

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

Highlights of  
COLLEGE NEWS CONFERENCE

Sunday, August 14, 1960

Guest: Senator Hubert H. Humphrey (D. Minn.)

1. In answer to students' queries regarding Joseph curran, President of the Maritime Union's statement that Khrushchev preferred Kennedy to Nixon, Senator Humphrey admitted that Khrushchev will be uppermost in the minds of the voters in November, but stated "We can not let Khrushchev make decisions for us."
2. One student pointed out that in the West Virginia primary Humphrey had said "Kennedy is the spoiled candidate." Humphrey apologized to Senator Kennedy for this statement."
3. Senator Humphrey predicts that the Senate will pass the Democratic minimum wage bill of \$1.25 an hour.
4. Senator Humphrey also stated that the conservative Medicare plan which came out of the Senate Finance Committee yesterday will initiate a floor fight and that a much more liberal program will finally be passed.
5. Humphrey said he would declare it an honor and great responsibility if he were asked to be Majority Leader of the Senate in a Kennedy Administration.
6. Asked about the importance of this week's UN Disarmament Commission talks, Senator Humphrey said that he was afraid there were "political overtones" to this meeting and that the Republicans might well be playing politics with disarmament.
7. In answer to questions by the students after the show, Senator Humphrey stated that he did not think Adlai Stevenson would be the Secretary of State, rather he predicts Chester Bowles will be appointed. He, Humphrey, prefers Stevenson as Ambassador to the United Nations.

COMPLETE TEXT FOLLOWS

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

C O L L E G E   N E W S   C O N F E R E N C E

4461 CONNECTICUT AVENUE, N. W.

WASHINGTON, D. C.

KE 7-1100

EM 2-6969

SUNDAY, AUGUST 14, 1960

GUEST: SENATOR HUBERT H. HUMPHREY  
DEMOCRAT OF MINNESOTA

PANEL:

RUTH HAGY, Moderator

PAM RYMER, Vassar College

DEREK WINANS, Harvard University

BENNETT ROLFE, University of California, UCLA

RICHARD MILLER, University of Minnesota

BONNIE PETTY, University of California, UCLA

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

THE ANNOUNCER: Here comes the future! From Washington, D. C. we present the Peabody Award-winning COLLEGE NEWS CONFERENCE where the leaders of tomorrow meet the leaders of today.

Our guest today, Senator Hubert H. Humphrey, Democrat of Minnesota. And now here is our founder and moderator, Ruth Hagy.

MISS HAGY: Welcome to another weekly edition of COLLEGE NEWS CONFERENCE. Senator Humphrey, it is a very great pleasure to welcome you to another -- for another visit to our campus news room.

SENATOR HUMPHREY: Thank you very much. I am happy to be here.

MISS HAGY: I would like you to meet the student reporters who are going to interview you. From the University of California, Bennett Rolfe, who is the former president of the Young Republicans at UCLA. Bennett is just going into the University of California's law school.

From the University of Minnesota, Richard Miller, who is the international affairs administrative assistant of the United States National Student Association.

From Vassar College, Pam Rymer, who has been president of the Young Republicans at Vassar.

From UCLA, Bonnie Petty, who is chairman of the United Nations Model Assembly at her school. From Harvard University,

Derek Winans, who is vice chairman of the Democratic National Student Federation.

Students, I am sure Senator Humphrey needs no detailed introduction to you or to our television and radio audience. He is very, very well known as a senior member of the Foreign Relations Committee, as Chairman of the Subcommittee on Disarmament, the Agricultural and Forestry Committee, Government Operations and more notably he was one of the leading contenders for the Democratic nomination.

MISS RYMER: Senator Humphrey, recently Joseph Curran, who is president of the National Maritime Union, after a conference with Premier Khrushchev, remarked to American newsmen that the Premier preferred Senator Kennedy to be the next President of the United States. I wonder how you will interpret this remark and also what political implications you think this stated preference might have on the November election.

