

PLEASE CREDIT ANY QUOTES OR EXCERPTS FROM THIS ABC RADIO AND  
TELEVISION PROGRAM TO "RUTH HAGY'S COLLEGE NEWS CONFERENCE"

RUTH HAGY'S COLLEGE NEWS CONFERENCE  
SUNDAY, April 13, 1958

SUMMARY

714  
SENATOR HUBERT H. HUMPHREY APPEARS ON RUTH HAGY'S  
COLLEGE NEWS CONFERENCE.

1. RED CHINA TESTS. Humphrey announced within the past year underground explosions of nine kilotons have been set off in Red China directed by Soviet technicians. "These Red China experiments show how easy it would be for Krushchev to say he has quit testing, then shift the site of such tests to Red China. An effective disarmament agreement must include Red China." In five minutes of radio, Humphrey said that while nuclear tests within Red China could be detected by U.N. member countries on her border, Red China could not be held to a disarmament agreement while she is not a member of the U.N. Therefore, if Soviet tests continue within Red China, we will have to "face up" to this problem.

2. FALL-OUT. Humphrey said every U. S. weather station should report radioactive fall-out daily and eventually this should be done all over the world.

3. SUMMIT. Humphrey urged President Eisenhower to go to the United Nations and call for a meeting of the Disarmament Commission, followed by a meeting of the Security Council. The Summit Meeting should be held only as a result of progress within the U. N.

COMPLETE TEXT FOLLOWS

PLEASE CREDIT ANY QUOTES OR EXCERPTS FROM THIS ABC RADIO AND  
TELEVISION PROGRAM TO "RUTH HAGY'S COLLEGE NEWS CONFERENCE"

COLLEGE NEWS CONFERENCE

4000 MASSACHUSETTS AVENUE, N. W.

WASHINGTON 16, D. C.

EM 2-6969

KE 7-1100

- - - -

SUNDAY, APRIL 13, 1958

- - - -

COLLEGE NEWS CONFERENCE PRESENTS

SENATOR HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

Democrat of Minnesota

Panel:

RUTH HAGY, Moderator

ELAINE FREEMAN, Goucher College

CARL TERZIAN, University of Southern California

JOE DE COLA, Ohio State University

SANDRA BREGMAN, George Washington University

GABRIEL KAJECKAS, Georgetown University

PLEASE CREDIT ANY QUOTES OR EXCERPTS FROM THIS ABC RADIO AND  
TELEVISION PROGRAM TO "RUTH HAGY'S COLLEGE NEWS CONFERENCE."

THE ANNOUNCER: Here comes the future, from Washington, D. C., we present COLLEGE NEWS CONFERENCE. Our guest today, Senator Hubert H. Humphrey, Democrat of Minnesota, who will meet our college reports in their unrehearsed news conference.

And now, here is our moderator, Ruth Hagy.

MISS HAGY: Hello and welcome to another weekly session of COLLEGE NEWS CONFERENCE.

Senator Humphrey, it is a great pleasure indeed to have you here in our Campus News Room. I would like you to meet the student reporters who will interview you at once.

From Ohio State University, Joseph de Cola, Executive Director of the Young Republicans.

From George Washington University, Sandra Bregman.

From the University of Southern California, Carl Terzian, last year student body president, who has just been appointed as educational good-will ambassador by the International Exchange Service of the United States Department of State and he will shortly tour the Pacific and Australia.

From Goucher College, Elaine Freeman, and from Georgetown University, Gabriel Kajeckas.

Students, as you know, Senator Humphrey is Chairman of the Subcommittee on Disarmament, a leading member of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, of the Agricultural Committee, and one of the leading spokesmen of the Democratic party.

Who has the first question for him?

Miss Freeman.

MISS FREEMAN: Senator, you announced in this morning's paper that an underground explosion in Russia on March 25th was detected in Nevada, five thousand miles away. What significance do you attach to this?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: The purpose of the announcement, Elaine, was to indicate to the American people that extensive efforts are being made now to ascertain underground explosions. In other words, to, I won't say prove, but to underscore the reliability of an inspection and detection system, not only for weapons above the ground, but for explosions underground.

MISS FREEMAN: Can all explosions be detected?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: That is hard to say, but it surely means an explosion of such intensity can be detected. It also means we have made considerable progress in detection and inspection.

I would say that weapons over two kilotons could be detected with great reliability.

