



MUTUAL BROADCASTING SYSTEM

The Honorable Hubert Humphrey
United States Senate
140 Senate Office Building
The Capitol

Sent for info
File
EW

POSTMASTER:
Parcel may be opened
for postal inspection.

1440 BROADWAY, NEW YORK 18, N. Y.

Comp. pp. 7-11
Jan 24 - Wash

MUTUAL BROADCASTING SYSTEM, 1627 K Street, N. W., Washington, D. C.

Mutual's Washington News Bureau
STERling 3-3800
METropolitan 8-1551

ADVANCE PRESS INFORMATION

PLEASE HOLD. FOR RELEASE AFTER 7:00 PMEST (6:00 PM CST)
MONDAY, JANUARY 24, 1955

ATTENTION: EDITORS AND CORRESPONDENTS:

Attached is the complete transcript of REPORTERS' ROUNDUP
with this week's guest - Senator Hubert H. Humphrey, Democrat of
Minnesota.

The key topic: FOREIGN TRADE POLICIES.

By-liners on this week's panel are: Jim Lucas of Scripps-
Howard Newspapers and Charles W. Bailey of Cowles Publications.

REPORTERS' ROUNDUP, moderated by Commentator Robert F.
Hurleigh, is a weekly nation-wide network feature produced by Mutual
in Washington and is heard coast to coast over most of MBS' 582
affiliated stations, 9:30-10:00 PMEST (8:30-9:00 PM CST).

FOR RELEASE AFTER 7:00 PMEST (6:00 PM CST), MONDAY, JANUARY 24, 1955

"REPORTERS' ROUNDUP"

GUEST: Senator Hubert H. Humphrey (Dem., Minnesota)

MODERATOR: Robert F. Hurleigh

PANEL: Jim Lucas, Scripps-Howard Newspapers

Charles W. Bailey, Cowles Publications

--O--

FISKE: REPORTERS' ROUNDUP, where bylines make headlines! In a moment hear United States Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, Democrat of Minnesota, answer questions fired at him by a panel of veteran reporters.

HURLEIGH: Do you support the President's request for a three-year extension of the reciprocal trade agreements act?

LUCAS: Are any great number of Americans jobless as a result of foreign competition under the reciprocal trade programs?

BAILEY: What would extending this law do to our wage and labor standards in the United States?

HURLEIGH: Congress is now considering President Eisenhower's proposals for stimulating world trade through a three-year extension of the reciprocal trade agreements act as its first order of business. The President is making a strong appeal for passage of the trade program, arguing that it is vital to continued friendly relations with America's allies and to help fight Communism abroad. Opponents say that the high level of national income, high level of employment, wages, profits and the lively flow of investment necessary to sustain our economy are highly vulnerable. Our guest tonight is United States Senator Hubert Humphrey, Democrat of Minnesota, and a member of the Foreign Relations Committee. Senator Humphrey is a former Mayor of Minneapolis and was first elected to the Senate in 1948 and re-elected in 1954. He serves on the President's Commission on International Relations and the Democratic Steering Committee of the Senate. And now our guest is ready.

FISKE: REPORTERS' ROUNDUP, which comes to you transcribed this evening from the Senate Radio Gallery in your nation's capital, is presented by Mutual and Facts Forum, Facts Forum, a non-profit, non-political organization, re-prints many of these interviews in the monthly Facts Forum News. The February issue contains an interview with Dr. Bella Dodd by Ralph de Toledano. Dr. Dodd relates her experiences while a member of the Communist Party and the reasons for her denunciation of the Party. To reserve your copy, send your subscription order direct to Facts Forum, Dallas, Texas - six month's introductory subscription - only \$1.00. United States Senator Humphrey of Minnesota, one of the best known members of the Senate, will now meet this panel of Washington reporters: Jim Lucas of Scripps-Howard Newspapers, and Charles W. Bailey of Cowles Publications. Your moderator is Robert F. Hurleigh.

HURLEIGH: Tonight's REPORTERS' ROUNDUP presents a discussion of the reciprocal trade between the free world and the United States. Mr. Lucas, let's have the first question for Senator Humphrey.

LUCAS: Senator Humphrey, to establish a basis of discussion, perhaps set the tone - just how do you feel about the President's request that the Congress extend the reciprocal trade agreements for a period of three instead of one year?

HUMPHREY: Well, Mr. Lucas, I strongly support the President's request for the extension of reciprocal trade for a period of three years. I think it will lend real stability to our economic negotiations and it can do much to promote economic progress and stability throughout the free world.