SENATOR HUMPHREY: I don't believe that I gained the same inference from the news story, Pam, that you seem to have gained. I read something in one of the local papers about Mr. Curran's visit in the Soviet Union and something to the effect where Mr. Khrushchev had made a comment relating to both Mr. Nixon and Mr. Kennedy. Neither one seemed to be very complimentary but I would like to elevate this conversation a little bit above Mr. Khrushchev's comments

on Nixon and Kennedy. It seems to me one of the most dangerous things that can happen in this election is to let utterances of Mr. Khrushchev determine the political decision of the American people. It is difficult enough for us to make our own decisions. I hope Mr. Khrushchev won't be in a position to make a decision for us as to who ought to be President. It ought to be clear by now that neither Mr. Kennedy or Mr. Nixon are friends in a political sense or a personal sense of Mr. Khrushchev, and whoever is President of the United States will have to face Mr. Khrushchev, will have to deal with the Soviet Union, and I hope he will be able to do so without a sort of an emotional sickness that is gained before he even gets to be President.

MR. MILLER: Well, Senator Humphrey, in view of your recent eight hour discussion with Premier Khrushchev and also in view of a statement you made on May 8, 1960, in reference to Senator Kennedy, in which you stated, and I quote, "Kennedy is the spoiled candidate and is young, emotional and juvenile." In view of these two factors do you think Senator Kennedy is adequately ready to deal with Premier Khrushchev in the long sessions that he would have to if he were President of the United States?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: Where did I make that statement?

MR. MILLER: This was in your campaign speech of May 8, 1960, as reported in the Washington Star and Baltimore Sun.

SENATOR HUMPHREY: If I made it, I was in error. I doubt that I made it. If I did make it, I am sorry, I apologize. It is wrong, and again may I say that one of the dangers of political campaigns is the emotional fervor into which you get yourself.

Now I was trying to indicate to Pam a moment ago that we have enough problems amongst ourselves. I would suggest that we didn't let Mr. Khrushchev determine who will be the President of the United States, that I hope that we will be sensible enough to make our own decisions in the light of the experience and the background and the training of the respective candidates, plus the platform of the two political parties, plus the men and women that these candidates might bring into positions of responsibility if one of them were elected President. And I happen to think the latter point is very important, and here is where I feel that Mr. Kennedy has a decided advantage that he will be able to bring to the Presidency men and women who see the future. Men and women who are not bound by the past. Men and women of imagination and of conviction and idealism and when you look over the associates of Mr. Kennedy, you will see what I am saying. When you stop and think of men like Mr. Galbraith in the economic field, of Mr. Bowles in the foreign policy field, just to mention two, Mr. Ristoff<sup>?</sup> of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, an advisor

in the field of political strategy on the international front, these are great men and I happen to think that Mr. Kennedy is blessed by fine associates and no man today is big enough in himself to be President. He is going to need help.

MR. ROLFE: Senator, in a campaign pamphlet which I have in my hand here which you issued in the Wisconsin primary, you demonstrated that Senator Kennedy voted 27 times with Secretary of Agriculture Ezra Benson.

SENATOR HUMPHREY: Yes, sir.

MR. ROLFE: You also demonstrated that on each of these farm proposals you voted against the two gentlemen. Now with this in the background, can you really recommend support for Senator Kennedy by the farmer?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: Yes, sir, because the choice is not between Senator Kennedy and Senator Humphrey on agriculture. The choice is between Vice President Nixon and Senator Kennedy and in this one Mr. Kennedy is just twice as good, on the basis using Mr. Benson as the yardstick, because Vice President Nixon has been the agricultural companion of Mr. Benson spiritually, politically physically, economically through the eight years of the Eisenhower-Nixon-Benson Administration.

Now it is true that from 1953 to 1956 that Mr. Kennedy voted several times on important farm issues along



the Administration policy. He found the error of his ways. The difference is that Mr. Kennedy arrived at political and economic maturity on agriculture in 1956. Mr. Nixon is still back in the swamps with Mr. Benson. He simply hasn't been able to extricate himself. Oh, now that the campaign is on, he says "Ezra, be gone." He tries to have the shadow fade away, but it just doesn't work.

MR. ROLFE: Senator, you seem to sense some inadequacies in other areas. In the Washington Post of May 5 you said, and I am quoting "Kennedy voted against the interests of the people on such issues as agriculture, rural telephone assistance and library, highway and hospital construction."