MISS FREEMAN: But does this mean that further inspection is not necessary?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: No, it means we are perfecting an inspection and detection system and rather than to have the atmosphere beclouded by charges and counter-charges as to whether or not you can have inspection, I think we should

proceed to develop to the best of our scientific ability  
an inspection and detection system which I say can be  
effective.



1 MR. TERZIAN: Senator can you tell which explosions are nuclear and which are conventional by present means?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: That is very difficult. However, we have people who are experts in this matter. Of course in the one that was in the paper this morning, the one in the northern Urals, this was in an area that was relatively free from earthquakes and therefore was subject to more definite ascertainment as to the nature of the explosion. Where you have a number of earthquakes it is very difficult.

However, our scientists, our seismologists and those who are engaged in this inspection and detection work have been able to, should I say, filter out the non -- the man-made explosions from those that are those of nature.

MISS BREGMAN: Well, Senator, if the United States can detect these explosions as well as you seem to indicate they can, then what is the necessity of our insisting that Russia must agree to limitations and to inspection before we will agree to cease testing? In other words, why is there a system necessary?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: Sandra, let me say this to you, that despite our ability to detect as well as we are able to, it would be wrong to say that under the present system, with our own detection as the only means of ascertainment of explosions that such a system would be fully reliable. Therefore I insist that we have international inspection, and

I insist that we have international inspection not merely because of the relationships between the USSR and the USA, but there are other countries in the world, such countries for example as ~~the~~ <sup>Eastern European</sup> ~~the~~ <sup>A</sup> countries under Communist domination and Red China and when you get to that you need international inspection.

MISS HAGY: And speaking of Red China, you have just subject of the touched on the prize-winning question this week. Miss Bonnie Goldberg of New Rochelle High School of New Rochelle New York will receive a set of the Encyclopedia Americana for it, and she says "Can any agreement on testing or disarmament be effective that doesn't include Red China?"

SENATOR HUMPHREY: I think it is fair to say I have raised this issue a number of times both with the Secretary of State and others who represent our country in this level, this area of diplomacy. I personally believe if you are going to have a truly effective disarmament agreement of major proportions you must include within it Red China. But this does not mean that you have to have her in the beginning.

Now I have been talking about the beginnings of disarmament. I have been talking about the cessation of bomb tests under international inspection for a limited period of time and if you have that under international inspection with the UN it can work.

Now let me just add if you will pardon me, Ruth, there was -- let's put it within the past year, a very substantial explosion in Red China. Four times the size of our Ranier explosion. An explosion of approximately nine kilotons. An underground explosion in Red China.

Furthermore, this explosion was conducted by and directed by Soviet technicians, not technicians from Red China.

This is the largest explosion that we have ever recorded from RedChina, and we have this information. Our government has it and I think it should have been made available. I got the information, may I say, from the seismologists, from Soviet journals which were translated and from information that I was able to gather from other countries.

But I want to add that this explosion indicates the importance of international inspection, because without international inspection, it is entirely possible that this could have gone on without anybody even knowing it, and what is more, the Soviets could have disclaimed any knowledge of it.

MR. DE COLA: Senator, if we were to start disarmament negotiation with Red China as well as Russia, would this mean recognition of Red China by the United States?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: No, it does not at this time because working through the United Nations under an international



inspection system you would be able to have inspection stations all around the periphery of Red China, deep into the Soviet Union, deep into other countries who are members of the United Nations and I think for all practical purposes at this stage it would mean that we would have a reasonably secure inspection and detection system that would cover Red China.

MR. KAJECKAS: As far as Red China is concerned, Senator, isn't it true that any disarmament treaty we could form with Soviet Russia would exclude then under our present organizational pattern, Red China, in which Russia could continue to test nuclear weapons?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: This is why I have advocated that you must have international inspection. <sup>under the United Nations</sup> This is why I have advocated that all explosions from that point on, or from the point of the agreement, be under U.N. supervision.

This means, in other words, that we could continue testing for peaceful uses of explosives. It means that you would have, however, those explosions under the supervision, under the surveillance of the United Nations and if any took place other than that it would be prima facie evidence that they were explosions for military purposes.