LUCAS: This program, as I understand it, is approximately twenty years old. It was initiated by Cordell Hull.

HUMPHREY: That's about right.

LUCAS: During that period have any great number of Americans become jobless as a result of foreign competition?

HUMPHREY: I don't believe so. I suppose you can always find specific industries and particular areas that may be somewhat adversely affected, at least temporarily, but I think that a general review of the reciprocal trade program would reveal that it has been to the benefit of the United States, and of course to other countries. The word "reciprocal" indicates that there is some negotiating. In other words, it isn't something that we just sign up without going into the merits or the demerits of a particular proposal. We give and

we get. It's good Yankee horse trading.

LUCAS: Well, that word "reciprocal" interests me. I see how we can reciprocate in matters of foreign trade with a highly developed country like Germany or England, France, perhaps Japan, but what is there that we can reciprocate, say with Viet-Nam, on?

HUMPHREY: Well, in Viet-Nam and in other parts of Southeast Asia they have great supplies of very important and critical metals. As a matter of fact, while my facts are not just before me, I think it is true that a rather substantial proportion of the metals that we need for modern American industry, with all of its complexity and intricacy, comes from this very area that you have just noted, not only from Indo-China, but from other areas such as Indonesia and the Malaya States, and other areas there. So we could surely make some agreements there.

HURLEIGH: Mr. Bailey.

BAILEY: Senator, I understand that one part of the President's proposal would grant a tax advantage to American firms who invest their money overseas. Do you think this would be an unfair advantage for large business firms compared to small ones? I know you are a member of the Small Business Committee of the Senate and wondered whether you might have some comment on that.

HUMPHREY: Well, Mr. Bailey, that has been one part of the President's overall economic message. It doesn't relate directly to the reciprocal trade program, but it does relate to the economic, or the foreign economic policy of this Administration. I would say that particular section, and I have so noted it, would require some very careful study and analysis, because I think there is an opportunity here to promote an excess flow of American capital into foreign areas where the profit opportunity could be much better than on domestic production, or it even could be excessive, and this could actually penalize internal economic development. I would want to weigh that very very carefully. However, I do feel that we ought to do as much as we can without any adverse effect upon our own economy to promote some independent private foreign investment -- much more than we have done to date.

BAILEY: Well, Senator, you mentioned the importance of encouraging the flow of American capital overseas. The opponents of this reciprocal trade extension have pictured it as an aid program actually under which a few industries

would bear all the cost instead of having the taxpayers in general bear the cost of this program.

HUMPHREY: I don't really follow that argument very well, Mr. Bailey. First of all, I would just like to say this - sometimes we have to do things that we wish sometimes we didn't. The truth is that we are engaged in a colossal struggle with the forces of international Communism, and for us just to sit back and think that we can win this struggle by military means alone and by vast and huge expenditures of public funds for military strength, I think is being short-sighted. The Soviet two years ago literally shifted its strategy and its tactics not totally away from the military pressure - because we surely know that they are building huge forces and threaten us at all times - but the emphasis has been upon the economic warfare. It has been an emphasis upon moving in and making trade agreements, and the facts do reveal that the Soviet has moved far out in front of us in terms of tying down trade agreements that were advantageous to the Soviet Union and the cause of Communism. Now I think we should be able to meet that, and as the most powerful and the richest and the most productive nation on the face of the earth, I am unwilling to accept the proposition that the Soviet with its collectivism, with its State ownership, can outbid, out-compete and outsell us in the markets of the world.

LUCAS: Senator, there are areas of the world where American capitalism, American capital investment, is not always welcome.

HUMPHREY: That is surely true and I don't think that we ought to ever be caught with a program where we say it's either this or nothing. That's one of the reasons that I have favored, as a member of the Senate, substantial economic aid in certain areas. I also believe that we ought to look forward to this program of the International Finance Development Corporation, to the use of the International Bank, the World Bank, for further economic development. This is a very complex subject, and it isn't just a matter of General Motors or Ford Motor Company or some huge strong American corporation with all of its efficiency going into a country. That's just one of the opportunities that we have, but we ought to have many more. We ought to have some Government program, it seems to me. We ought to have this great international program that's designed through the World Bank and the International Finance Development Corporation, which is now in the stages of being established, and we might very well increase

our activities in private financing.

LUCAS: I take it, as a ^{corollary} ~~consequence~~ to this, then you might support the so-called Marshall Plan for Asia, which is pretty much dead, as I gather?

