

File

REPORTERS' ROUNDUP
TELEVISION
PROGRAM

PRESS RELEASE: (Advance information)

FOR RELEASE: 5:00 PM EST, Sunday, April 29, 1956.

--O--

United States Senator Hubert H. Humphrey, Democrat of Minnesota, is guest on nation-wide Reporters' Roundup TV program.

Senator Humphrey is questioned on numerous news-making topics, including:

THREAT OF WAR IN THE MIDDLE EAST

REPUBLICAN ADMINISTRATION'S HANDLING OF FOREIGN AFFAIRS

WEAKENING OF NATO

PRESIDENT EISENHOWER'S VETO OF THE FARM BILL

ECONOMIC SITUATION OF THE FARMER

CONGRESSIONAL ACTION ON THE BRICKER AMENDMENT

Senator Humphrey, member of the Senate Foreign Relations, Government Operations, and Agriculture committees, is interviewed by Clark Mollenhoff, of Look Magazine and Cowles Newspapers, and L. Edgar Prina, of the Washington Evening Star. This panel program is moderated by Robert F. Hurleigh, Washington commentator.

Attached is the complete (ADVANCE) transcript of REPORTERS' ROUNDUP TV, a weekly nation-wide television feature, filmed by Washington Video Productions. This program is viewed on 94 television stations from coast-to-coast.

DO NOT RELEASE PRIOR TO 5:00 PM EST, Sunday, April 29, 1956.

--O--

"REPORTERS' ROUNDUP" TELEVISION

GUEST: SENATOR HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
Democrat, Minnesota

MODERATOR: Robert F. Hurleigh

PANEL: Clark Mollenhoff, Look Magazine and Cowles Newspapers
L. Edgar Prina, Washington Evening Star

--O--

FISKE: REPORTERS' ROUNDUP, where by-lines make headlines! In a moment, hear Senator Hubert H. Humphrey, Democrat of Minnesota, answer questions fired at him by a panel of veteran reporters. Your moderator, Robert F. Hurleigh.

HURLEIGH: Reporters' Roundup guest today is Senator Hubert Humphrey of Minnesota. He is a member of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, the Government Operations, and Agriculture Committees. He was elected to the Senate in 1948 and re-elected in 1954. Senator Humphrey will be questioned today by L. Edgar Prina, Washington Evening Star, and Clark Mollenhoff of Cowles Newspapers. Senator, the questioning will begin in just a moment.

BUSINESS: (Commercial insert - one minute)

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

MOLLENHOFF: Senator Humphrey, there has been an awful lot of talk about bi-partisanship in foreign affairs among the Democrats particularly over the years. And, lately, there has been an awful lot of sniping at Secretary Dulles and President Eisenhower. I wonder how you justify this in the light of all this talk about bi-partisanship in foreign affairs?

HUMPHREY: Well Mr. Mollenhoff, bipartisanship in foreign affairs does not mean acquiescence in every decision which has been made by the administration, when those decisions have been made without appropriate consultation with the committees of the congress which have responsibility in this area. Bi-partisanship as Arthur Vandenberg put it so simply, means more than just being present at the crash landings. It means being present at the take-off. And I don't believe there has been sniping. I believe there has been honest and legitimate observation and criticism where it was deserved.

MOLLENHOFF: But, Senator there has been an awful lot of talk in generalities about no consultation. I have yet to hear of any real specific instance where there wasn't consultation. Could you give us one?

-more-

What instance where there wasn't real and proper consultation?

HUMPHREY: Well, yes I can give you very good instance where there wasn't proper consultation. In the Mideastern affairs for example, when there were shipments of war materials or defense materials to Saudi Arabia, we had no advance information on the shipment of planes to Israel by the French Government or under a French export license, there was no advance information. Furthermore, may I say that it is not just a matter of advance consultation, it is also a matter of whether or not the administration seeks to gain effective political advantage^{out} of what I would call ^{some} distortion of the the evidence before the committees when discussion has taken place.