SENATOR HUMPHREY: Yes, sir.

MR. ROLFE: Well, what is the problem? Is Senator Kennedy a Johnny-come-lately?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: Senator Kennedy is running against Mr. Nixon. He is not running against Senator Humphrey. You see I was at this particular moment, Mr. Rolfe -- Bennett, I think you understand politics as a Young Republican; you ought to. You understand when you are in a primary contest you seek to point out defenses in your record.

Now many people think that Senator Kennedy's record on these issues that you are mentioning was a better record than mine. I was of the opinion that mine was a



better record than his. But I must say that we don't have a choice now in the general election between the record of Senator Humphrey on these issues and Senator Kennedy. And you can take your choice as to which of the two are the best records. You have the choice between the record of Richard Milhaus Nixon and Senator John Fitzgerald Kennedy, and on that basis may I say that even the president of the Young Republican organization ought to vote for Kennedy.

MR. ROLFE: Are you implying then that the Democrats could have made a better choice?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: I am not at all implying that. I am implying there was a difference in the record which I thought, from my personal view, was a better choice, but may I add we took that record to the people in two states and do you know what the people said in two states? They said they thought Kennedy's record was better. And I am willing to bow to the will of the majority in this instance, and on November 8 I have a feeling that the majority will look kindly upon the record of the Democratic nominees.

MR. WINANS: Senator, what do you think will be the determining issues in this campaign between now and November 8?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: Well, it is very difficult to predict in the fluid situation in which we live today in politics, both internationally and domestically, what will be the

determining issues. But some of the important issues, I think, are quite obvious. In the Midwest there is an agricultural depression, a serious economic agricultural depression. This is an issue, believe me, and it is not one that anyone can ignore.

There is the issue, of course, of unemployment which is growing in this country despite the fact of the general figures or the general economic figures that indicate a growing economy. There are surely matters that deal with education, the need for our school systems to be improved. The issues of adequate health protection for our elderly.

There are a number of domestic economic issues, and social issues that will have to be faced in this campaign. That is what a campaign is for. It isn't just politics, it is in a sense dramatic education to be sure, but it is education.

Then the other issue, of course, is our foreign policy and our national security, and in this area I believe that there will be some very important pronouncements made by the respective candidates and I think that you will find that Mr. Kennedy, as the Democratic nominee, will demonstrate a knowledge of the international scene which will be very encouraging to the American people because this man has pioneered in the areas of African, international relationships with the countries of Africa, of Latin

America, of the NATO countries, of India and Asia. His record is manifestly clear and I think more will be heard from him that will be good.

MISS HAGY: Senator, despite what you said earlier about Khrushchev not being an issue in this campaign, don't you believe that the ability to handle Premier Khrushchev and the Russian situation will be uppermost in voters' minds when they go to the polls this November?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: Yes, I suppose that will be uppermost. Maybe I didn't make myself clear. What I was trying to say, and I say this with very deep concern and seriousness, I do not want to see this campaign get down to a point where we are trying to frighten the American people on the basis of Mr. Khrushchev, because whoever is elected President, if we get an emotional -- if we arouse an emotional fervor in this country, whoever becomes President will be in a sense locked in. He won't have any freedom of movement. And what I worry about is if the Republican candidate makes it his entire program to be the one of denouncing Mr. Khrushchev, which doesn't take very much courage, or intelligence, I may add, but if that becomes -- to see who can shout the loudest, frighten the American people the most, conjure up the most hideous possibilities, whoever then becomes President in that kind of an emotional ferment will find himself in an impossible

situation and I prefer that America act like a strong nation, poised, confident, knowledgeable, and then, may I add, be prepared to deal not with Mr. Khrushchev only -- may I add one of the things we ought to start to do is to deal with the world. If we spent a little less time dealing with Mr. Khrushchev and a little more time with the program for Latin America, an understanding of what is going on in Africa and better cooperation with our allies in Europe, and a more sympathetic and knowledgeable understanding of what is going on in Asia, Mr. Khrushchev would be less of a problem. Mr. Khrushchev's strength today is out of our own lack of adequate policy planning and programming in the areas I have just mentioned.