HUMPHREY: Well, no, I wouldn't -- those are names. If you mean, do I believe that we ought to lend on a very selective basis some economic assistance, for example, in a country such as Pakistan, an ally of ours, I would say, yes, I think this is to our advantage. I happen to believe that military assistance alone to many of the Asian countries is not adequate, because the stability of their government will depend - will in a great sense determine how much of an ally they are going to be.

LUCAS: I don't know how specific you want to get, but you have mentioned Pakistan. How about India?

HUMPHREY: I believe that we ought to give economic assistance to India. As a matter of fact, while the Indians do many things I don't like, and while Mr. Nehru at times acts up in a manner that is displeasing to me, the choice in India today is not a choice between a good Democrat and a good Republican, as you might want back here in the United States, but it's a choice between the Congress Party of India, which represents at least the forces of political freedom, and the forces of Communism that are on the march. Now that Five Year Plan which is coming to a conclusion here in the next two years has some specific goals that need to ^{be} met, because there is going to be an election in India, and India today as a sort of neutral is a whole lot better than India tomorrow as an outright adjunct to or power in the Soviet orbit.

LUCAS: They have taken some rather restrictive measures against American industry in India --

HUMPHREY: Oh, recently --

LUCAS: In the aviation field and in the automotive industry -- is it possible that by the use of the reciprocal features of this legislation that some of those restrictions might be loosened?

HUMPHREY: I think so. I would hope so. At least it would offer an opportunity. I think we have to realize that a country such as India, that was under British colonialism for years, is somewhat sensitive to what we might call Occidental wealth, or the great money and power of the Western world. We are going to have our difficulties with India, but I want to tell you, from

my point of view, the difficulties that we are having now will be the irreducible minimum as compared to the difficulties we would have if the political situation in India went further to the left and finally over into the Communist orbit.

HURLEIGH: Mr. Bailey.

BAILEY: Senator, to get back to this side of the ocean on this question again, do you think that some provision should be made to help American industry, say that would be hurt by foreign competition under the provisions of the reciprocal trade agreements - some form of subsidy for the industry or some compensation for workers who are laid off because a business has to shut down?

HUMPHREY: I think we are going to be faced with that, surely. If we go through with the three-year program, with the downgrading escalator clause so to speak - I mean where the President can cut five percent each year for three years, and also to bring down any tariffs that are over 50 percent down to at least 50 percent minimum, I think we are going to have to take into account the realities of what may happen in specific limited areas of American enterprise and industry, and it seems to me that when we make a national policy such as this, then the whole nation ought to bear the burden and not place this strictly on the backs, let's say of the coal miners -- and coal today is a sick industry. I think the Government of the United States has an obligation here to see to it that we do something in this particular area. It may happen, for example, in some selected pottery industries in the United States -- possibly a program of retraining of workers, a program of capital loans for starting up new industry that could re-hire these workers, or for change-over of plant from one form of equipment to another so that it could stay in the marketplace and provide jobs and still be able to maintain capital solvency. I think we have got to face up to that.

BAILEY: Now is this kind of a program that you have just outlined different in your view from the type of action that was taken last summer to raise the tariff on imports of Swiss watches into this country after the domestic watch-makers came down to Washington and presented their case and complained about the situation? Do you see a difference between --

HUMPHREY: Yes, I think there is a considerable difference. I want to say,

however, that the watchmaker is in a peculiar category. First of all, that's a very sensitive kind of, should I say profession? I mean we need these skilled craftsmen. Now we may actually have to pay a price to maintain this kind of a skill so that it doesn't become extinct so to speak, because these men are frequently of the greatest importance in our national defense efforts. I think that you can justify some programs, may I say, on the terms of overall national security and national defense. I think you have to draw the line some place, however, and you have to recognize that if you have an expanding economy - and that's what I am looking forward to - where you have relatively full employment, that even though one may be temporarily displaced in a particular industry for a particular period of time, that if you have got a growing economy and not a restricting one, he will find work, particularly if you provide during that interim period adequate employment compensation benefits, some retraining and relocation where the necessities may demand it.

BAILEY: Well, would you favor the program of American government spending to accomplish these things rather than increases in the tariffs on certain products when these industries get in distress? It seems to me in the watch-making situation you had an approach that was quite different from the one you have just described.