MR. KAJECKAS: Under such an agreement, Senator, Soviet Russia would have to agree to such an international inspection. Do you see any prospects of their doing that?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: Yes, I do, and I think we ought to press for it. Indeed, I think, Mr. Kajeckas, that we ought to press for it and this has been the weakness to date in all of our discussion about disarmament. We continuously reiterate the American position of a disarmament agreement on nuclear weapons and the production of nuclear materials with inspection, but we never put the Soviet to the test in the United Nations before the other nations of the world as to what she really means by a test and this Senator wants to see -- I mean what she really means by inspection -- this Senator wants to see the Soviet Union lay down before the United Nations Security Council or Disarmament Commission,

m2

the outlines of what she would accept as a reasonable inspection and detection system.

I think we ought to do the same thing.

Therefore, I have recommended that the U.N. -- that we go to the U.N. and encourage a special task force of scientists under U.N. auspices to immediately start in the preparation of an international inspection and detection system.

MR. TERZIAN: Senator, you have placed great emphasis on inspection teams and this is wonderful, but my question is this: Haven't we in the past had poor experience with inspection teams, especially in Korea where we have an international team, but we know that Communist China is today violating the treaties with those countries. Your example is appropriate and it is just the sort of thing we ought to avoid because under that agreement which was signed in haste, and many people were critical of it, despite the fact that, of course, it stopped the Korean shooting which was a blessing, but despite that, we ought to have learned that if you are going to have international inspection, you must permit mobility -- that is of the inspection team -- there must be a way to be able to adjudicate the differences of opinion that come up and surely there must be a broad enough inspection system so that it is truly effective.

Now, this is where we learn, you see.

m3

MISS BREGMAN: Senator, let's say we could get Russia to agree to an inspection system tomorrow, or within a few weeks.

Is the United States perfectly ready and would it be good for the United States, right now, to stop all testing? Can we afford this strategically?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: Miss Bregman, I am sure that the United States would have much to gain from an inspection system that was reliable and that, of course, would be one that we would have to follow through very carefully as to its reliability.

I have been told, and I am sure the world knows, that we have a substantial advance in atomic weaponry. We have more to gain from a cessation of tests than anyone else, from the moral point of view, the political point of view and the technical point of view.

What is more, I want to make it quite clear that a beginning on an inspection agreement for the cessation of nuclear tests does not mean peace. It means merely the first step. It is but a small beginning, but I say it is a significant one if you could ever get inspection, a breakthrough into the Iron Curtain countries.

MISS HAGY: Senator Humphrey, are you saying that you would be willing to forego the coming tests in the Pacific which have been planned?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: No, I haven't said that at all. As a matter of fact, I would say that no inspection system could be agreed to in the time between now and the time that the tests were going to take place.

The tests that will take place in the Pacific could be justified on the basis of maintaining some parity in modern scientific advances. These tests are going to take place, but I suggest that immediately upon the completion of those tests that the President of the United States go to the United Nations, address the United Nations in terms of our proposals for disarmament and call upon the U. N. to take the lead in proposing agreements for disarmament discussions. This means meetings of the Security Council.

By the way, that is where this all ought to take place anyway, and we in America should be insisting that it take place in the U.N.

MR. DE COLA: Would you recommend, sir, that the U.N. handle this rather than a Summit Meeting?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: I would recommend that the United States of America utilize the instrumentality of the United Nations, which is man's greatest instrument for peace. I think it is most unfortunate that we continue to by-pass it or, at least, to use it only haphazardly.

I would surely suggest as follows, that within a reasonable number of days, and I say days -- sometime



within this month, I hope -- that we would call for a meeting of the Disarmament Commission. The Soviet has said it won't come.

All right, if it won't come, that is its privilege, but at least let's follow through on the order of the General Assembly which asks for a meeting of the Disarmament Commission in the month of April or May. So let's have that meeting and if the Soviet doesn't come, let's note to the world that she didn't come.

Secondly, let's call for a meeting of the Security Council, and at the Security Council, if foreign ministers wish to attend or prime ministers wish to attend, they can under the provisions relating to the Security Council. And then at that point, list out your agenda for whatever meeting may take place later on.

Instead of all this quibbling about foreign ministers' meetings and the ambassadorial level of diplomacy, why don't we use the instrument of peace, the United Nations? After all, peace is not merely the responsibility of the United States and the USSR; peace is the responsibility of every nation, and the United Nations really represents most every nation.

