

REPORTERS' ROUNDUP

MAY 8, 1952

(COPIED BY CBS NEWS DIVISION)

ANNOUNCER:

Providence Evening Bulletin...

HOLLES:

Hard battle ahead for control of Congress!

ANNOUNCER:

Cincinnati Inquirer...

HOLLES:

Dirksen directs campaign for GOP Senate!

ANNOUNCER:

Seattle Post Intelligencer...

HOLLES:

Ohio primary vote puts Taft in lead again!

ANNOUNCER:

Dallas Times Herald...

HOLLES:

Ike's backers promise full discussion of issues.

ANNOUNCER:

How does Senator Everett M. Dirksen, Republican of Illinois, react to these headlines? In a moment hear him in person answer questions fired at him on Reporters' Roundup.

HOLLES:

I'm interested in finding out from Senator Dirksen what the chances are of the Republicans winning control of Congress next November.

RIGGS:

Yes, would it take a real landslide victory to take control of the Senate away from the Democrats?

BYRNES:

What about the big debate that's going on about the President's constitutional powers? What are the Senator's views on this?

MOORE:

What are the chances of a deadlock at the Republican convention between Taft and Eisenhower?

HOLLES:

Well, gentlemen, our guest tonight is a prominent Republican who carries a heavy responsibility in this year's campaign in his role as Chairman of the National Republican Senatorial Campaign Committee. In that position he is directing the party's efforts to win not only the presidency in November, but to take control of the Senate away from the Democrats as well. To accomplish that, the Republicans must not only hold the forty-six Senate seats they now have -- but they must take three seats away from the Democrats.

Senator Dirksen also is a member of the very important Banking and Currency Committee of the Senate and therefore is rather closely concerned with the steel dispute and the matter of economic controls.

Fellow reporters, our guest is ready...

Reporters' Roundup, where bylines make headlines, comes to you transcribed this evening from the Radio Gallery of the United States Senate in Washington. Here to answer the questions of our panel of reporters is our guest...

ANNOUNCER:

Senator Everett M. Dirksen, Republican of Illinois.

HOLLES:

Our reporters are...

ANNOUNCER:

Robert L. Riggs of the Louisville Courier-Journal; William Moore of the Chicago Tribune; and Robert D. Byrnes of the Hartford Courant.

HOLLES:

And here is Mr. Riggs with the first question for Senator Dirksen...

RIGGS:

Senator Dirksen, of the 33 Senators being elected next fall, 14 are Democrats now and 19 are Republicans. To get control of the Senate your party has to take three seats away from the Democrats and hold all the ones you have now. Do you have in mind three seats you believe can be easily captured?

DIRKSEN:

Well, Mr. Riggs, as a matter of fact I have more than three seats in mind that I think we can capture.

RIGGS:

Let's hear about some of them, Senator.

DIRKSEN:

Well first of all there is Connecticut, now represented in the Senate by one Senator, Senator Benton. There's also Wyoming. There is New Mexico, there is Kentucky, there is Maryland where they had their election only yesterday and where Glenn Bell, presently a Congressman, is the Republican nominee for the Senate. All in all I think we have some eight states in mind particularly, in addition to those that we now hold, where we think we have an excellent chance.

RIGGS:

Now Senator, as a Kentuckian, I'm interested in your putting Kentucky in that list. On what grounds do you put Kentucky as a chance for the Democrats to lose?

DIRKSEN:

Well, I'm not forgetting the fact that you had a Republican Senator in the Senate not too long ago, as a matter of fact, and I'm hoping, of course, that we can duplicate that feat and bring a Republican back from the great blue grass state.

RIGGS:

Of course the same Republican is running again this year, as you probably know, John Cooper.

DIRKSEN:

Yes, and I esteem him as a friend and a fine gentleman and an upstanding American.

RIGGS:

But when Mr. Cooper won in 1946 the Democrats in Kentucky were angry at the Democratic nominee. There's an adage in Kentucky that Republicans win only when Democrats are mad at Democrats. And so far as the Democratic politicians tell me now, nobody in Kentucky is mad at Senator Underwood - no Democrat I mean.

