

Reporters' Round-up

FROM THE . . .

PRESS INFORMATION OFFICE

MUTUAL BROADCASTING SYSTEM

1627 K ST., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D. C.

STerling 3-3500

RADIO BROADCAST TRANSCRIPT

PRESS RELEASE

PRODUCED AND RELEASED
BY JACK A. GERTZ
Director of Public
Affairs

REC'D MAY 24 1957

FOR RELEASE 7:00 PM EDST MONDAY, MAY 20, 1957.

coop. file = may 20th wash

UNITED STATES SENATOR HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, DEMOCRAT OF MINNESOTA, is the guest on nationwide Reporters' Roundup radio program for Monday, May 20, 1957.

SENATOR HUMPHREY is questioned on numerous newsmaking topics, including:

ARE YOU PESSIMISTIC ABOUT THE SITUATION IN THE MIDDLE EAST?

HOW STRONG ARE THE TIES BETWEEN ARAB NATIONS, COMMUNIST RUSSIA AND RED CHINA?

WHAT IS THE REACTION OF MIDDLE EAST LEADERS TOWARD THE EISENHOWER DOCTRINE?

WILL YOU BE A CANDIDATE FOR PRESIDENT IN 1960?

WILL THE ARABS SUCCEED IN PREVENTING ISRAEL FROM USING THE SUEZ CANAL?

WILL THERE BE SOME LEGISLATION PASSED TO REDUCE TAXES?

WHEN WILL CIVIL RIGHTS LEGISLATION BE ACTED UPON?

IS PEACE POSSIBLE IN THE MIDDLE EAST AS LONG AS NASSER IS IN POWER?

WHAT IS YOUR IMPRESSION OF COLONEL NASSER?

File
speech

SENATOR HUMPHREY is questioned by well-known newsmen of the Washington Press Corps: Mr. William H. Lawrence, National Affairs correspondent for the New York Times; and Mr. Lyle Wilson, Chief of the Washington Bureau of United Press. This panel program is moderated by Robert F. Hurleigh, Washington commentator and director of Mutual's News and Special Events.

Attached is a complete transcript of Reporters' Roundup, a weekly nationwide feature of the Mutual Broadcasting System. This program is heard 9:35 PM EDST, and is broadcast on some 584 Mutual affiliates from coast-to-coast.

Reporters' Round-up

FROM THE . . .

PRESS INFORMATION OFFICE

MUTUAL BROADCASTING SYSTEM

1627 K ST., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D. C.

STerling 3-3500

RADIO BROADCAST TRANSCRIPT REPORTERS' ROUNDUP

GUEST: U. S. SENATOR HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
DEMOCRAT OF MINNESOTA

MODERATOR: Robert F. Hurleigh

PANEL: Lyle Wilson, United Press
William Lawrence, New York Times

-0-

ANNOUNCER: Reporters' Roundup, where by-lines make headlines! In a moment hear the Honorable Hubert H. Humphrey, United States Senator of Minnesota, answer questions fired at him by a panel of veteran reporters.

HURLEIGH: Senator Humphrey, are you pessimistic about the situation in the Middle East?

WILSON: Senator, how strong are the ties between Arab nations, Communist Russia and Red China?

LAWRENCE: Senator Humphrey, what is the reaction of Middle Eastern leaders--both Arabs and the Israelis--toward the Eisenhower Doctrine?

HURLEIGH: The Middle East and the Far East have become the principal areas where the United States opposes most vigorously the Communist plans for world domination. Recent events in the Middle East and the Far East indicate that the Kremlin and the Chinese Communists believe they have an opportunity to strengthen the Communist position. To help provide you with a revealing picture of the current situation in the Middle East, Reporters' Roundup guest tonight is United States Senator Hubert H. Humphrey, Democrat of Minnesota. Senator Humphrey returned to Washington earlier today from an important fact-finding mission in the Middle East. Senator Humphrey is Chairman of the Middle East Subcommittee of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. Senator Humphrey also serves on the Senate's powerful Government Operations and Agriculture committees. He was elected to the Senate in 1948 and re-elected in 1954. Now, our guest is ready.