MISS FREEMAN: Then do you feel we should not take part in any Summit negotiations such as Russia is now striving for?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: I don't believe I said that, Miss Freeman. What I said was that I feel it is desirable that we utilize the instrumentality of the United Nations, the facilities that are there, and may I add even the good offices of the Secretary General, Dag Hammarskjold, who surely is dedicated to peace, and all the environment of peace which is to be found in the United Nations, working out our disputes and our differences for an agenda in the Security Council, not only between ourselves and the Russians, but in the presence of other nations.

Once you have arrived at that procedural step, then, if it is needed, to have a Summit Meeting, indeed hold it. I think the Summit Meeting will be held. I think the only question is what will they talk about and when will it be held and I suggest that we have definite points about which we talk.

I think we ought to limit the agenda. I think it ought to be limited specifically to things we think we can accomplish and then have the meeting held, but let's make it held, let's have it held as a result of progress and developments within the United Nations, utilizing the facilities and the work of the United Nations.

MISS FREEMAN: Well then, do you think along with the Summit Meetings that Russia is negotiating for, do you think that, in the answer Dulles is now drafting, he should agree to ambassadorial talks on the 17th of this month?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: Miss Freeman, I think it is time our government quit worrying about what the Russians are saying in notes and starts worrying about what we are going to say in terms of positive proposals.

I have been pleading as one citizen of this country and a member of Congress, that our government quit this rebuttal. You can't win arguments by rebuttal. Let's get on to the affirmative case.

We are peace-loving people and we ought to have the whole world understand this. Therefore, let us propose that we utilize the United Nations' facilities for seeking the beginnings of some agreement, and let's propose, whether the Soviet likes it or not, that we go to the United Nations.

I predict that if we call for a meeting of the Security Council, once having first called for the Disarmament Commission's meeting, which is our responsibility under General Assembly resolutions, as a second step, if we call for a meeting of the Security Council, that the Soviet Union will come and they will come prepared, and in the Security Council you can't just argue. You've got to vote, yes or no. Yes or no, either, and let's find out whether the Soviet Union really wants a Summit Meeting. That is the place to find out.

MISS BREGMAN: Well, Senator, do you think in this way we could gain back the propaganda initiative that the Soviets have taken from us in recent events in the past few

weeks?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: Yes, I think we could, but I don't think the most important thing is just propaganda initiative. You know, the best propaganda is good policy. If you really have good sound policy, you don't need much propaganda.

One of the reasons we are having trouble on propaganda is that we don't have a policy. No one quite knows what our policy is. We are not sure what the policy is on disarmament negotiations. We are not sure whether we are going to the United Nations and, by the way, this morning your own newspapers tell you there is grave disagreement between ourselves and the British. You see, this lack of policy, this ambivalence, this uncertainty just causes us to lose every argument because we have nothing upon which to base an argument.

MR. KAJECKAS: Senator, as far as propaganda is concerned, you hailed Krushchev's recent announcement of suspension of nuclear recent tests as "a tremendous propaganda scoop."

Do you feel that President Eisenhower's letter in return to Krushchev has gained back any of the propaganda value we had already lost?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: I think I said at the time that I thought that letter was the President's best effort to date, but it did not regain our position. What the President did was to list out for the world to see the many efforts that

we have made in trying to get the Soviet to come to the conference table. I think we are a whole lot better off to take one single portion. Let's say the limitation of nuclear tests over a period of time with international inspection and press it relentlessly, like a broken record, and say to the Soviet Union, "Come hither to the United Nations. Quit your talking and get down to work. We are prepared to negotiate. We want to know what you want as an inspection system."

And in the meantime, let us take the initiative in the U.N. for outer space supervision. Let's take the initiative in the U.N. to get teams at work on radioactive fall-out, even more than we have; let's take the initiative in the U.N. <sup>under</sup> to get a task force for detection and inspection and a host of other things. You see we can really move if we make up our mind what we want to do.

MR. KAJECKAS: Don't you feel though, Senator, since in the past Russians haven't been too conducive to obeying international agreements and so forth, as far as anything else is concerned, and if they didn't comply with disarmament negotiation ~~Treaties~~ and so forth, wouldn't this just lead to a one-way street as far as the United Nations is concerned? Wouldn't this be a tremendous propaganda flop as far as the United States is concerned, if they didn't comply with the agreements?