DIRKSEN:

Well, Mr. Riggs, I've seen so many political adages go overboard as a matter of fact and probably that was demonstrated in 1950 in the great state of Illinois where it seems that all the betting was against a Republican victory. But I fancy there's a ground surge in the country today that's going to stand us in good stead in 1952. And when all the hostility and the umbrage in the souls of people manifests itself in November, I rather fancy we'll have Kentucky in the Republican column also.

RIGGS:

I was interested to see you put Wyoming in that list. Senator O'Mahoney who's up again next year won in 1946 which was a very bad year for Democrats. Do you think that this is a worse year for Democrats than '46 was?

DIRKSEN:

Well -- I fancy that when you put together all the hostility and feeling that has generated out there over a period of time that there's a splendid opportunity for a Republican and certainly there is a good candidate or two in Wyoming who will spearhead the drive.

HOLLES:

Mr. Riggs do you have another question on that?

RIGGS:

Well, I was going to ask the Senator if he has in his Republican list -- 19 Republican seats are at stake, do you have any seats that might be in danger? I don't mean that you want to write any of them off, but some places where you'll have to work harder than others?

DIRKSEN:

Well I know of no seats that are in danger at the moment, Mr. Riggs. I'm not unmindful of the fact of course that when you make political predictions they're always somewhat on the imponderable side. But I'm reasonably confident with the right kind of effort that we can hold all those we've got at the present time.

RIGGS:

The Democrats profess to believe that there are five or six or seven that they have a good chance to take away from you while you're taking some away from them. I had in mind Senator Cain in Washington; Senator Ecton out in the West. What do you think about those two seats?

DIRKSEN:

Well, I simply say that with the right kind of campaign that we can hold them and as Chairman of the Senatorial Campaign Committee, I expect to make the right kind of campaign and put them in the Republican column, or keep them there.

BYRNES:

Senator Dirksen, you said first of all Connecticut was a state where you were going to pick up a seat. Does that mean you think that Senator Benton is the most vulnerable of the Democrats up this year?

DIRKSEN:

Not necessarily, I think there are quite a number of vulnerable Democrats this year.

BYRNES:

Why did you put Connecticut first?

DIRKSEN:

Oh I suppose it's because the letter began so close to the beginning of the alphabet for one, and it was probably the first that just haphazardly came into my mind.

BYRNES:

Is there any Democratic Senator in more danger than Senator Benton?

DIRKSEN:

Well I wouldn't know, as a matter of fact. I just looked at the thing as a whole piece of goods to be worked upon when the time comes.

BYRNES:

Out of this whole piece of goods, Senator, would you say how many Senators you think you'll get?

DIRKSEN:

Well I hope that out of the eight where I think we have a splendid chance in addition to those that we now have, that we may be able to score in all eight states, and of course that would be well over the required three in order to give us a majority.

MOORE:

Senator, the President talks about a whistle stop crusade unless Congress gives him all the money he is asking. How do you think a campaign of that kind would affect the Republican candidates for Senator?

DIRKSEN:

Well, I have an idea that if there's another whistle stop campaign there'll be a second whistle stop campaign right behind it this time. If I had anything to do with it I would want to follow right along and bring the whole truth and the whole story to people. And that would be for the edification of the country and I think in the interest of the whole story and all of the facts.

HOLLES:

Senator Dirksen, you mentioned eight states which you hope to win - in which you hope to win Senate seats, that is eight presently democratic states. Now you

mentioned Connecticut, Michigan, Maryland, New Mexico, Virginia, Wyoming, Kentucky, I think.

DIRKSEN:

That's right.

HOLLES:

That's seven.

DIRKSEN:

New Mexico, Arizona..

HOLLES:

Arizona, that's the other. Of these eight, how many do you think are you counting on now as rather sure of victories, you appear rather confident.

DIRKSEN:

I think the opportunities in all eight states are exceedingly good in 1952. And so I'd rather not particularize and break it down because I just don't want to lower my sides and say to myself and say to the party and those with whom I shall associate in this campaign - that our opportunities are exceedingly good in all eight.