MOLLENHOFF: Well do you think that they have actually distorted - the administration has actually distorted the picture on foreign affairs?

HUMPHREY: Yes, I surely do! I think that when Mr. Dulles can come before our committee and say that the international scene seems much improved seems rosy, and then when Admiral Radford can take the same trip that Mr. Dulles took and come back and say that the international situation is deteriorating, is precarious, that it is not only exaggeration and may I say misinformation, but it shows a great confusion of policy on the part of the administration.

MOLLENHOFF: Do you doubt but what they are trying to do the best job they can?

HUMPHREY: Oh I am sure that I never would impune the motives of the President or the Secretary in foreign affairs. I have said repeatedly, Mr. Mollenhoff, ^{I am convinced that} that both the Secretary and the President seek peace and justice in this world, but I am not convinced that just because they make a move that it necessarily is right. And as an elected official I feel an obligation to speak my mind.

MOLLENHOFF: But how would you work your way out of the situation in the middle east right today?

HUMPHREY: Well, now, Mr. Mollenhoff, that is hardly the appropriate question. May I say I am not the President of the United States nor am I the Secretary of State, and it is not a simple matter to be sure. And when you say how do you work your way out of it, may I say that it might be a good idea if we had an opportunity to talk about it, amongst the appropriate members. . .

MOLLENHOFF: What moves being made today are wrong?

HUMPHREY: Well, I think there are several moves that have been made that are wrong. For example, in the whole matter in which we have handled the

the Middle Eastern situation. We have not had a policy. We have moved from one alternative to another. We have tried to be what they call "50-50". If we gave 50 million dollars aid to Israel, we gave 50 million dollars to the Middle Eastern countries - the others, the neighbors, whether they needed 100 million or 25 - it was divided up 50-50. Furthermore, I happen to be one that believes that the request of the Israeli Government, for arms, for defensive arms to bring back balance of military power in that area is a legitimate request, and that the State Department's reply to it is unacceptable. And may I say that ^{I think} it sometimes borders abt being upon the hypocritical, when we acquiesce with the French selling supplies to Israel but aren't willing to do so ourselves. When the Israeli Government would like to get a particular kind of materiel which we are capable of supplying.

HURLEIGH: Mr. Prina.

PRINA: Senator Humphrey, don't you think that if we sold arms to Israel right now, we would be driving the Arabs and particularly Egypt further into the arms of the Soviet?

HUMPHREY: No, I do not. May I just review for a moment that the arms to Egypt first of all, which the Czechoslovakians provided, a Communist satellite state -- we offered to sell arms to the Egyptians. We offered to sell ^{them} as early as June of last year. And the only reason the Egyptians didn't buy arms from the United States was that our price was a little too high and we wanted it in hard currency. The Czechoslovakians were willing to sell on the basis of barter. Now, when Egypt gets jets, and not only jets but gets tanks and high-powered mechanized artillery and when we find that this increases and augments her military power ^{to a point} where she could be an aggressor and an effective aggressor, then indeed I say that a policy that ignores that is one that ignores the realities of the military and political situation in the Middle East.

PRINA: Well, Senator Humphrey, in view of recent developments, namely Mr. Hammarskjold's mission of peace to the area, and Soviet declarations that they want peace in the Middle East - in view of that do you still favor shipments of arms to Israel?

HUMPHREY: Yes, yes I do, Mr. Prina.

PRINA: Why is that.

HUMPHREY: First, may I say that some of us long before the Administration put its support behind United Nation's action, I recall that Senator Mansfield of Montana and myself as many others in the Senate - but I recall a specific debate in which we were engaged - that we recommended that our President ask the United Nations, initiate action in the United Nations to try to utilize

the United Nations's agencies and instrumentalities to try to secure a cease-fire, to secure peace in the area. We delayed and we delayed. I am exceedingly happy that Mr. Hammarskjold's mission was as effective as it was, but he has only a temporary cease-fire and there is a very violent situation in the Middle East and I do not believe that it is going to be helped by permitting an imbalance -- now don't misunderstand me, I wish there were no arms race, in fact I wish that long ago that we had placed and received an agreement among all nations to place an embargo on arms in the Middle East, but you can't ignore the realities.

