matter of fact we Republicans tried to put that across last year. We had a motion to recommit in the House of Representatives because the Senate had put in scholarships, grants and loans. We passed the bill originally in the House of Representatives by a vote of 300 and some to 70-some, which was overwhelming. Now we can do that again. We can improve the National Defense Education Act.

All I can say, to use the words of some of our very able members on the Republican Side, on the Committee on Education and Labor, that great big bill that thick (indicating) that was sent up by the Kennedy Administration is nothing but an invitation to disaster.

Now we Republicans are offering our substitute. It has already been introduced by Al Quie of Minnesota, a very able member of the committee, and I hope we can bring that to passage.

MR. WICKER: Well in bringing that bill to passage, how can an opposition party go about this? Will you simply direct your efforts toward defeating the administration bill, that will have some steam behind it from the administration, or can you actively try to promote your own bill -- in the country as well as in the Congress?

MR. HALLECK: Well, we have already started to promote it in the country and I was glad for the invitation of the members on our committee to sit down with them in the press conference and

I expressed my thoughts, there.

Now how we go about getting it done is, of course, a great question, because we Republicans in the House of Representatives are outnumbered three to two. But Mr. Wicker, I will make you a little guess, if they get one of those bills on the floor, ultimately we will come around to the amendment stage and then to a motion to recommit that the minority always has. We Republicans will have. And then we will come forward with a bill that is constructive, useful, helpful, will help Education, and something that can be accomplished.

MR. WICKER: And this bill in your opinion will have -- a bill as you describe it -- will have the reasonably united support of the Republican forces in the House? This is a Republican policy?

REPRESENTATIVE HALLECK: I will say it will have pretty solid support. Sometimes people complain about my leadership up there. Well, I lost one when we beat that "regimentation or ruin" farm bill last year that even now the Kennedy administration has abandoned because it was no good, and I will say we will have good support on our side and I will say enough support of right-thinking people on the Democrat side that we can put across a good program.

SENATOR DIRKSEN: May I make a short response to Mr. Wicker: That question you raise occurs very frequently: Well, what is your alternative? Suppose a proposition is essentially and basically un sound and you are going to reject it. Do we have an

obligation as a party to come up with something that is a little less unsound? I don't think so. 11

1 If the basic concept is bad, you are under no obligation to come along with an alternative. You just reject it out of hand like that.

MR. EVANS: This will turn on that answer. There seems to be no end of political issues along the Potomac. The unemployment rate is 5.8 percent today. It is going up. The Common Market British entry has failed -- this is one of our key policies -- policies of the Kennedy Administration. You have mentioned Cuba. There is the issue of spending. The tax bill.

How would you select the one or two major issues in which you think the Republican Party should take strong positions and how do you develop a consensus that joins the so-called liberal with the so-called conservative Republicans to develop your thesis?

SENATOR DIRKSEN: Well, I don't know what you mean, Mr. Evans, by joining the liberal and the conservative.

MR. EVANS: Well, take civil rights.

SENATOR DIRKSEN: Well, that is only one. But I do know this, that the emphasis in this session will certainly be fiscal. The Administration already places it on the tax bill. And then you have the deficit and of course you can't separate your budget from the tax bill because they are in the same domain.

Now we will line up and confront that issue when the

time comes but actually nothing has been done thus far because in the Senate certainly the committees are not meeting. And we will have time and when we do, we will have a package and it will be a package that will have some real sting and steam in it.

MR. EVANS: Well, to get specific, Senator Dirksen, fiscal -- either you have to oppose a tax reduction or find some way to reduce the budget, isn't that correct?

SENATOR DIRKSEN: Yes.

MR. EVANS: Would you go along with reducing defense spending or space spending, which are the major areas of our spending, and with that saving vote a tax cut, or do you think the tax cut proposal itself goes too far?

SENATOR DIRKSEN: Well, let's not limit our economy just to the defense and space field. When you start looking at a budget and try to reduce it and bring it within the frame of your revenues, you look at the whole kit and caboodle, and that will include space and defense spending and the farm program and HEW, and virtually everything in that seven-pound document that was delivered to us on the 17th of January. And we are in process of doing exactly that right now.

MR. EVANS: But you don't have yet a policy on what the Republican position is going to be --

SENATOR DIRKSEN: First of all, I think, get something quite

definite to know where the knife is going to be inserted, and then present it and then get acceptance of it, if you can, and then after that you present it as a package.

MR. AGRONSKY: Mr. Halleck, you have been nodding as Senator Dirksen spoke. Do you know where the knife is going to be inserted, fiscally, in the President's budget?

REPRESENTATIVE HALLECK: Mr. Agronsky, since Mr. Kennedy became President of the United States the expenditures of the government for non-defense items have gone up more than \$20 billion. Now then as far as I am concerned, let me just say this: On the House side we have been having meetings of our 20 members on the Appropriations Committee and we are getting all the help we can get to try to find the places where we can cut.

I will say to you, Mr. Agronsky, that we can make some cuts in the Defense Establishment, we can make them in foreign aid, we can make them in non-defense areas and in my opinion we are going to do it.

Now as far as the tax bill is concerned, you know we Republicans are experts in this business of tax reduction. I was the Majority Leader of two Congresses, the 80th, that Mr. Truman held up to scorn, and the 83rd under Mr. Eisenhower. And we gave the people of this country substantial tax reduction, cut the cost of government, balanced the budget and had a little money left over to apply on the

national debt.

Now I am just hoping that we will be able to gather enough forces this time to accomplish something like that.

MR. AGRONSKY: Mr. Halleck, can you be more specific?

REPRESENTATIVE HALLECK: In respect to cutting the cost of government?

MR. AGRONSKY: Well, you said you thought there could be cuts in the Defense Establishment.