ANNOUNCER: Reporters' Roundup, which comes to you transcribed from the Senate Radio Gallery in your nation's Capitol, is presented by the Mutual Broadcasting System as part of its public service programming to stimulate interest in current public affairs issues. Reporters' Roundup is devoted to encouraging a desire in all Americans to listen, read, and think more about public affairs. When the American people inform themselves from sources of their own choosing, they make wise decisions. May the opinions you will now hear expressed by our guest prompt you to further thought. Our guest is U. S. Senator Hubert H. Humphrey, Democrat of Minnesota. Senator Humphrey is prepared

to answer the challenging questions of this panel of well-known and able reporters: Mr. William H. Lawrence, National Correspondent for the New York Times; and Mr. Lyle Wilson, Chief of the Washington Bureau of United Press. Your moderator, Robert F. Hurleigh, commentator and Director of Mutual's News and Special Events.

HURLEIGH: And now, Mr. Lawrence, let's have the first question for Senator Humphrey.

LAWRENCE: Senator, I suppose the first question is a rather obvious one but whenever anyone returns from an area as important as the Middle East where we've had war in the last few months--what would you say the chances now are, for war or for peace?

HUMPHREY: Well, I would say, Mr. Lawrence, that the chances are that there will not be open hostilities. Peace is a rather broad term to use for the area. There really isn't any peace but at least there is not open fighting. I'm somewhat optimistic about the future, that is, compared to the very dismal past.

LAWRENCE: Well now, the tension was very high in November, enough to lead to an invasion by three nations and Egypt and then they withdrew. Is the tension greatly reduced then since then?

HUMPHREY: Not that much, but I would say, number one, that the Arab states have learned of the strength of Israel so there is apt not to be any attack by Arab states upon Israel. The Israelis know that the rest of the world will not condone open military force in the area; they learned that at the United Nations so there will be no attack by Israeli forces, that is, at least there seems there will be none. There surely will be no attack by the British or the French or the United States because we seek no territory, we are not at all desirous of aggression or expansion of frontiers. The only real danger is from Communist subversion insofar as any kind of attack is concerned. I don't expect the Soviet to move militarily. Now this doesn't mean that the area is peaceful; it's restless; it's filled with emotion, passion, hatred and bitterness, but everyone recognizes that there is great danger in letting all of this get out of hand, and unless things develop much more in Syria than they have, where there is a considerable Leftist and Communist infiltration, I wouldn't expect that there would be any hostilities. That's a guess and you can be awfully wrong in this business.

WILSON: Senator, to go from the general to the particular, what should be the action of the United States when the Israeli attempt to send a ship through the Suez Canal and are stopped by Egyptian force?

HUMPHREY: Well, I would hope that our action would be one of wanting to see this situation settled peaceably within the councils that are established, such as the United Nations or the World Court. I am not an international lawyer;

I'm not just sure which of those two bodies would be the adjudicating body, but at least we ought to make sure that there were no hostilities. I don't expect there will be any hostilities. I do not expect that the Egyptians will attempt to use force because if they do it will, of course, be to their own difficulty, their own trouble, because the Israelis are much stronger and believe/^{me}the Egyptian people and surely the Egyptian government knows that. And, I wouldn't expect the Israelis to use force. This is a test case and it would be one that undoubtedly would be brought to the attention of the Security Council and possibly the United Nations General Assembly.

WILSON: Well, may I ask this, Senator. In view of the pressure exerted by the United States upon the Israeli during the late hostilities in the Middle East, do you think the United States are committed to see that the Israeli are able to use the Suez Canal?