PRINA: How do you know now that there is an imbalance?

HUMPHREY: I know that there is an imbalance because we requested and literally demanded of the Department of State to come on over before our committee, they did not do it upon their own, they did it at the request of the Chairman. We had a recitation of what is known to be the arms in the Middle East insofar as we know, and there is an imbalance.

PRINA: If this is true, and if Israel is threatened, why do they not turn to the Soviet Union for arms where they can get them just as easily as Egypt got them?

HUMPHREY: Well, may I say that the State of Israel has sought to have friendly relations with the United States, and we do have very friendly relations, and furthermore I think it is all to the credit to the Government of Israel that it has not turned to the Soviet Union because when you turn to the Soviet Union for arms or goods, may I say that sometimes you fall into their arms, and that is the danger as I see it in the Middle East.

PRINA: Yes, but you remember that Israel has bought arms behind the Iron Curtain, they have bought arms from Czechoslovakia . . .

HUMPHREY: I imagine they have bought some from . . .

PRINA: . . . and, they have maintained their independence.

HUMPHREY: The Israeli Government has been attacked many times by spokesman of the Soviet Union and I think it is all to the credit of those people and of their government, that they do not seek to do business with the Soviet Union on this basis.

HURLEIGH: Mr. Mollenhoff.

MOLLENHOFF: Senator, is there any political advantage for the Democratic Party in this whole discussion of international affairs?

HUMPHREY: I doubt that Mr. Mollenhoff as far as ^{any} what you'd call vote advantage is concerned. I spoke here the other day on NATO, for example, what I think is happening to NATO. I do this as a sense of personal and public obligation. I don't believe that you arouse, or

let me say garner in votes, and I wouldn't hope that that is why we should do it. I happen to be one that believes that you need strong security, strong national defense even at the expense of more appropriations. I sincerely believe that if American is going to be a leader, it has to be a leader. It cannot blink its eyes at what the Soviet is doing in the Middle East.

MOLLENHOFF: Senator, aren't you at a disadvantage here from a political standpoint now. There is no war on, can't a great case be made for the fact that the United States is in a lot better shape right now than it was when President Eisenhower took office?

HUMPHREY: Well, Mr. Mollenhoff, I have said a number of times that there is just about as much prosperity in the Middle West as there is peace in the Middle East. And I might even include that in North Africa, because . . .

MOLLENHOFF: On that particular point . . .

HUMPHREY: . . . there is no peace in the Middle East. The fact that we're not engaged in hostilities does not mean that the world is at peace. And the fact that there are violent eruptions in one part of the world after another which may explode any minute, does not mean that there is a peaceful condition in the world.

MOLLENHOFF: But, until they explode, aren't you at a political disadvantage?

HUMPHREY: Well, if we are at a political disadvantage . . .

MOLLENHOFF: . . . even if that is the case?

HUMPHREY: . . . well may it be, but I am not going to let the American people be deluded into believing that all is well, as I cited. For example when General Gruenther tells us that NATO is in the process of being considerably weakened. Chancellor Adenauer, in his report which didn't get by the way in the American newspapers, I don't know why but the Adenauer, Chancellor Adenauer's report that something had to be done immediately to strengthen NATO. The Prime Minister of France, Lord Ismay of the NATO alliance, General Gruenther and others have said that we have a deterioration of the great alliance of NATO. I say that it is time the American people understood what is happening, and . . .

MOLLENHOFF: Don't you have faith in President Eisenhower to take care of that? He handled NATO personally himself for a long period of time.

HUMPHREY: He handled it very well, and his final report in 1952 asked for things to be done which he hasn't done as the President of the United States!