HUMPHREY: Yes. Yes, and I think you have cited the situation very carefully and very adequately. I would. I would say that instead of trying to block off foreign trade that we would try to make some adjustments back here in the domestic scene. We may have to take our time in some of this. These things are not easy and I don't say for a single minute that when you go into a long range policy such as we are talking about here that there won't be some rather difficult readjustment periods.

HURLEIGH: Mr. Lucas.

LUCAS: Senator, this is a global problem, this problem of world trade, and particularly in the Far East our friends such as the Japanese are in very difficult straits because they are not allowed to trade with the Chinese Reds.

HUMPHREY: Yes.

LUCAS: There are restrictions placed on them for good strategic military tactical reasons, but do you feel that there should be some easing of the restrictions on East-West trade if we are going to solve this problem and

raise world living conditions?

HUMPHREY: My own personal feeling is that in view of the tense international situation -- and by the way, I am one that thinks it's not quite as rosy as the Administration spokesmen so indicate -- that what we should be trying to do is to improve the area of trade and commerce amongst the free nations of the world and amongst that great uncommitted bloc - and there is still a great uncommitted bloc - and that's why a trade program such as we are talking about here is tied in with many other things. It's tied in with military security; it's tied in with economic security. I happen to believe, for example, that by the improvement of the living standards of substantial numbers of people, let's say in Southeast Asia, still not in the Communist area, that we could find a great market for American goods. You can't sell something to paupers. You can't sell highly developed American goods, manufactured goods or even raw materials, to people that are totally without income. Therefore, it's to our advantage as the greatest producer nation on the face of the earth to have a credit program, a capital improvement program, an economic aid program that makes possible customers. Modern American industry understands this very well. They know today that the best place for them to sell their goods is to a well paid worker, and they realize that if they are going to stay in business, our large corporations, that they have got to have customers - customers with money in their pocket. Now that's why I say that in a foreign trade program you are just talking theory if you are not thinking in terms of how to sell to people that have it. Therefore, to me as a United States Senator and as a citizen, I believe it's all to our advantage at times to help other people help themselves so that they in turn can buy some of the things that we might produce.

LUCAS: This is entirely off the subject, and I will let Chuck bring it back with his next question, but I am interested by your observation that things are not so rosy as has been pictured by the Administration. Could you expand on that a bit?

HUMPHREY: Well, I still feel that the Soviet Union is increasing its military power. I still feel that there are highly critical and tense areas in the world. I am not at all pleased with some of the developments that I see happening in Southeast Asia. I think there are difficulties in North Africa that are being minimized. And I do not believe that we ought to go around kidding

ourselves that we are living in an era of peace, nor do I think we ought to fall for the propaganda of the Soviet Union that if we will just co-exist that everything will be lovely and just fine. If we mean by co-existence that we will get on the march with a trade program, with an economic program and with military strength, and trying to find new friends and build new areas of strength, then I will go for co-existence, but if you mean by co-existence that we just sort of play dead and act like we are somehow happy about the whole situation, then I say that we would be living in a fool's paradise and false security. So from this man's point of view I think that we ought to continue building our military strength. We ought to continue to build our alliances. We ought to continue to expand our foreign trade, and in that area and in economic development, I think, just as a matter of national pride, as the greatest merchants in the world, the greatest producers/ in the world, the greatest industrialists in the world, the finest skilled workers in the world, that we Americans ought to be a little bit ashamed of ourselves to think that we would have to take a back seat or a second place to any other nation on the face of the globe. Look - we can outproduce them, outsell them, outdistribute them - we can outdo them in any area we want to as long as it is in production, selling and marketing. This is something that we really know. We may not be so clever around some of the diplomatic conference tables, because sometimes we stub our toe there, but I think that if we will give American industry and American capital, backed up with American government confidence and strength, an opportunity to show what can be done we can really make headway.

HURLEIGH: Mr. Bailey.

BAILEY: Senator, a year ago the President proposed a three-year extension of this trade agreements act. The Congress extended it for one year and it appeared that the President was satisfied for the time being. Now again he requests a three-year extension rather than a one-year extension. Do you think it's necessary to go for three years, and if so, why?

HUMPHREY: I do. I think it was necessary last year, and the reason why is very obvious. First of all, our foreign exporters, our private exporters in the business world trying to do business with importers in the European, let's say, business world -- it sometimes takes us six to eight months to even come to an agreement, and if you have only got a one-year extension of a

reciprocal trade act upon which you are basing this agreement that you have worked so steadfastly to arrive it, you really haven't got much, but to do business I think you have got to have longer periods of time in the whole area of international or foreign economic policy if you are going to make any forward progress. You need time for original planning. It's going to take a lot of time on some of these reciprocal trade agreements just to negotiate them. Then you need time for delivery. You need time to see what the effect of that will be. Therefore, I support this three-year program.