SENATOR HUMPHREY: The Soviet has never had propaganda advantage in the United Nations. The Soviet stands exposed in its ugly nakedness in the United Nations time after time. They were taken to the cleaners, so to speak, in the Hungarian uprising. In the United Nations more than any other one place, and I say to you the Soviet is very reluctant to turn down sensible proposals in the U.N., particularly when we have been talking about them outside of the U. N. We have little to lose and much to gain in acting in the role of a judicious peacemaker because, to be sure, recognizing the Soviet might violate an agreement, but if she does, we will know about it if she has inspection.

1

MR. DE COLA: Senator, this morning Denmark's biggest newspaper said that the recent tests in Russia had to be called off because of a "catastrophic accident" which increased the radioactive fallout over Russia.

Doesn't this point up the danger in this country -- would you care to comment on this in terms of the danger to the American public?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: Of course I am not an expert when it comes to radioactive fallout. I don't even claim to be an expert on these subjects of disarmament, but we are certainly seeking and searching for answers. I read that news dispatch and I would say there is most likely a great deal of evidence to support it. You may recall a few days ago I said that the Soviet had literally poisoned the atmosphere with radioactive debris. I suppose the word "poisoned" may have been too strong, but at least let me say it polluted the atmosphere with radioactive debris. The recent tests were the dirtiest tests the world has ever known. They were tremendously dirty.

What is more, they covered over -- when I say the world has ever known, I mean these are the dirtiest tests the Soviets ever conducted and they are the largest tests the Soviets every conducted.

Furthermore, they literally covered the northern stretches, the Scandanavian countries, Northern Europe,

2 parts of the United States and Japan, with radioactive fallout. Very heavy.

Now by the way, I think that our -- you mentioned that and I want to make a little suggestion to you: I think every weather station in the United States of America ought to report the degree of radioactivity in the atmosphere every morning just as it reports weather conditions. I think we ought to propose this as an international proposal so that every weather station in every city in the world where there is this kind of service has this kind of recording and reporting. The Japanese, as you know, have it, but it ought to become world wide. In so doing by the way this would add to our inspection and detection.

MISS BREGMAN: What would it take to get this done, just a law or an administrative order.

SENATOR HUMPHREY: I think it would essentially take an administrative order and a little more appropriations in the United States. I think our weather bureau is entitled to more for many reasons, not only this, but surely in the United Nations it would take a resolution and then some implementation.

MR. TERZIAN: I am interested in your work with disarmament in your Senate Subcommittee and I have these questions to ask: While it is true that disarmament we hope will be a first step toward a universal peace, what does the

3

United States really have to gain now out of disarmament? Wouldn't this lose some of the morale security building of our allies and also cut down our own defenses?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: Mr. Terzian, I hope our country always has something to gain from lifting the burden of armament. I hope that the United States stands for progress, for construction, for development, for growth, and not merely for weapons. And I am afraid that what you have said is part of the image that the world has of us, that we have something to lose in disarmament.

We have nothing to lose in disarmament if we build up the productivity of our own country. If we build up and help others build up the strength and economic development of their countries. To be sure you don't unilaterally disarm. This Senator has never suggested this. I said seek disarmament from a position of strength, but strength is more than weapons. It is a belief in yourself. It is an understanding of what this is all about, the kind of a world we would like to live in.

It also means a sense of spiritual faith, a sense of morality. Now this is what we ought to have and I think we have much to gain if we pursue it carefully, methodically and for a purpose.

MR. TERZIAN: I agree there and let me ask this following question: One way to build this up is certainly by

mm4

improving our foreign aid. I know you are greatly interested in foreign aid, so let me ask this question: Why is it, since we know the Russians are hoping some day to win over the world, perhaps through economic trade rather than the military, why does the President have to beg Congress to approve his reciprocal trade and foreign aid programs when this might be one of our greatest deterrents to Communist aggression?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: Well, first of all may I say there has been a real lack of wilfull leadership here in Washington. When you are in and out, half one way and half another, luke warm one day and torrid or frigid the next, it is rather difficult to know just what is the policy and what is the purpose, but I must say the Congress ought to approve foreign aid expenditures and foreign aid investments. These are not really giveaways, these are real, sound investments and make no mistake about it, the Soviet Union today is waging a war of trade, of economics, it is waging a war of political subversion.

I doubt that the Soviet is ging to drop any bombs on us. The kind of bombs they are dropping on us now are these letters from Krushchev and formerly from Bulganin upsetting everybody in terms of propaganda. They are dropping other bombs on us. Tying up one trade agreement after another with countries. Moving into Asia and Africa



5

with programs of technical assistance and economic aid.