REPRESENTATIVE HALLECK: There is no question about it, Mr. Agronsky. I have said already I think each of the Armed Services, if the Secretary was put right up against it and the people running the show, he could find ways and means to cut a billion dollars out of each one of them.

Now then foreign aid, I have been supporting it. I have supported some cuts, too. There are going to be some cuts this time.

I saw the other day in the paper where a very prominent man who has had very much to do -- happens to be a Democrat -- with raising money for health purposes, he made a speech out in California in which he said we have been pumping money into the Institutes of Health that they couldn't even spend.

Now what I am saying is we Republicans will be first up in the House of Representatives, and we are hoping to get some Democrat help and we are hoping to find ways and means to make substantial reductions in the expenditures

of the government. I realize that the new Director of the Budget says a balanced budget would be devastating for the economy of the country. I just don't believe that.

MR. AGRONSKY: He denies he said that, sir.

REPRESENTATIVE HALLECK: I just read the transcript again.

SENATOR DIRKSEN: You know if you are going down in the hole of a deficit, that is like the wagon going down hill. First you've got to stop it and then turn it around and start up hill. Why come along with new programs like the Youth Conservation Corps and others when you've got a \$12 billion deficit staring you in the face? That is where you start. And then you examine every other thing that is in that budget where you can make a cut.

MR. WICKER: Before I ask the question I really want to ask Senator Dirksen, I would like to return to your answer on education for just a moment, because you left the impression, at least with me -- and I want to be sure I am clear on it -- that you considered aid to education perhaps an unsound proposition. I think this was your --

SENATOR DIRKSEN: Well, I considered the bill that came up here two years ago to dip into affairs of states and municipalities as entirely unsound and quite at variance with our concept of Federal-state government and in that respect I deem it quite unsound.

MR. WICKER: To pass on to another subject, almost every Republican leader prior to the elections of 1962 said that the Republicans needed to make substantial gains in the Congressional elections in order to make the Presidential nomination in 1964 worth anything.

Mr. Morton said if you didn't make those gains, the nomination would have to be peddled.

Now you didn't make those gains. I mean you didn't make large gains, and I wonder how much you now think the Republican nomination will be worth in '64.

SENATOR DIRKSEN: It will be worth plenty, believe me.

Frankly, I think this Administration, on net balance, is in real fiscal difficulty. And You wouldn't get a \$12 billion budget and this kind of tax cut, or a tax proposal, unless they were in serious difficulty, and that is the reason for it.

Unfortunately time does not permit an opportunity to spell it out. But it involves the balance of payments, it involves unemployment, it involves the increase in consumer prices, it involves nearly everything in the domestic gamut. And I think that nomination is going to be worth plenty.

MRS. CRAIG: Mr. Halleck, you have said that everybody is for economy in the abstract, but with the "me" left out. Would you oppose a suggestion that Congressional

salaries be raised by \$7,500 a year, including you?

REPRESENTATIVE HALLECK: Yes. And Mrs. Craig may I say -- and maybe these blunt answers are not what you want on this program -- I made the first speech for the last increase. In the House of Representatives we raised the salaries of Representatives to \$25,000. The Senate thought that they weren't worth quite that much so they cut it back to \$22,500, and we had to go along.

SENATOR DIRKSEN: We thought they were worth that much. It was a little timidity, I think.

REPRESENTATIVE HALLECK: Well, whatever it was, Mrs. Craig, I think at the moment it would be ill advised to raise the salaries in that fashion and so you say "oppose." I am one -- I probably should hasten to say that I think I am worth a little more than twenty-two five, although you can get a big argument about that.

MRS. CRAIG: Mr. Halleck, you have been critical of the President's spending. He hasn't got any money to spend if Congress doesn't give it to him. You have been expanding his powers and giving him the money. Why do you do that?

REPRESENTATIVE HALLECK: Mrs. Craig, I am awfully glad you asked that question. You know I have been here 28 years going on 29, and if I make it I will finish out 30. In just four of those years we had a Republican Congress.

And in all of those Republican Congressional years we cut the cost of government, we held down the spending. Mr. Eisenhower had a Democrat Congress for six of his eight years. They are the people who have been spending the money. I have stood against it. We Republicans have stood against it.

We have stood against programs that we thought were wasteful, unnecessary, but we have been overwhelmed, we have been outnumbered. We are outnumbered now in the House of Representatives, three to two. We have been outnumbered more than that in recent years.

So as far as I am concerned, I just wish we had more Republicans there. We'd do what we have done before: Give this country some real good government.

MR. EVANS: Senator Dirksen, I would like to go back to this joint leadership conference, otherwise known as the Ev and Charlie Show.

Will you invite every Republican Governor from time to time, so that all 17 are brought into this, to participate in those conferences?

SENATOR DIRKSEN: Oh, Mr. Evans, I can't give you an answer. I can say this. We used to invite the ranking members of committees to join with us at the White House. Now Governors may come and if they do, if they are in town and it coincides with our program up there, why

obviously the thing to do would be to invite them.

MR. BROOKS: Senator, I am going to have to interrupt. I'm sorry, but I see that our time is up.

Thank you very much, Senator Dirksen and Congressman Halleck for being with us. I'll tell you about next week's guest on MEET THE PRESS after this message.

(Announcement)

THE ANNOUNCER: For a printed copy of today's interview sent ten cents in coin and a stamped, self-addressed envelope to Merkle Press, 809 Channing Street, N.E., Washington 18, D. C.

MR. BROOKS: Next week our guest on MEET THE PRESS will be President Kennedy's chief economic advisor, Dr. Walter Heller, the Chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers. Now this is Ned Brooks saying goodbye for Senator Everett Dirksen, Congressman Charles Halleck and MEET THE PRESS.

- - - - -