HOLLES:

Well are you working on the premise that it will take a Republican landslide to carry along all of those eight states?

DIRKSEN:

It will be extremely helpful but notwithstanding the fact that it might not be a landslide of the proportions that some people have in mind that we can still do the job and carry the Senate.

HOLLES:

Well if the Republicans win the presidency in November but should lose the Senate, would we again have government by deadlock or government by frustration such as we had in 1946 with the roles reversed then?

DIRKSEN:

Well I don't refer to it as government by frustration. I just refer to it as a nice, gentle restraint in government, if that sort of thing should happen.

HOILES:

That's what you refer to the 1946 ...

DIRKSEN:

That's right. We kept the country on sound and even keel. I was a member of the other branch of Congress at that time.

MOORE:

Senator, how big an issue will government spending be in the campaign?

DIRKSEN:

In my judgment it will be one of the outstanding issues, for the very good reason that spending is so closely related to the issue of taxation and people will be refreshed four times a year on the fact that taxation has become quite an onerous burden, not only for the individual, but for businesses as well. And so it looms as one of the real outstanding issues in the campaign.

MOORE:

Well, Senator Dirksen, I notice you have been credited with saving 90-million dollars with the Dirksen limitation on spending in the Treasury appropriation bill. If you do get a Republican Senate do you think you can make big economies all along the line?

DIRKSEN:

I rather fancy so and I pointed out only this morning in a release that I am hopeful that the Senate and House both will accede to an amendment that would put an expenditure limit in every appropriation bill because when all is said and done it is not the appropriations that count, it's how much they spend over and above the available revenues in the course of a fiscal year that finally determines if there's going to be a budget - a deficit. And as a matter of fact, I



5/6/52

noticed from the testimony of the military before the House in January that they have upped their estimated expenditure by two billion dollars and if that's the case, I pointed out this morning that our deficit for fiscal '53 could be something more than 14 point 4 billion, it might be 17 billion or even more. So it's expenditures that count and if you put in an expenditure limitation then you know what they're going to spend for 365 days and what your budget circumstance is going to be at the end of that time.

RIGGS:

Senator Dirksen, going back to the campaign, do you believe that your job as Senate Campaign Chairman would be easier if one man is the Republican nominee than it would be if the other man is? Now, everybody knows of course that you're for Senator Taft. Would it be equally easier for you to carry Senate seats with Eisenhower the nominee as it would be with Senator Taft - or vice versa?

DIRKSEN:

Well I think it would be equally easy to carry the seats with Senator Taft. I think there is a fundamental strength for him everywhere in the country and so I'm in his corner, but may I say that I try to separate those two functions in my mind so that when I go out into a state to help energize the party and to do something for a Senatorial candidate I make that the burden of my job at that particular time and don't try to embarrass a candidate who may have ideas other than my own. But I fancy that Bob Taft could do that job just as well as anybody and when I say that, I, of course mean no Republican candidate.

HOLLES:

Well, do I understand you to say then, Senator Dirksen, that if General Eisenhower should be the nominee that your prospects in the Senatorial contest would be as good as if Senator Taft was the nominee?

5/8/52

DIRKSEN:

Well, it's a little difficult to answer. I think with any candidate that we might have that it will be helpful in 1952.

BYRNES:

Senator Dirksen, you spoke earlier about a ground swell for the Republicans. A good many politicians talk about ground swells. How can you document that? What evidence do you have of it?

DIRKSEN:

Well, Mr. Byrnes, would you mind if I throw something, just a little personal at you reporters? You know it's easy sitting in an ivory tower in Washington to get one idea, but you get another idea when you go out and rub shoulders with the people everywhere. That was one of the rather interesting things about the '50 campaign in Illinois. A good many reporters came out, promptly rushed back to Washington, wrote some columns, said I was to be defeated by not less than a hundred and fifty thousand, maybe by two hundred and fifty thousand. I had the pleasure of saying to a few of them - and very gently, of course - well, you fellows just don't know what you're talking about. For when all is said and done, you measure the strength and intensity of a political momentum by going out among the voters. And I fancy that I've been out in the field about as much as any member of the Senate. I've been rubbing shoulders with people to appraise and to assess what I see out there and I think it is a moving force right now that will not diminish in its intensity as we go along toward November.