MOLLENHOFF: Wouldn't he be in a better position to assess that particular thing in the light of his background, than senators or anyone else on the hill?

HUMPHREY: He should be, but may I say that a man is not infallible, and furthermore may I say that he too may have some political considerations. There may be advise that is given to him that is not as sound as it should be. When he was in charge in NATO, he was in charge of it. Now he is President of the United States. All I ask President Eisenhower to do, Mr. Mollenhoff, is to do what he recommended to do when he left the NATO command, which he has not done and he has been President of the United States in a position to help do that.

HURLEIGH: Do you believe that General Grunther resigned from NATO command because of dismay over the situation?

HUMPHREY: I am not in a position to know that. I know that General Grunther did as good as he could do. I know that in his reports to the committees of the Congress that he was deeply concerned about what he felt was the new strategy of the Soviet trying to soften up our NATO alliance and may I say that the one objective, or the immediate objective of the Soviet Union has been to divide us from our allies, to weaken the NATO alliance. And when the leading spokesman, when President Gronchi of Italy, the Prime Minister of France/^{Guy Mollet} when Chancellor/^{Adenauer} of Germany, when General Grunther and Lord Ismay of NATO themselves, say that something is wrong and something more must be done immediately. When Iceland, the Parliament of Iceland orders out all NATO troops from Iceland by act of their Parliament, I say that it is time for us to wake up, and not to try to gloss over it as if everything was wonderful.

PRINA: No, Senator Humphrey, you intimated that it was the administrations fault for the situation in the Middle East today - in other words . . .

HUMPHREY: Did I do that, sir?

PRINA: Well, I believe you did, you said here we have this . . .

HUMPHREY: Well, what I would like to intimate is that there are violent forces/^{of revolution} in the Middle East as there are in the Middle -- as there are in North Africa. And whether there had been an Israel or not and whether there had been an Egypt or not, that undoubtedly these forces would have erupted.

PRINA: Yes, but Senator . . .

HUMPHREY: Now, we ought not to be however the innocent victim of forces. The task of leadership is to give some direction to these forces.

PRINA: Do you think . . . -more-

HUMPHREY; There is revolution all over these under-developed areas of Asia and Africa. I say that we have not had a concerted policy in the Middle East, and I say that no one can find what policy we have had because it has been hop, skip and jump!

PRINA: Well, let me just specialize abit here . . .

HUMPHREY: Please do!

PRINA: . . . and talk about Egypt. Do you believe that we could have prevented the Soviet Union from going into the Middle East, that is in this arms deal with one of her satellites with Egypt?

HUMPHREY: Well, I don't know, I really couldn't say that we maybe could have. We might very well have intercepted shipments, as had been done on other occasions. I think we were in a bad position to do anything about it beaause we were the first to be willing to sell arms to Egypt, and therefore our moral position of rebuking the Soviet countries was surely, literally rubbed out?

PRINA: Well, do you think we should have sold the arms at a cut rate in order to keep the Soviet out?

HUMPHREY: No, I do not.

PRINA: You'd rather - prefer the Soviet come in . . .

HUMPHREY: I think it would have better if there had been no arms sold, may I say.

PRINA: Yes, but we weren't faced with that situation . . .

HUMPHREY: Well, we didn't have the latter choice either, Mr. Prina, may I say Mr. Prina. We offered arms once.

PRINA: We could have cut the price.

HUMPHREY; No, we were not asked a second time. We were offered, we offered arms once to Egypt - if you want to continue on this - and the price was too high, and then the Egyptians turned to a cheaper seller, and they didn't ask us the second time, they sold it. All I am saying is that thas is a fact, I am not going to argue about should it have happened or how did it happen. We know it happened. And, once that does happen and since our policy is in the Tripartite Agreement of 1950 to be one of assuring the territorial integrity and the boundries of Israel, it seems that it would have been wise and prudent in light of the military information that we have to have tried to restore that balance, not to have given aggressive arms, but to have permitted the sale of defensive arms only to restore the balance. May I say that all of it is deplorable.