HUMPHREY: I do not know. I do feel, however, that the Israelis have a very valid point in seeking to use the Suez Canal provided that the armistice agreements are still in effect. As you have known, the United Nations/General Secretary, Mr. Hammarskjold, has tried to get both Egypt and Israel again to abide by the armistice agreements of 1949. Egypt has insisted on having a status of belligerency, and, as such, from time to time, the Israelis have indicated that the agreements are not binding. I do hope now that the test case will reveal that the armistice agreements are binding, that the Canal is to be open without discrimination and I would hope that that would be our position. However, I don't think that we have made any commitment.

WILSON: Senator, the Canal is not open without discrimination.

HUMPHREY: Pardon?

WILSON: The Canal is not now open without discrimination.

HUMPHREY: It is not now open. We all understand that, of course.

WILSON: Well, what happens next?

HUMPHREY: I would say, I think I've indicated to you, that if the Israelis attempt to force the issue, which they've indicated that they will, that it will be brought before the Security Council of the United Nations. That's what it's for.

WILSON: Pardon just a minute, Bill, --well, Senator, then you foresee at least one more resort to force in the Middle East?

HUMPHREY: No, I do not.

WILSON: Well, you said you thought the Israeli would attempt to force the issue.

HUMPHREY: Force the issue in the terms of sending up through a ship.

That does not necessarily mean that there will be a resort to military force.

LAWRENCE: Senator, isn't our policy out there pretty one-sided? Now back a couple of months ago the President of the United States was insisting that the Israeli government obey a decision of the United Nations and withdraw their troops.

HUMPHREY: Yes sir.

LAWRENCE: Now there is already a decision of the United Nations Security Council requiring that the Canal be open.

HUMPHREY: Right.

LAWRENCE: Why do we not insist on that without any further...

HUMPHREY: I think we should, I think we should and I'm sure that's exactly what the Israelis are attempting to force by using the Canal under a new case. After all, the Israelis have not attempted to use the Canal for a considerable period of time. Now they're going to try to.

LAWRENCE: Do you see any signs that we're putting pressure--real pressure--on Nasser to make him obey the decisions of the United Nations?

HUMPHREY: Not that I have seen, Mr. Lawrence, and I did not discuss this matter with anyone in the area.

LAWRENCE: What was your impression of Nasser?

HUMPHREY: My impression of him was that Mr. Nasser, when it came to his domestic economy, his own Egyptian economy, had genuine interest in its revival, in its improvement and in some reforms. When it came to the international scene, I felt that he had limited knowledge, he had deep prejudices, he was afflicted by a disease quite common in many areas of anti-westernism; he was so anti of the Great Powers, the Western Powers, that he was blinded to the realities of the situation. I regret that that's the case, but it is so. He has traveled very little; his education is of a very modest and I would say most respectfully inadequate military type of education, thereby not giving him the general orientation that would be needed for the kind of leadership which he seeks, apparently, to apply in the Middle East.

LAWRENCE: Is he a dictator and he playing footsy with the Communists?

HUMPHREY: I suppose he's a kind of a dictator. Let's put it this way: I don't believe that Egypt is a totalitarian society at all; it's authoritarian but not totalitarian. There's a neat difference and a very substantial one in that. He does exercise control but not absolute control; you don't feel a police state when you're in Egypt; you don't feel it around you, so to speak. When you say, "is he playing footsy with the Communists?", I talked to him about that and he made it quite clear to me that he was not a Communist, that he was not playing footsy with the Communists even though I must say by the

actions that he has taken that he has given the Communists a considerable inside advantage within Egypt, and, apparently now, under the most recent discussions relating to tolls in the Suez, has found that the Communists are about as difficult to deal with as anybody could be.

LAWRENCE: Well, do you think peace is possible in the Middle East as long as Nasser is in power? Many of our allies say that it is not.

HUMPHREY: Well, I'd ask our allies what do they intend to do about it. This isn't a matter of whether you like Nasser or whether you don't. The decision as to whether or not Nasser should be in power was made last October. The only time that you had a chance to get rid of Nasser was in October.