BYRNES:

Well, when you say you rub shoulders with the voters and hear from the voters, just what do you hear, Senator?

DIRKSEN:

Well, I hear first of all the umbrage and as I say the hostility of the voters toward policies today; corruption in government; the Communist issue; the taxing issue; and all these others that will be the challenging issues in 1952.

MOORE:

Senator Dirksen, a lot of Republican Senators have been fighting Mr. Truman's plan to spend seven and nine-tenths billion dollars on foreign aid. What do you think their stand will be as a vote getter?

DIRKSEN:

Well as a matter of fact I think the people in the country generally feel that there has been a lot of waste in this program for one thing; and secondly, they're wondering whether they're getting their money's worth. We've had a lot of magnificent promises; we've had little performance; and I remember so vividly the days when they said "Isn't the Marshall Plan better than war?" Now we've got the Marshall Plan and war, too. And they haven't been able to sell that any longer and people are just beginning to wonder about the quid pro quo - this for that aspect of the foreign aid program. And if you want my personal opinion, I'm interested in a far deeper retrenchment in cut-back in the foreign aid program than that which has been suggested by the Foreign Relations Committee in the Senate.

RIGGS:

Senator Dirksen, you spoke of being at war. How large a part do you believe the Korean business will play in the coming campaign?

DIRKSEN:

Very much, as a matter of fact. Because it gets so close to the people whose sons are out there. And it is conveyed to still others and don't forget if you have as an objective or as a target an army of four or five million there's always the possibility that the son in every family may be called upon for foreign service and so that brings war, whether in Korea or elsewhere, right close to the family hearthstone of America.

RIGGS:

And how would the Republican Party approach the Korean problem? Would they say it shouldn't have happened? Or we shouldn't have gone into Korea? Or it's too bad!

Or, how would they approach it?

DIRKSEN:

Well, having gone into Korea, what was to be done about it? Would you just deal with the condition now, rather than with a theory? But I think generally the Republican would have followed pretty well the thesis that was laid down by General MacArthur when he addressed the Joint Session in April.

HOLLES:

Senator Dirksen, we've been hearing a lot of speculation lately about the ... who should be the keynoter at the Republican Convention out in your home State. Have you any suggestion?

DIRKSEN:

No. As a matter of fact, they set up a committee to select a keynoter. And as a general thing, they take somebody who's in a neutral corner and not too closely identified with the activities of any one Candidate. So they make a tentative list. The committee looks it over. And from that, they select a keynoter. I was under consideration some years ago. But I think I was too closely identified with the well-being of a Candidate at that time. And so, I had to be taken from the list. That's the way it will work.

HOLLES:

Well do you feel that your championship of Senator Taft eliminates you now?

DIRKSEN:

Well, I think, as a matter of course, the whole country knows my fidelity to the Taft cause and what I've been doing in that field. And I just fancy if they want to pick somebody who's neutral, that they probably would not pick me.

HOLLES:

There's also been suggestions about General MacArthur, whom you just mentioned a moment ago, being a Convention speaker. Is there much talk about that within the Republican Party circles?

DIRKSEN:

There has been a great deal. And if I may express a personal hope, I do hope that General MacArthur can come to Chicago ... because there is something magnetic about him, and about the things that he says, that will certainly energize that Convention.

RIGGS:

Senator Dirksen, I assume you believe that General MacArthur is fully lined up behind Senator Taft in picking the Candidacy.

DIRKSEN:

Well, he has expressed a viewpoint that is certainly consonant with that expressed by Senator Taft ... although he has not, insofar as I know, unequivocally declared himself for Taft. But I think his sentiment is in that corner. ... I say that ... That isn't meant to be unusually guarded. I simply want to do full justice by anybody and not put a sentiment into somebody's mind that I'm not sure of.