BAILEY: Another one of the President's general trade proposals would envisage a clearing up of our customs regulations --

HUMPHREY: Yes.

BAILEY: -- to make it more, apparently more, simple to fulfill those requirements. Does this tie in with that same general idea of stability and predictability in the field of international trade?

HUMPHREY: It surely does, and again may I say, as the leading commercial nation on the face of the earth - and that's exactly what we are, and I want to boast about it because it's the truth - we ought to have a customs procedure in this country that expedites the flow of commerce, and I am happy to say in the 83rd Congress, as you gentlemen know, we did pass an act to ask for a study to be made in that, and for proposals to come back to us for further simplification. I think that is a good sound suggestion.

HURLEIGH: Mr. Lucas.

LUCAS: Senator, I have gotten the impression that our customs service is in pretty bad shape personnelwise, and there have been further cuts in recent Congresses.

HUMPHREY: That's true.

LUCAS: Can we go into this sort of a program with an inadequately staffed customs service, or must that be built up?

HUMPHREY: I am not prepared to say just what the proportions of that service is. I have visited, however, many of our customs offices, and I am of the opinion from what I do know that it is understaffed, that I am sure that there will be necessity for some retraining, and too, if you start to go into a more modern customs program, and I think in the main if you are going to enter upon this kind of a policy we ought to realize that we are going to have to forward it at some cost.

LUCAS: Well, we have discussed this thing from the policy and philosophical viewpoint, both at home and overseas. Now in the realm of practical politics just how much chance does this program have of approval in this Congress?

HUMPHREY: I think it has a very good chance, sir. I am not so sure just how much chance the one item that we discussed earlier, the tax concessions for foreign - American capital in foreign countries - might have. Of course that would require some tax treaties with other countries because that requires a good deal of commercial negotiation, but by a three-year extension, I think with the President's support - if he will continue his support now -- and I say that because he advocated three years before and then settled for one -- if the President will stick with us, and if his Administration won't let us down, I think we will be able to get a three-year extension through, and further customs simplification and some other areas that he recommended in his economic message.

LUCAS: Well, the turn-over in the Senate, particularly this time, wasn't too great. There were, oh, less than ten changes.

HUMPHREY: That's correct, but I think if the President last time -- if the Administration forces, let me put it this way, if the Administration forces and the Congress last time had come out with a three-year extension bill it would have gone through, but they came out, as you know, with a one-year program, and when some of the Democrats tried to make it a three-year one, we had the rug pulled out from underneath us by a statement from the White House that the one-year was adequate. So all I ask is, of our good President, is - Stay with us and we will deliver the program.

HURLEIGH: Mr. Bailey.

BAILEY: I had another question in the realm of practical politics. Historically we have seen a pattern of Congressional voting on these problems where the manufacturing areas of the Northeast and what might be called the eastern part of the Midwest have favored high tariffs while the South and the West, with agricultural products to sell, have favored free trade. Do you think this pattern still exists?

HUMPHREY: I think it exists somewhat in what you might call the prejudices of the mind, but the economic facts reveal today that the South is becoming highly industrialized and the Midwest, which was once basically a producer of raw materials, food and fibers is becoming industrialized. I think that you

are finding that this whole attitude of high tariff in America has lost its meaning. It isn't a great political subject any more. No politician is going to pay to go out and arouse the fervor of the people by giving high tariff policy, but I think you can go out to the people and point out that we are engaged in a colossal struggle in this world that is military, economic, and it is diplomatic. We have every opportunity to balance off on the military. We have the capacity to do it. We can do it on the diplomatic and on the economic. We ought to lead, and if we are going to lead we are going to need to do what has been outlined here - technical assistance, economic assistance, extension of reciprocal trade, customs simplification - and I repeat, this is a natural area for the American people. We are born capitalists and traders. We ought to be able to do this.

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

FISKE: A large portion of the responsibility for keeping the American people the best informed people in the world belongs to radio newscasters, commentators and analysts. On Mutual you'll find veteran newsmen in every category who are experts in their fields and who take their responsibility to you, the listener, with utmost seriousness. Whether you prefer a fast, five-minute digest of the big headlines of the moment or thoughtful penetrating and informed commentary, Mutual is your network for news, as you like it and when you like it. Weekday evenings there are Fulton Lewis, Jr., Gabriel Heatter and Virgil Pinckly, with full quarter hours of news, as well as Lyle Van and his famed five-minute news capsule. And the daytime favorite, Robert F. Hurleigh, is heard every morning with news and commentary. Cedric Foster, whose constant search for background takes him to many corners of the world. And Cecil Brown, Bill Cunningham and Sam Hays. These are but a few of the Mutual names for news. Hear them all regularly over most of these stations. Mutual is your network for news.

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

FISKE: From David Brewer Jetmore, of Jersey City, N. J.

HURLEIGH: In view of the fact that we cannot increase our imports unless we tear down our present high tariffs to encourage imports, what is to be the prime determining factor in arriving at a proper trade balance for this country?

HUMPHREY: Well, I would say to our questioner that if you look upon the American economic situation as one that is static, in which there is little hope for progress, then indeed there wouldn't be much opportunity for increased imports without some disturbance to local American enterprise, but I guess maybe I am just an optimist. I am of the opinion that we are going to have expanding markets. We have a growing population, and by lowering some of these tariffs we will be able to bring into America new products that will not necessarily displace what we have but find a new market.

FISKE: From Annie Lee, of Malden, Massachusetts.

HURLEIGH: How can the American workers retain their high wages if the tariff is lowered and foreign goods undersell the American market?

HUMPHREY: Well, I think it should be crystal clear that we don't intend to let our country be flooded with so-called depressed wage commodities. We are talking about reciprocal trade programs. Furthermore, let the record be clear. The American worker is a greater producer per man hour per person than any worker in the world. He has the capital tools at his finger tips to produce goods and services. Actually the American worker can face competition from practically any country in the world, despite our high wage standards. This is the great accomplishment of our free enterprise system.

FISKE: From Ella Simmons, of Sherman, Texas.

HURLEIGH: If we lowered our tariff and increased our foreign trade with our friends and also the countries behind the Iron Curtain to a certain degree - wouldn't it relieve the world tension and make more friends?

HUMPHREY: I am of the opinion that if we can increase world trade that it will relieve some of the tension. More important, however, it will protect those areas that are today somewhat vulnerable to Communist infiltration. It will give them that solid base of economic growth and stability from whence Communism doesn't gain any friends. In other words, I look upon this program as having three assets: Economic strength amongst our allies, as the President

said; Number two, economic growth in underdeveloped areas to improve their particular situation, both political and economic; and thirdly, an increasing volume of world production and trade will help as to our own economic growth and a rise in our own standard of living. I think that's a pretty good package and I think it can be well defended.

FISKE: Handsome Cyma Dual Purpose Clocks are being sent to the persons named for submitting the three prize-winning questions on this evening's broadcast. This program is presented by Mutual and Facts Forum to provoke further thought and interest in national and international issues. Many Facts Forum programs are published in the monthly Facts Forum News. The February issue contains a special feature article by Freda Utley, a well-known and respected authority on the Far East, revealing her conviction, based on actual experience, that the Russian people actually despise their Soviet tyrants. For more information about the February Facts Forum News, write to Facts Forum, Dallas, Texas. Each week our listeners are invited to send in questions. Next week our news-making guest will be questioned on whether foreign economic aid should be continued or discontinued. The writers of the three most interesting and timely questions will each receive this handsome prize: a Cyma Dual Purpose Clock, made by the world famous Cyma watchmakers. This Cyma Clock will be your companion at home or wherever you go. Send in your questions on the back of a postcard with your full name and complete address to REPORTERS' ROUNDUP, Mutual Broadcasting System, Washington, D. C. All questions remain the property of REPORTERS' ROUNDUP.

HURLEIGH: I want to thank United States Senator Hubert H. Humphrey of Minnesota for being our guest on tonight's REPORTERS' ROUNDUP, which came to you transcribed from the Senate Radio Gallery in Washington, D. C. My thanks also to the reporters on our panel: Jim Lucas of Scripps-Howard and Charles W. Bailey of Cowles Publications. Until next week, your moderator, Robert F. Hurleigh.

FISKE: This broadcast of REPORTERS' ROUNDUP will make news because its guest, Senator Hubert H. Humphrey of Minnesota, has faced questions which are asked by all 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 speaker answers the questions of Robert F. Hurleigh and a panel of veteran reporters. Fred Fiske 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