PRINA: Well is there any indication that a balance would remain a balance? I mean if Israel bought 50 million dollars worth of arms from us, couldn't Egypt turn around and buy also?

HUMPHREY: I am not a prophet, I couldn't say that. I am aware of one thing. . .

PRINA: But, isn't it logical to assume that?

HUMPHREY: I am aware that there is an imbalance at the present time and I am aware that we have some obligations under the charter of the United Nations, the first to recognize the State of Israel, sponsored her membership in the United Nations, a signatory to the Tripartite Agreement of 1950 -- all of these are political and moral responsibilities and I don't think it does any good to go around and say "well, we ought not to try to restore the balance"!

PRINA: There has been no sign that we aren't going to live up to these responsibilities, has there been?

HUMPHREY: Well, I think one of the first ways to live up to the responsibilities is to see that this country has a chance to defend itself.

PRINA: And, you don't think we have^{done}/that?

HUMPHREY: No, I do not.

MOLLENHOFF : Senator Humphrey, to swing from the Middle East to the Middle West, Secretary Benson has stated recently that he thinks that there is considerable vote appeal to the farmers of the Midwest in the President's veto, andⁱⁿ/the boost in prices. Do you think that the Republicans have made any headway in the Midwest with that veto?

HUMPHREY: No, I do not.

MOLLENHOFF: Well, what about now in the soil bank? They have put a soil bank in the lap of the Congress that they want passed. How can you Democrats politically stand in the way of putting money in the farmers' pockets?

HUMPHREY: I don't think we have any intention of so doing. I want to say for the record right now, that this administration is a Johnny-Come-Lately on the soil bank, and as I said one time maybe rather facetiously that as long as it was called acreage conservation reserve they were against it, but when someone put the word 'bank' in it, why they immediately had chain reaction . . .

MOLLENHOFF: But, Senator . . .

HUMPHREY: They have kind of forgotten the soil part of it, Mr. Mollenhoff, but I am the sponsor and the original sponsor in the Senate of the soil bank which this administration turned down as late as September 30, 1955 . . .

MOLLENHOFF: Secretary Benson said that wasn't the same soil bank that yours was impractical and he gave the impression . . .

HUMPHREY: May I say, may I say Mr. Mollenhoff, that while he did make that statement -- he has made many statements which he has subsequently had to retrieve -- and retract -- had he thought it not impractical he could have offered then, may I say, the suggestions which they got around to offering in the middle of January 1956. No, ^I want to say that the administration never was much of a devotee to soil bank until they thought it was politically popular and they found that out in the hearings of the Senate Committee on Agriculture.

MOLLENHOFF: Well, Senator just in the last few days here you have made some speeches in which you criticized the administration . . .

HUMPHREY: Oh, you bet!

MOLLENHOFF: . . . for wanting to get some of this money, this soil bank payment out to the farmers this year - in this pre-payment plan suggested by the President. Now you criticized it.

HUMPHREY: Yes that's right. Oh, I should say I have!

MOLLENHOFF: Well, from a political - suppose you are right economically, from a political standpoint how can you Democrats stand up there and oppose a move which would put money in the farmers' pockets this year?

HUMPHREY: Well, Mr. Mollenhoff, may I say that the bill which we passed in the Congress - the Conference Report - would have put money in the farmers' pocket for production, for a sensible soil bank. Not one of these unbelievable incredible pre-payment propositions where you pay people for doing something that they haven't done, in the hopes that they are going to do it. Now . . .

MOLLENHOFF: Yes, but from a political standpoint, Senator ^{the} -/Iowa farmer or the Minnesota farmer is in the position where he wants some money now!

HUMPHREY: The Iowa farmer and the Minnesota farmer does not want any money from his government in the nature of a gift. The Iowa farmer and the Minnesota ^{farmer} wants to earn his money - he wants a fair price for what he produces. He would like to have, yes, a fee for soil conservation practices, but I know my farmers well enough to know that they would be the last that would

want the Government of the United States to dip into the Federal treasury to pay them for doing nothing a month before the election in the hopes that they are going to get somebody a vote. You can't buy farmers' votes - not Minnesota farmers' votes anyway.

MOLLENHOFF: But, Senator you said the income of farmers was done and they are sorely in need of more income . . .

HUMPHREY: That's right.

MOLLENHOFF: . . .and, here is a proposition where the Federal Government in July, August or September would be giving him a check for taking his acreage out next year and this fall. Now, how - I just can't see how politically you can stand in the way of that, even if you would be right economically?

HUMPHRY: Well, may I say Mr. Mollenhoff, that I have a great reliance upon the fair play and the good judgement of the American people. I haven't had a single farmer write to me asking for a prepayment on something that he was supposed to do at a date next year. I have had farmers write to me and say that they would like a fair price for what they produce, that they would like to have a better farm program in terms of marketing, that they would like to see their county committees strengthened, they'd like to get a fair and reasonable return on their investment, but I have never found a farmer yet, at least in my part of the country - maybe you gentlemen know some to the contrary - that have asked for a handout, and they will resent it. And may I say furthermore, that the city people will resent it and a farm program ought to be just and sound economically and sound socially.

PRINA; This doesn't have to be viewed as a handout. There, there is a consideration that is coming from them. They have got to deliver just as well as they do under any other . . .

HUMPHREY; Well, what if they are unable to deliver? What if marketing, what if acreage allotments are cut back so severely next year out of the kind of a program which this administration is now authorizing that you have unbelievable surpluses far beyond what you have now and therefore you have to cut back your acreage allotments. If that happens no one will be able to go into the soil bank. Because you have got to have enough acres in production to be able to live - and the only way the government would be able to collect next year upon these advance payments would be by legal action against many of our farm people. No, I say that if the administration wanted a soil bank, they had it. And I am willing to authorize one now for whatever crops can be put under it. Furthermore, may I say that the

soil bank does not add income, gentlemen, it is replacement income. There isn't one new dollar in the soil bank of new income. It is replacement income at best and I am of the opinion that farmers would rather produce than to be on some sort of a politically inspired gravy train which is made available in the months of September and October and quickly snatch away next year.

PRINA: Senator Humphrey, talking on the political side of this farm issue and apparently that seems to be the only side . . .

HUMPHRY: No, that isn't the only side, may I say.

PRINA: Don't . . .

HUMPHRY: I disagree with that, Mr. Prina. There is a side of justice, there is a side of decency, there is a side of fair play!

PRINA: Sure, there is.

HUMPHREY: And this administration's farm program has been unjust, it has been unfair and it is socially irresponsible and economically indefensible.

PRINA: Senator, before that last reply, I was going to ask you whether you didn't think the Democrats pulled a tremendous boner in trying to over-ride the President's veto in the House and then failing even to get a simple majority?

HUMPHREY: Politically, yes, I think so.

PRINA: Can't the - can't the Republicans now say there is your evidence of it being a bad bill?

HUMPHRY: No, no they can say that there were maybe some people who switched votes just out of the political convenience, so they can be on both sides of the question. I'd like to stay with just one side of the question all the way down the line.

PRINA: Yes, but what do you think they are going to say?

HUMPHREY: Oh, I imagine they will make some political hay withit, but the American people are a very wise and wonderful people. They are able to see through a certain amount of this nonsense. They are able to see all these double plays. The farmers are going to look at it and see how did you vote all the way down the line, not just the last vote, but all the way down the line.

HURLEIGH: A fast question, Mr. Mollenhoff.

MOLLENHOFF: Well, Senator, how can you say the Republicans are political when they are pulling the price support level down to get less production, and you people want to boost the price level?