RIGGS:

Do you believe that General MacArthur is completely out as a possible Candidate himself?

DIRKSEN:

Oh ... I doubt very much whether he's out as a Candidate. You may have observed that there have been a good many write-in votes for General MacArthur in many sections of the country. And he's a man of high popularity. But I think he has shown a fine restraint and a grand humility in the matter ... because he hasn't been self-seeking, nor has he sought to aggrandize his own personal position.

HOLLES:

You say that you don't believe he is definitely out as a Candidate. Do you foresee the possibility of a deadlock at Chicago, Senator?

DIRKSEN:

Well, Mr. Holles, I say that about General MacArthur in the same way that others who have been mentioned would not be out of the running. Who knows finally what

will happen at the Convention? Now, more responsive to your question, I don't know whether there'll be a deadlock. A deadlock would require, of course, that you have a number of Favorite Sons and that the vote of their Delegates stay in their corner for a number of ballots. Then you'd have to have some uncommitted delegations that would continue to vote one way and another for a little while at least ... so that you had a substantial segment of votes that had not made up its mind where to go. Now that, of course, could develop a deadlock at the Convention.

HOLLES:

But the way Senator Taft himself explains it there will be no sizable block of votes that will be undecided when the Convention opens. He's quite confident that it will be ... that both he and General Eisenhower will go in with the great bulk of the votes.

DIRKSEN:

Well, that can well be. And I rather fancy of the twelve hundred and eight odd Delegates who will be there that most of them will be accounted for on the first ballot ... and certainly not further than the second. But I'm not unmindful of the fact that Governor McKeldin of Maryland will be a Favorite Son. I assume that Earl Warren will be a Favorite Son in California. I don't know what the present inclinations of Governor Dewey are, nor the Delegates that might not be committed. So what is the total? But when you look at the whole, certainly most of the Delegates, I fancy, will be committed on the very first or second ballot. And this thing is beginning to shape up pretty well as a struggle between two contestants.

MOORE:

Senator Dirksen, getting back to government spending as a campaign issue ... sitting up in the Senate Press Gallery, I think I've heard you talk about the Bureaucrats stockpiling money. What is a money stockpile? And how much do the government Bureaucrats have in theirs?

DIRKSEN:

Well, Mr. Moore, I'm glad you raised that question because there is more confusion and mumbo jumbo about fiscal affairs in government than any other subject of which I have any knowledge. I sat for twelve years on the House Appropriations Committee and you hear about funds obligated but not extended. You hear about funds authorized. You hear about funds appropriated. But when all is said and done, the question is: How much is there in the stockpile ... and by that I mean money that has been authorized and appropriated in earlier years that continues to accumulate into a great mountain of money. And there it is to draw on-at any time. And as of February, I pointed out, it was ninety-seven thousand million dollars. That's ninety-seven billion in unextended funds from the Treasury figures. I fancy, by June 30, that will be down to seventy-five billion. But if we appropriate eighty-seven billion more and provide new authority for that amount in this Congress, you will have over a hundred and sixty billion of available funds for expenditure. And in proportion as they spend out of that Herculean pile, that's going to determine finally what the deficit is going to be on June 30, 1953, a year hence. So it's expenditures that count. And that's the reason I'm interested in a limitation on expenditures ... so that they have X number of dollars to spend; and when they get to the end of the rope, that's all they get ... unless they can come up and justify to us in a deficiency or supplemental bill that they're entitled to more. But that is the sure way to a balanced budget and of putting our fiscal house in order.

BYRNES:

Senator Dirksen, with all this talk of expenditures, and authorizations, and so forth, are you willing to make any prediction as to whether if this program you've been talking about is carried out, there can be any reduction in taxes? ... That is, translate government finances down to the average man's pocketbook.

DIRKSEN:

Well, Mr. Byrnes, there manifestly can be no reduction in taxes ... unless you first

reduce spending ... unless you're willing to say, " Well, an unbalanced budget will be all right." But if you're going in for a sound fiscal program, you start with a balanced budget, which means that you spend within the revenues. Now then, if you do that and have something left over, you can still balance your budget ... and then hand on those economies to the taxpayers so that they actually light in the taxpayer's pocketbook. It is the only answer to alleviation of this tax burden that I know.