And what are we doing? We are complaining or foot-dragging and I say we ought to get on the beam. We ought to challenge the Soviet in every area that she moves and further more go to the United Nations and outline a broader program and ask the Soviet to pool her efforts.

MISS FREEMAN: Do you feel our Administration is also not being bold enough in its plans to combat the recession at home?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: Well, Miss Freeman, I am glad you mentioned that. I was wondering if we were just going to stay on disarmament even though I must say that the foreign policy of our country, foreign aid and foreign trade, is terribly important, to my mind the most important. I do not believe that enough is being done to combat the recession and I must say to you Miss Freeman, that the depth of this recession is not something just to be talked about lightly.

It isn't, of course, a depression, but we must prevent it from becoming one and the worst part of what is happening today is that it weakens our position internationally, it weakens our alliance and lends a degree of uncertainty to our leadership. More than that, when there are over five million fully unemployed, and better than two million partially unemployed, there is great personal tragedy in

6

this. So I feel that the Administration ought to take action. It is already late. And what action it takes ought to be decisive in the field of tax reductions and public works.

MR. DE COLA: Senator, the President said in his press conference this week regarding the recession "I see no need for emergency action right now," that tax cuts and huge public works programs might lead us into inflation.

What do you think of this?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: I want to say in a most friendly spirit that the problem in America today is not inflation. The problem in America today is tragic deflation that has happened to the complete deflating of the incomes of over 5,200,000 workers. Steel production at 48 percent of capacity, carloadings down 20 percent from a year ago, industrial construction down 13 percent.

I plead with you young people to know that what has really happened is that no one seems to have the zeal to keep America growing and progressing. We are constantly talking today about being able to stabilize things. I remind you that stability -- stabilizing -- which means just holding your own, means retreat because our competition is moving out in front. Therefore we need to think in terms of growth. We need to think in terms of expansion and development and not merely trying

to ignore the ugly facts of life.

MR. DE COLA: Then do you agree with the President in his telling the people to "buy" at his press conference last week in terms of this expansion?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: The trouble is, Mr. DeCola, when the people were at work so they could buy he said don't buy. When there are five million-plus fully unemployed, two million-plus partially unemployed, when there are drops in incomes all over the country, the President says "Now buy."

Of course I want to see them buy, but there is no sloganizing easing that is going to get us out of this. What is needed now, first, is a tax reduction for the lower income and middle income groups with either some moderate tax reduction, I think in terms of small business and small corporations and excises, secondly, select an effective program of unemployment compensation that will extend the benefits and the duration of the benefits and improve them, along the Kennedy-Humphrey-McCarthy bill that we had before the Congress.

And thirdly, school construction, <sup>hospital</sup> construction, roads, upping agricultural income, and I hope that the Congress will override the President's veto of that freeze order. These are the things we need to do.

MISS BRWGMAN: Will you be available in 1960 for the Democratic Party's Presidential nomination?

ml SENATOR HUMPHREY: Well, Miss Bregman, the Lord willing, I hope that I shall be available and I hope that I will do a good enough job between now and then as a United States Senator to bring credit to myself and I hope credit and respect to my state and the nation.

I have no future political ambitions.

MISS HAGY: Thank you, Senator Humphrey, for your very interesting, informative interview.

Thank you, students, for your questions.

I want to remind you at home that you too can be a parlor panelist on COLLEGE NEWS CONFERENCE by contributing your questions on national or international issues and sending them to Encyclopedia Americana, Box 83, Washington 4, D. C. The winning questioner will receive a handsome \$300 30-volume set of the Encyclopedia Americana.

Join us again next week when our guest will be Senator Styles Bridges of New Hampshire, who is the Chairman of the Republican Policy Committee.

Until then, good-bye and a good week from Ruth Hagy and the college correspondents of COLLEGE NEWS CONFERENCE.

THE ANNOUNCER: You have just seen COLLEGE NEWS CONFERENCE where the citizens of tomorrow meet the leaders of today.

COLLEGE NEWS CONFERENCE is created and produced by Ruth Hagy, Assistant to the producer, Peggy Wheadon.

m2

COLLEGE NEWS CONFERENCE is directed by Richard Armstrong  
and originates in Washington.

- - -





# 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](http://www.mnhs.org)