HUMPHREY: Oh, may I say that the Republicans have an entirely different philosophy. What the Republicans did, was first of all to announce 76% of parity on wheat and when we tried to restore a parity program that would give the wheat farmer a decent price of 90% of parity with limited production, and I want to emphasize, we had production controls, this administration under the same set of figures, under the old law that they had 76% of parity suddenly raised it to 84. I say very frankly that when the administration talks about principle, they threw that out the window the first day. The prepayment plan is not principle; the way the President revised and adjusted the price supports under the old law, not the new one that he vetoed, but under the old law, is fully indicative of the fact of outrageous political, outrageous politics in the farm situation.

HURLEIGH: I am sorry gentlemen, I am going to have to cut in here. Our board of judges has selected the prize-winning questions which Senator Humphrey is going to answer in a moment or two. Stand by for the names of the winners.

BUSINESS: (Commercial insert - one minute)

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

FISKE: From Mrs. Elizabeth Lort of Washington, D. C.

HURLEIGH: Senator Humphrey, what action should Congress take on new version of the the/controversial Bricker amendment?

HUMPHREY: Bury it! I am opposed to it. I don't think it is necessary. I think the treaty making powers in the Constitution as provided and as we have under experience as well as court interpretation is thoroughly adequate to protect the rights of the American people.

I am against it.

FISKE: From Marie Peterson of Baltimore, Maryland.

HURLEIGH: Senator Humphrey, would American security be threatened if we eased controls on peaceful exports to the Soviet bloc?

HUMPHREY: Surely if any strategic materials it would. You possibly could do something in this area in foods and fibres, that is in foodstuffs, but I think we ought to recognize that strategic goods are what the Soviet really wants and her bloc wants and we ought not to release or ease those controls.

FISKE: From Mr. D. Mundis of Lake Forest, Illinois.

HURLEIGH: Senator Humphrey, does the Fifth Amendment protect potential Communist subversives who threaten the security of the United States?

HUMPHREY: I doubt it. I think the Fifth Amendment was designed to protect good, wholesome, decent citizens and I think it should remain inviolate. I am willing to rely upon the Federal Bureau of Investigation, the Investigatory agencies of our Government, the good sense of the American people, and the courts of law and justice to be able to protect this country from subversion and subversives.

HURLEIGH: Thank you Senator Humphrey. Attractive Longines watches are being sent to the persons named for submitting the prize-winning questions just answered by Senator Humphrey.

Now, two weeks hence Reporters' Roundup will have as its guest United States Secretary of Agriculture, Ezra Taft Benson, speaking on farm prosperity vs. farm depression.

HUMPHREY: Can I come?

HURLEIGH: Be sure to send in your questions for Secretary Benson with your full name and complete address on a postcard. Address it to Reporters' Roundup, Box 26, Washington, D. C.

FISKE: In an effort to stimulate your interest in the matters you have heard discussed, and in all other issues, Facts Forum invites you to send in questions on a postcard with your full name and complete address to Reporters' Roundup TV, Post Office Box 26, Washington, D. C. The writers of the three most interesting and timely questions for Secretary of Agriculture Ezra Taft Benson, will each receive a handsome Longines watch.

Facts Forum does not offer a final word on either side of controversial issues, but asks further study, so that you the American public may hear, read, consider -- and arrive at your own decisions.

HURLEIGH: I want to thank Senator Hubert Humphrey, Democrat of Minnesota, for being our guest on Reporters' Roundup, and my thanks to L. Edgar Prina, Senate Correspondent for the Washington Evening Star and to Mr. Clark Mollenhoff, our colleague of Cowles Newspapers.

Now, next week our guest will be United States Senator Allan J. Ellender, Chairman of the Senate's Agriculture and Forestry Committee, and be sure to send in your questions for Secretary of Agriculture Ezra Taft Benson two weeks hence. Until then, this is Robert F. Hurleigh.



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