BYRNES:

Well, Senator, do you think that you can cut expenditures so that you can get a budget balanced ... and have something to pass on to the taxpayers?

DIRKSEN:

Well, certainly you can get far closer to it than some of the sentiments that have been expressed in the Senate. Some say, ...'Oh, we can cut six billion this year.' Others, "eight billion." Well, you're still a long way from an unbalanced budget which, according to the President's estimates, will be unbalanced by the tune of 14.4 billion dollars ... and it might be more. That simply means that the cuts have got to be deeper. And to get good sizable quantities of economy, you have to go where the money is. And the money is in the foreign aid program. It's in the military. And it's in those functions that run into the figures. The rest of it is just cheese paring. Now, I don't mind paring cheese with the rest of them, and saving a thousand here a hundred thousand there. But you're never going to balance the budget that way.

HOLLES:

Senator, just one final question: Where, would you say, the matter of government spending stands with the people as a campaign issue? How far down in the list?

DIRKSEN:

Well, of course, spending shows up in the form of taxation, and I would put it right at the top of the list ... because you make that wound green four times a year. And don't you forget that on the fifteenth of September, which isn't too long



before Election Day, folks will have the privilege of decorating the counter again for the Bureau of Internal Revenue.

HOLLES:

Thank you, gentlemen.

Our board of judges has selected the three prize-winning questions submitted by our listeners for this broadcast. In a moment, Senator Dirksen will answer these questions. Stand by for the names of the winners.

ANNOUNCER:

Mutual has the right combination for good evening listening. Top dramatic entertainment and up-to-the-minute news information as well. Every evening, you can hear veteran reporters, analysts, and commentators whose job it is to see that you receive accurate and authoritative news of events at home and abroad. On week nights Gabriel Heatter brings his famous colorful and dramatic delivery to fifteen minutes of news commentary. Bill Henry compresses the top headlines of the day into a terse five-minute digest. And Frank Edwards presents his views of what's going on in the world today in thought-provoking and penetrating analysis. Weekends too, you can hear Mutual's top names for news. Among other experts, Cecil Brown, one of your favorite daytime newscasters, reports on the significant happenings of the day every Saturday and Sunday evening. Don't forget! For a good evening's listening, Mutual has the right combination of thrilling entertainment and informative news programs. Hear them over most of these stations. Remember, Mutual is your network for news.

HOLLES:

And now, Senator Dirksen, here are those three prize-winning questions from our listeners.

ANNOUNCER:

From Charles A. Waldren of Littleton, Colorado:

HOLLES:

Do you think, Senator, that General Eisenhower will lose ground when he comes home

and commits himself on the various issues?

DIRKSEN:

Well, it's a little difficult to answer that by saying, "Yes," or "No." He might conceivably gain ground with some people by his answers and lose ground with still other people. So, it's a question of balancing the two. But my notion offhand is that in some quarters, certainly, a very affirmative and definite answer on some of the challenging questions right now might cause him to lose ground.

ANNOUNCER:

From Mr. L. Waller of Northport, New York:

HOLLES:

Do you think, Senator Dirksen, that President Truman seized the steel plants as a political move ... that is, to secure the labor vote for the Democratic Party?

DIRKSEN:

Well, I ... I'm not prepared to say just what was in the President's mind when he seized the mills. I only know that I have an opinion as to whether I think it's warranted and justifiable and legal or illegal. I think it was beyond the powers in the Constitution. I think it was illegal. And whether or not it was a political motif, President Truman, himself, can best affirm.

HOLLES:

You have taken the position, I believe, that the President should return the plants to the owners now without waiting for the Supreme Court to act upon.

DIRKSEN:

Very definitely so, and I go just a little bit further and say that he ought to have used another remedy that Congress provided ... and that was the Taft-Hartley Act which is still there.

ANNOUNCER:

From Mrs. Priscilla Gledhill of Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania: