

THE JOINT SENATE-HOUSE REPUBLICAN LEADERSHIP

SENATOR DIRKSEN - REPRESENTATIVE HALLECK

26 May 1964

STATEMENT BY SEN. DIRKSEN: It is clear that the military situation in Viet Nam is deteriorating which, when coupled with the Communist moves in Laos and Cambodia, constitutes a grave threat to all of Southeast Asia. It is also clear that while the Johnson Administration falters in indecision, the United States is a party to another treadmill conflict that parallels the experience of the Korean War of a dozen years ago.

An examination of the record of American policy statements on Viet Nam over the past two years offers an insight to the continuous setbacks we have suffered in Southeast Asia:

On April 30, 1962, Under Secretary of State Ball said we faced "a long, slow, arduous" war in Viet Nam. Three hundred and fifty-eight days later Secretary of State Rusk repeated the warning declaring "no quick" victory could be expected. Nevertheless, as if to counteract news reports that the war was going badly, the White House publicly announced 163 days later that

the United States would withdraw 1000 American troops in the next three months, and a major portion by the end of 1968.

Seventy-nine days later the troop withdrawal policy was abandoned when Secretary of Defense McNamara assured Saigon that American military personnel would "stay as long as needed," a position re-emphasized by President Johnson in a subsequent statement.

Notwithstanding these policy declarations, Secretary McNamara was telling Congress 28 days later that he still hoped for the troop withdrawal by the end of 1965. Two weeks ago the tune had changed again with Mr. McNamara declaring that the Viet Nam war "will be long, hard and very difficult and we should not delude ourselves into thinking that it won't." Now Secretary of State Rusk this past weekend has warned the Communists that if they continue their aggressions the United States may "expand the war."

If, as is evident, it is difficult for Americans to understand this vacillating American policy, how demoralizing it must be for the Vietnamese. We only know that indecision in Washington is dribbling away both American lives and American prestige in Southeast Asia. We think the time has come for President Johnson to announce a firm policy and to pursue it with vigor.

STATEMENT BY REP. HALLECK: I have this statement for the Joint Senate-House Republican Leadership:

Probably the greatest hoax perpetrated on the American people since Franklin D. Roosevelt promised in 1932 to cut the Federal budget 25 per cent is the current snow job picturing President Johnson as a disciple of economy in government. Now here are a few facts:

For the first three months he was in office, President Johnson spent more money than any President in history -- \$24.3 billion. This is \$2 billion more than the late President Kennedy's peak quarter -- \$22.3 billion, December - February, 1962-1963.

President Johnson is currently spending \$2 million a day more than President Kennedy and \$50 million a day more than former President Eisenhower.

President Johnson is actually spending \$99.9 billion this current fiscal year but is hiding \$1.6 billion of the spending by selling Federally-held mortgages and other assets to private investors so the spending won't show in the budget. For the next fiscal year President Johnson will actually spend the all-time record amount, in peace or in war, of \$100 billion, but, of course, hopes to hide \$2.3 billion of it by similar disposal of government assets.

The President has requested from Congress appropriations for the next fiscal year starting July 1 greater than President Kennedy or any other President ever demanded or received from the legislative branch in its history.

Despite all the publicity about turning off lights in the White House and reducing the Federal payroll, Mr. Johnson's so-called reductions have been unmasked by Senator Harry F. Byrd of Virginia who wrote the President last week that he noted the Federal payroll had been reduced by 14,848 employees on temporary ... temporary public works projects but only by 845 elsewhere.

Finally, the President has boasted to the press that Congress is "finding that our budget requests did not contain any padding," despite the fact that the House of Representatives - thanks to a Republican task force - has already cut more than \$3 billion out of his requests and we are not through yet.

If any further proof of the snow job is needed, let it come from Secretary of the Treasury Dillon, who only yesterday asked Congress to increase the Federal debt limit from \$309 billion as of June 30 to \$324 billion

for the coming year, an increase of \$<sup>15</sup>~~10~~ billion to take care of the red-ink spending. As Mr. Barnum said, "There's a sucker born every minute."

QUESTION: Senator Dirksen, what do you ... your criticism of the Vietnamese policy in southeast Asia, what do you propose as an alternative?

SENATOR DIRKSEN: Well, frankly, I have not proposed anything as an alternative. After all, it's not our problem.

There are a number of alternatives, if you can think of alternatives in terms of four or five different selections, but that certainly is not a decision that the minority is expected to make. If the President wants to confer with us on the matter, we will certainly be more than glad to be frank and candid with him and express our interest and also our conviction as to what we think about any alternatives that might be proposed.

That, I think, is in line with the position that we've always taken in the field of foreign policy.

QUESTION: Mr. Halleck, has the joint Republican leadership looked over this new compromise Civil Rights Bill that the Senate will work on now?

REP. HALLECK: No, not ... the Joint Leadership Meeting has not. The ... I understand that there have been some consultations. I have been consulted a time or two about certain provisions that would be included or not included, and I have expressed myself in respect to some of them, and I understand Mr. McCullough from time to time on the Republican side in the House has been consulted. But there has been no discussion of it in the Joint Senate-House Republican Leadership except in broad general terms.

QUESTION: Would it be your thought that the House might concur in this package if it stays the way it is now?

REP. HALLECK: Well, I haven't ... I haven't seen it in its entirety. Let me just say this, that we in the House of Representatives, I think on both sides of the aisle, we're doing the best we could with a complicated, complex, difficult problem - to write some good provisions.

There isn't any question but what we were blazing new trails in many areas and while there was a feeling on the House side that the ... we didn't want to march up the hill only to have to march back down

again, no one ever suggested or thought that the Senate of the United States would not exercise its right to go over the Bill very carefully and, particularly in view of the fact that some time had elapsed to give everybody a chance to study it a little more, and that the Senate would then work its will on the Bill and its various provisions.

Now, as to what happens after the Senate passes the Bill, and maybe I should say if the Senate passes the Bill, although I'd be quite sure they will ... some sort of a bill ... then the alternatives, of course, are to either have the House take the Senate Bill as it passed the Senate or to have it go to conference for the ironing out of any differences that might be brought about.

As to which course would be followed, I don't know whether I would be consulted or not. Actually, that sort of a matter is within the control of the Democratic Leadership of the Congress and the Administration and they probably would have to make that first decision.

QUESTION: Which course do you think they should follow?

REP. HALLECK: Well, off-hand, I would say that the normal procedure is to have of this sort, if there are considerable differences, go to conference. And I likewise recognize that some of the problems that would be there involved. I don't think anyone could make any firm determination about that and certainly I wouldn't in my individual responsibility or as the Republican leader in the House of Representatives until we find out what sort of a bill the Senate finally brought to passage.

QUESTION: You don't put this in the same category as the farm bill which was (rest inaudible).

REP. HALLECK: Well, I didn't like <sup>the way</sup> the wheat - cotton bill was handled, but there the principal problem involved was that the wheat bill that the farmers themselves had turned down was added on to a cotton bill, and with no chance in the House of Representatives to amend it or consider it or do a thing. We were just asked to take it. And I didn't support that action.

QUESTION: Mr. Halleck and Mr. Dirksen, would each of you tell us who do you think President Eisenhower was talking about when he laid out a description of the ideal Republican Presidential candidate, and further I understand that you've talked to the President ... both of you recently. Could you tell us whether that

discussion you had had any part of this ...

REP. HALLECK: The discussion, so far as I remember it, had nothing to do with this.

Let me just say this, that as far as I know and as far as I ... as a matter of fact, I am convinced that President Eisenhower in that statement stated his own views as to what the Republican Party stands for; and I, as I read it, it occurred to me that it was largely a restatement of the positions that he took, and may I say most of the time I took with him, in his eight years as President of the United States.

It was a kind of a resume of many of the things that we had dealt with. Now it included certain other things that had been before the Congress and the government of the United States since he went out of the Presidency, but I didn't find in it any attempt or anything to read anybody out of the Party.

QUESTION: You don't think that he was trying to read Senator Goldwater out of the campaign?

REP. HALLECK: I would be very sure that he wasn't.

QUESTION: Do you think Senator Goldwater ... do you think that shoe would fit Senator Goldwater's foot in the specifications that the President laid down?

REP. HALLECK: Well, didn't Senator Goldwater approve the statement?

ANSWER: Yes, sir.

REP. HALLECK: Well, that's good enough for me.

QUESTION: Senator Dirksen, would you respond to the same question?

SEN. DIRKSEN: Well, I thought I ought to respond now that Peter talks about the "ideal" candidate. Maybe he was talking about me ... (laughter) ... but I'm pretty sure that he wasn't, but ...

(?) Maybe (?) he was talking about Harold Stassen.

SEN. DIRKSEN: (Continuing) I'm certainly not a candidate. I think this was just general criteria that the General was laying down and had no other purpose than exactly that. He was neither fingering nor pinpointing nor showing any hostility to one candidate or another, and so you have to accept it as a general pre-convention statement as to certain criteria that are desirable in a Presidential nominee.

QUESTION: Senator Dirksen, you said that if President Johnson wanted the counsel of the Republican

leaders and their confidence, you would be glad to give your frank and candid views on Viet Nam. By this do you mean he hasn't sought the counsel of the Republican leaders or hasn't consulted with them fully enough?

SEN. DIRKSEN: We have had a number of meetings with the President on Viet Nam, and, in fact, we've had the advice and the counsel of Dean Rusk, of John McCone of the CIA, and also Bob McNamara, the Secretary of Defense, but this situation changes from time to time out there, and in order to remain fully current and take account of all the changes and the new techniques that are employed, obviously, we've got to have frequent consultations.

I remember on one occasion when it was indicated that at that particular time new weapons of larger bore and caliber with a Chinese imprint on them had been found in various places, so there you have an indication of the type of a change that takes place. It was along about the same time you had a sortie from Cambodia into Viet Nam. There was no way of evaluating how serious it was or what its purpose was, as a matter of fact. So we are ready always to consult with the President.

QUESTION: Mr. Halleck, in reference to your statement about a sucker being born every minute, could that apply to someone like Henry Ford?

REP. HALLECK: Well, I couldn't quite put him in that category. I see in the papers that he's come out for President Johnson, and that's his right; and I might say in response to that that I'm not too surprised by that declaration. As a matter of fact, I voted for the conference report on a tax reduction bill, but I have constantly taken the position that any tax reduction to be really meaningful and to really afford some benefit to the high ... to the over-burdened and pressed taxpayer had to be accompanied, if not preceded by, some reduction in Federal spending.

And so I've been doing the best I could to bring about that reduction in Federal spending and I might say just to wind it up that I am sorry that Mr. Ford isn't going to be with us, but we'll have to try to get along without him.

QUESTION: Mr. Halleck, a minute ago you said you had been consulted "a time or two" about the Civil Rights compromise. Is a "time or two" enough? Has it been enough for you?

REP. HALLECK: Yes. I ... in other words, I don't think that we on the House side ought to be dictating what the people on the Senate side do. They have

their responsibility in respect to this very difficult matter and so far as I can see, they're exercising it; but there were a few things ... for instance, I ... we struggled on the Republican side to put in that vote fraud section. We happen to believe that ... all right -- guarantee everybody the right to vote, but there's another important thing that goes along with that, and that the man's vote is counted after it's cast. And we thought if you're going to see that everybody has a right to vote, then let's kind of arrange it so that ... that we'll get the votes counted the way they're cast.

(Someone calls "Charley") ... (Mr. Halleck continues) ... and so when there was a suggestion that that go out in the Senate I complained a little.

QUESTION: Charley, is it your position that leaders of both parties of the House ought not to come to any decision until they see the final form of the Senate bill?

REP. HALLECK: I would ... I can't hardly speak for the Democratic leaders in the House, but it would be my idea that, as a matter of determining procedure, we ought to know first of all what the

Senate brings to passage, and if it is substantially the House Bill, then there wouldn't be very much to deal with in a conference.

QUESTION: Mr. Halleck, Senator Dirksen has said repeatedly that he would like very much to have the Bill enacted and signed before you go to the convention on July 13th. Do you have this same feeling that he has - that you would like to have it all wrapped up ...

REP. HALLECK: Let me just say this, I would have liked to have wrapped up this whole session before our convention July 13th. And I hoped maybe that would be done, but now that's a forlorn hope, and so it's very obvious to me that the work of this session of Congress is not going to be concluded in time for us to get our convention, and I understand we're going to have to come back between the two conventions and probably have to come back after the Democrat convention.

SEN. DIRKSEN: Mr. Kenworthy, let that be a lesson to you as to how modest I really am. (Laughter.)

QUESTION: Senator Dirksen, ... (first phrase inaudible) ... this question of representation (inaudible) ... going back to the Henry Ford question a minute ago,

one of our oracles of journalism reports in the morning paper that the old established powers of the Republican party - banking, industrial and publishing magnates - are either in favor of the election of President Johnson or at least not strongly opposed to it. This seems to be a considerable shift. I wonder if you'd like to philosophize on it a bit.

SEN. DIRKSEN: Yes. Let me give you two answers. The first one is that I doubt whether there's a Ford in my future (laughter) ... and the second one is that we haven't reached election day by any means yet. So ...

QUESTION: Mr. Halleck ... another point ... At the bottom of your statement here you criticize the Secretary of the Treasury's request for a debt limit increase. Does this mean that you and your Party are going to oppose this outright in the House?

REP. HALLECK: Let me just say this. The debt limit arrangement was originally adopted to put some sort of a brake on spending. Now, there have been times when I have supported an increase in the debt limit; I wondered whether or not it was an effective instrument to deal with this problem of over-spending, but there have been times when I haven't supported it.

Now I'm finally getting around to the position, as far as I'm personally concerned, that if you just continue to increase the debt limit, maybe that's an invitation to increase deficit spending. And so I don't ... I guess it's maybe a little early for me to say, but there'll be a lot of votes against increasing that debt limit this time.

QUESTION: Senator Dirksen, on Civil Rights amendments, I wonder if your original package would eliminate the section in the House-passed Bill that would deny protection to atheists ... fair employment practices. Would you explain (?) your point of view on that?

SEN. DIRKSEN: Well, does it need any explanation? An atheist is one who does not accept the deity, and it would be an amazing thing under the Constitution and every interpretation I've seen and that includes the Bill of Rights to deny a man the right to make a livelihood because he didn't agree with the prospective employer as to what his religious belief ought to be.

That was one on which there was immediate and wholehearted consensus from everybody who sat in the conference.

QUESTION: Senator, are you going to put in your bill today?

SEN. DIRKSEN: We trust we'll be able to, and I'm quite sure we ...

QUESTION: (Interrupting) Could you tell us about the changes, if any?

SEN. DIRKSEN: Marshall, it would be a difficult thing to outline here and now the changes because you got so many small modifications, for example, where you have language, you have transposition of paragraphs, and then you have changes of substance, and I fancy that we could take a couple of hours in order to deliberate those.

QUESTION: Do you experts have an explanation for us written (rest of sentence inaudible) ...

REP. HALLECK: The President... The Senator's (?) an expert, you know ... (Laughter) ...

SEN. DIRKSEN: Well, we ... we have been explaining right along, as you know, but the staff has also worked out some data on the matter, but I anticipate at some point I will make one of my reasonably longer speeches on the subject and lay it out in considerable detail.

QUESTION: (Inaudible).

SEN. DIRKSEN: No. One, it's a matter of timing. And I want to select the right time and the right place and the right circumstance and the right atmosphere in

which to do it, and I think there'll be some advance notice as to about ~~when~~ this is going to take place.

QUESTION: Are those changes made as a result of your ... I'm speaking of the changes made as a result of your Republican conference.

SEN. DIRKSEN: Well, there have been modifications, as I say, in language; paragraphs have been transposed; there have been word shadings that we had to take account of; sometimes you had to delete a phrase; sometimes you had to add a phrase, but I think as a general thing, all the four conferences that we had were extremely amiable in atmosphere. Everybody was quite affable about it, and I felt we made some real progress.

QUESTION: Did you make the changes in substance?

SEN. DIRKSEN: There have been some changes in substance.

QUESTION: Senator, why can't you say for sure that the compromise will be introduced today?

SEN. DIRKSEN: Well, Roger, I probably can say that it'll be introduced today, but you encounter this kind of a matter on which I do not believe I can give you the last word.

There is pending on the desk a jury trial substitute. Now, do we handle it separately or do we

incorporate it in the package? If we're going to incorporate it in the package, I would think the logical approach then would be to maybe table our own substitute, then table the Smathers amendment, and then table the Talmadge amendment, and then finally offer the substitute, and then you've got your whole picture rather clean so far as pending business is concerned.

QUESTION: You might do some tabling this afternoon then?

SEN. DIRKSEN: I doubt it very much, Jerry, whether it'll come this afternoon. I don't think so. I think that'll come after we determine what is a reasonable time for a consideration of the package. And then when you think you've run (?) a law now, at that point I think you've got to get the decks clear and then start on the new bill.

QUESTION: Senator, what's the next Republican move on the Bobby Baker case?

SEN. DIRKSEN: Well, I haven't the slightest idea. I haven't talked to either Senator Cooper or Senator Curtis or Senator Scott for some days about it. I do not know, as a matter of fact, what progress they're making on the report. The Committee is writing a report;

they're going to make some recommendations; but insofar as I know, that work has not been completed.

QUESTION: (By several) Thank you, gentlemen.