WILSON: Who made the decision?

HUMPHREY: Well, the British and the French and the Israelis wanted to get rid of him, and we apparently said that we're not going to permit anybody to get rid of him this way, and because of that Mr. Nasser is in power, he did win a kind of psychological victory, and, in fact, a very real victory, despite the military defeat that he took, so he is there, and I suggest that since he is there that we re-assess our policies and make up our mind just how we're going to deal with him because he is not the same Nasser that he was in 1953. He may be the same but his stature is different, and we're going to have to make up our mind that he is there with the considerable amount of support in the Arab world, amongst the masses of the people, and I would imagine at least amongst the more expressive support he has that in Egypt.

WILSON: Senator Humphrey, may I get a little closer to home?

HUMPHREY: Yes.

WILSON: In your judgement, who is responsible for the delay and reluctance of the Democratic-controlled Congress to act on civil rights?

HUMPHREY: Well, that, I guess, is a bi-partisan sin.

WILSON: Well, equally divided?

HUMPHREY: Reasonably so, yes. I don't think there's any glory in trying to find out just who is the most wrong. You know that I support civil rights legislation; I regret that it has not found its way out of committee, but like many things in the Middle East I think you have to have persevering patience and keep at it and keep at it and keep at it and not lose your head, and I hope that that's what we'll do, and I predict that before the Congress has completed its work--not necessarily this session, but before this Congress has completed its work--that we will have made substantial advance in the field of civil rights.

WILSON: More likely next year than this year.

HUMPHREY: I would imagine that is true. I'm sorry to have to report that because I had hoped that we'd have it this year but apparently not.

LAWRENCE: So far, Senator, this has been pretty much of a do-nothing Congress, hasn't it, with a very few exceptions?

HUMPHREY: Well, Mr. Lawrence, you know a lot about Congress. You've been around here longer than I have, and you know that most Congresses take about one session to warm up and then the second session to produce. It's something like hatching eggs--it takes about--now I want to be sure of my time on this--I think it takes 21 days to hatch eggs no matter how warm the hen, and I would suggest that it's going to take a certain amount of time to process legislation, to have all the arguments that a public body such as a representative Congress has, but we'll get around to passing a good deal of legislation before the elections come up in 1958.

WILSON: For example, Senator Humphrey, will you pass legislation to reduce taxes?

HUMPHREY: There's been some talk about that. I'm not on the Finance Committee. I think this is a possibility, yes.

WILSON: Well, it might come before you as a member of the Senate. Would you vote for it?

HUMPHREY: Indeed, if it appears to be a reasonable tax reduction bill. I want to know tax reduction for whom and whether or not there are any of the inequities in the tax laws that are adjusted. There are many loopholes in our tax laws which need to be closed. I believe that the repeal of some of the excise taxes which I consider regressive; I believe that increasing the dependency allowance, the deductible allowance for dependents, from six to seven hundred dollars is very desirable and I would hope to see the tax rate for smaller corporations and independent businesses adjusted more favorably.

WILSON: Senator Humphrey, we're gaining somewhat on politics at this moment, and I'm sure you feel quite at home in the field. Will you be a candidate for the Democratic Presidential nomination in 1960?

HUMPHREY: Why, Mr. Wilson, you know that I'm a candidate for the United States Senate if I run for anything in 1960. My term expires in 1960. I think it's always fair to say that one should not try to predict much further than 24 hours in advance with certainty, and in politics that may even be long-term planning.

WILSON: Well, Senator, well, you didn't say no.

HUMPHREY: I didn't say yes. I didn't say yes.

LAWRENCE: Well, are you trying to say there, Senator, that being

involved in your own electoral campaign whether you have primary opposition or not you'll certainly have opposition in the general that this would make it inadvisable for you to go into Presidential primaries?

HUMPHREY: What I was saying, Mr. Lawrence, was that by 1960 my second term in the Senate will be over, and I will have a decision^{to face}/at that particular time as to whether I will run for re-election.

LAWRENCE: Well, and if you run for re-election, does that rule out...

HUMPHREY: And, you can only run for one job at a time.

LAWRENCE: That's what I was getting at. You couldn't go in the primaries then?

HUMPHREY: Oh, you could, you could go into primaries if one desired to do that. I haven't made any such plans. Yes, Mr. Wilson?

HURLEIGH: It seems to me, Senator, you stopped him.

HUMPHREY: No, no, you can't stop these two able men. They're just being a little considerate now.

WILSON: No, not at all.

LAWRENCE: Why not go back to this Congressional business for a second. We heard a lot of complaints from the Democrats about uncertain leadership from the Administration.

HUMPHREY: Yes, that's been characteristic.

LAWRENCE: What puzzles me, as a reporter on the Washington scene without drawing any conclusions from it, is that I'm not quite sure where you get the certainty of leadership on the other side. Who is sure-footed among you Democrats?

HUMPHREY: Well, Mr. Lawrence, you're an able student of politics and if you'll permit me, as one who is not so able, to discuss this with you for a moment I think we might arrive at a conclusion. The American political structure is based upon a Presidential office of leadership. The Congress consists of 531 members and after you've been around here^{for}/a little bit you find that each member feels that he's just about as important as the others. It's rather difficult to have a leader in a Congress. You can have several leaders which diversifies the leadership but you generally don't have just one leader. Now when a President gets strong leadership, he generally has a program passed. But when he vacillates, then he permits the Congress to splinter up, fractionalize, and to have many different leaders in little pockets of leadership, and I think Mr. Eisenhower's mistake in this Congress, particularly on his budget, was in after having sent the budget down and he presented it as a document and then more or less said, "Well, let's see what

happens". Rather than trying to mobilize support for it, he permitted some of his own agents, his own Cabinet officers, to work it over, dissect it, to operate upon it, to perform political surgery, and then later on after he had looked over what happened, he said, "Well, we've got to do something about this; we've got to bind up the wounds", but in the meantime there's been so much damage done that it's rather difficult. So you've got a situation today where you do not have the most effective leadership at the White House level, that is, in terms of determined leadership, and in the Congress you have a very narrowly and closely divided Congress and on that basis it's rather difficult to say that there's any one leader.

LAWRENCE: Are you saying the President has vascillated then?

HUMPHREY: Oh, not only saying so. I think the record is manifestly clear, particularly when it comes to the budget. Now may I say that I'm pleased with what he's doing of late, very pleased. I'm pleased that the President's going to the people, speaking up for his foreign aid program. I'm pleased that he's beginning to recognize that the budget that he presented is in fact a rather reasonable budget, but he let months go by before anybody said anything. He let his own Secretary of the Treasury cast doubt on every part of the budget. He let other Cabinet officers cast doubt upon the budget. He's given the boys free run of the landscape, and now he says let's all get back on the track, but the trouble is that the horses are out of the stable, and you can't get them lined up for the race.

WILSON: Senator Humphrey, if it is in truth a reasonable budget, how can you seriously discuss the possibility of a tax reduction?

HUMPHREY: Well, this is an expanding economy, Mr. Wilson. I have great faith in the future. I have a feeling that under present tax rates, with a growth of our economy, that we're going to be able to bring in considerable more revenue. Furthermore, there are hopes, at least, in the days to come that there might be some modest cuts here and there. I hope that we can. For example, I feel that if we ever get a new Secretary of Agriculture and a new agricultural policy we'll be able to save a little money there and have fair farm prices. We could do it right now with a little ingenuity. I think that if the economy expands as much as we had hoped that it would that with present tax rates there will be a reasonable surplus and, therefore, afford ourselves an opportunity for a modest tax reduction. Now I'm not trying to kid the American people. There's not going to be any big tax reduction; that's political demagoguery and everybody knows it, but there is a chance for a modest tax reduction.

WILSON: You think there should be a big tax reduction?

HUMPHREY: Well, I guess like everybody else, I'm for taxes being reduced as much as you can reduce them, but I'm also for adequate defense and I'm also for adequate social services, and, as such, I say again you have a chance for a modest tax reduction, not a 5 billion dollar reduction. I don't think that's possible. Maybe a 2 billion, billion and a half, possible.

WILSON: Senator Humphrey, let me ask you a rather off-beat question. Your Party is somewhat fractured on some subjects such as tax reduction...

HUMPHREY: Our Party is like a solid wall of granite, may I say, compared to the mosaic of the Republican Party.

WILSON: Well, we're talking about your Party.

HUMPHREY: Well, I know, but I didn't want to be selfish about it. I wanted to include our friends in it.

WILSON: Solid and mosaic as it may be and however granite it may be, could you give me in simple language which I could understand a definition of a Democrat which would embrace both you and Senator Byrd of Virginia?

HUMPHREY: Well, Senator Byrd is a Virginia Democrat that has his own particular kind of politics. I have a great regard for Senator Byrd. He's a man of integrity; he's a Conservative and he's a very Conservative Democrat and makes no bones about it. I'm not. Within the household of our Democratic Party there are many personalities and there are different points of view, just as there is with any...

WILSON: Well, what happened to all that granite you talked about?

HUMPHREY: Well, that doesn't mean that the household is falling apart. It actually sometimes adds a little interest to what's going on in the household. I would imagine that Senator Byrd's analysis of tax laws, of financial problems makes a contribution to the Democratic Party because we have many liberal forces within the Party. Some of those may need a little restraint on occasion. I've noticed that for myself; I recognize that. So I don't turn Mr. Byrd out and say no, we don't need Harry Byrd. But I am saying this: That the majority of the Democratic Party is a liberal Party and I am saying that the Democratic Party on foreign policy has a consistent foreign policy. We'll support a good military security program; we'll support a foreign aid program, and we'll support a domestic program that is designed to help agriculture, independent business, improve our social welfare structure-- in other words, we'll support what we've started.

WILSON: How about mothers?

HUMPHREY: Well, we've never been against that either, as a matter of fact.

HURLEIGH: I'm sorry, gentlemen, but I am going to have to cut in here. Our board of judges has selected the prize-winning questions submitted by our listeners for this broadcast. In a moment, Senator Humphrey is going to answer these questions. Stand by for the names of the winners.

ANNOUNCER: Here's a Mutual note for you. News as you want it, the way you want it, and when you want it. That's the philosophy behind the news and news feature programs that Miles Laboratories presents over the Mutual network many times daily and seven days each week. For Hollywood doings there's Martin Starr and his "Here's Hollywood" feature. For interviews with the world's most outstanding personalities and news-makers there's "The Millie Considine Show" every weekday. And for quick digests of each day's major events, Mondays through Sundays, there are the many news programs featuring such outstanding reporters as Harry Hennessy, John Scott, Ed Pettitt and Lyle Van. Miles also knows you want a respite from weekday chores, and brings you "Queen for a Day" each morning. And for information about outstanding features in world events, in world history, there's "Wonders of the World" each afternoon. Yes, there are news and news feature programs set for you each day in the week over the Mutual network by Miles Laboratories, set to bring you the news as it happens, when it happens and the way you'd like to hear it. It's Miles' daily service to you, its millions of listeners, over most of these Mutual stations. Remember, Mutual is your network for news.

HURLEIGH: And now, Senator Humphrey, here are those prize-winning questions from our listeners.

ANNOUNCER: From Myron Rapoport of Jamaica Queens, New York.

HURLEIGH: Senator Humphrey, do you believe the United States should rule out a request if Russia asks soon for plane landing reciprocal rights with American commercial aviation?

HUMPHREY: I really haven't given that any thought, and I'm not trying to duck the question. I would say that you always take these questions under advisement and see whether or not there's any mutual advantage. I'm not one that's particularly afraid of the Soviet. If it's commercial aviation, you can recognize that they're going to be doing more than commercializing. You can just put it down in your notebook that the Soviet will also be doing a little investigating on the spot in terms of its political activities, so we have to take that into consideration. If we are willing to practice the same thing, there may be some mutual advantage.

ANNOUNCER: Florence A. Anderson of Los Angeles, California.

HURLEIGH: Senator, has the stand taken by the British and the French governments with respect to the Suez Canal led to some ill feelings between those countries and the United States?

HUMPHREY: I believe that we're growing together again--the U. S., Britain and France. The French have taken a much more adamant stand on the Suez Canal and a very honorable one in the sense that they want the Security Council go again re-assert the six principles which were adopted in October of 1956 as to the way the Canal should be managed. But let's be practical about this. Nasser controls the ditch, and if you want to send any ships through it, unless

you're willing to take the ditch away from him--the Canal away from him--by force, you're going to have to play according to the rules that he lays down. Now those rules were not too bad. They weren't what I would have hoped, but they were not too bad, and I think the policy which we have adopted of wait and see--using the Canal, waiting to see how the government of Egypt acts in terms of tolls and management of the Canal--is a sensible policy.

ANNOUNCER: M. Arthur Small of Brooklyn, New York.

HURLEIGH: Senator, should the government borrow seasoned representatives from press and radio to help improve U. S. information services abroad?

HUMPHREY: The more professionally trained people that you can bring into our information service the better and may I say most respectfully, the more qualified, the better. I know many people in the U. S. information service and they're, many of them, very able. In the main this agency has developed well. It's had a difficult time, both in Congress and out, but the more that we can get of qualified people from private sources in the United States to work with our information service, I think the more it will be improved.

ANNOUNCER: Attractive and dependable Wittnauer watches are being sent to the persons named for submitting the prize-winning questions on this evening's broadcast. Mutual has brought you this program with the hope of stimulating your interest in the matters you have heard discussed and in all other issues. Next week our newsmaking guest will be questioned on Atomic Radio Activity Fallout Controversy. The writers of the three most interesting and timely questions for our guest will each receive this handsome prize--an attractive and dependable Wittnauer watch, distinguished product of the Longines-Wittnauer Watch Company, since 1866 makers of watches of the highest character. Send in your questions on a postcard with your full name and complete address. Mail it to Reporters' Roundup, Mutual Broadcasting System, Washington, D. C. The decision of the board of judges will be final. All questions remain the property of Reporters' Roundup.

HURLEIGH: I want to thank U. S. Senator Hubert H. Humphrey, Democrat of Minnesota, for being our guest on Reporters' Roundup, which came to you transcribed from the Senate Radio Gallery in your nation's Capitol. And, my thanks, too, to the reporters on our panel: to Mr. William H. Lawrence, National Affairs Correspondent for the New York Times; and Mr. Lyle Wilson, Chief of the Washington Bureau of United Press. Be sure to send in your questions for our guest next week who will be questioned on the Atomic Radio Activity Fallout Controversy. Until then, this is Robert F. Hurleigh.

ANNOUNCER: This broadcast of Reporters' Roundup will make news because

its guest, United States Senator Hubert H. Humphrey, Democrat of Minnesota, faced questions which are asked by most Americans. Next week, and each week thereafter, Reporters' Roundup will seek out the top news and the man who makes it. You'll get the story behind the headlines as our guest answers the questions of Robert F. Hurleigh and a panel of veteran reporters. This is Jaffray Ford speaking.



Minnesota Historical Society

Copyright in this digital version belongs to the Minnesota Historical Society and its content may not be copied without the copyright holder's express written permission. Users may print, download, link to, or email content, however, for individual use.

To request permission for commercial or educational use, please contact the Minnesota Historical Society.



www.mnhs.org