MISS PETTY: In this connection, would you please tell us your feelings on the recent proposal by President Eisenhower of \$600 million to Latin America?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: Well I think, Bonnie, that we are going to have to have a much better Latin American economic program, but you know the answer to these problems is not just taking out the checkbook. This is like the rich father just writing out the check. This is not the answer.

The answer is much more than this. You need the money, there is no doubt about that, but it ought not to be the United States just to these countries, it ought to be a regional type of economic development program

organized under the Organization of American States.

That is what we have it for, the OAS, but it requires long-term planning. We have to know what we want. It isn't good enough just to charge down to Brazil or to Uruguay or Paraguay or Columbia or Chile or someplace else and say "Here, here, here's \$100 million." This doesn't do the job. We do need emergency assistance in Chile. I have been recommending this by the way, for about -- ever since the tragic earthquakes. I didn't get very much response until after the conventions, I might add.

I spoke into the Senate five times urging immediate assistance to Chile in large amounts, but I was told by the Administration "Oh, we are doing fine, we are sending blankets and some surplus food."

What I want to get back to is this, what we need to utilize is the United Nations, the Organization of American States, calling upon other countries in Latin America to cooperatively help one another, and we in turn joining with them, not as the boss, not as Mr. Rich Man, Mr. Big, but as a good neighbor and a partner, willing to do our share.

Now this does not come by just saying "Give us \$600 million more." Of course I might add now, Bonnie, the very same message that asked for 21 new programs and \$600 million for Latin America, all of which added up to billions of dollars of more expenditures, said "Now we will have none of this

wasteful spending."

You see on the one hand, pass 21 programs that will cost the taxpayers billions, and the last paragraph of the speech says "But we must have economy, we must have no more wasteful spending." It just doesn't add up. That politics was just a little too obvious.

1  
MR. MILLER: Senator Humphrey, in view of your -- well, I will put it this way: What do you think the United States ought to go to the Bogata Economic Conference prepared to offer, since you do not seem to be fully behind the proposal for \$600 million for Latin American aid?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: Richard, maybe I should ask you, what is the \$600 million for? You don't just go around and say "Look, hand me a bundle of money and I will find something to spend it for." Sensible planning requires that you have the projects in mind. The scope of the program that you intend to design in mind, and what we are doing here is putting, as they say, the cart before the horse.

Now I have no doubt but what we are going to need a sort of Marshall Plan operation for Latin America, but may I say that the Marshall Plan did not give the money first. The Marshall Plan spent two years of careful methodical planning prior to the commitment of the money. Where there was careful analysis on the part of the countries themselves to receive it, there was the Office of European Economic Cooperation to see that the dollars were spent well, cooperatively, and there was no waste, and then the Congress of the United States and the Administration was in close coordination with the partners in Western Europe. This is the kind of thing that I would think would be



2

somewhat helpful in the Latin American situation. Now at the Bogota Conference I think what we need to find out first is what do the responsible democratically-elected leaders of the Latin American countries think is desirable?

I have talked to some of them. Some of them think we need for example, housing, education, improvement of health, roads. That we need technical assistance to their agriculture. I think this is true. But you don't get that by just going down and say "Look, I have \$600 million." We tried this in the Middle East with \$300 million, you may recall. In the so-called Middle-Eastern operation a few years ago. The \$300 million is gone, the effort was anything but successful, the standard of living of the people has not particularly improved and our relationships in the Middle East are anything but what I would call happy.

MISS HAGY: Sir, then do you intend to vote against this and do you think the Democratic-majority-controlled congress will refuse to grant this loan?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: I think the Democratically controlled Congress may very well not authorize \$600 million at this time. There is money in the ICA program for the President. You can't spend \$600 million between now and January anyway and I prefer that if you are going to have \$600 million, I would like it to come with the new administration, whether it is Mr. Nixon or Mr. Kennedy, that is some

idea of where they are going to use it and now it is going to be used.

I protest this wanton waste of American money in international affairs. Now I am an internationalist. I support Foreign Aid. But I do not think it is foreign aid just to dip down into the treasury of the United States and to throw money around as an answer to Mr. Castro, or to Mr. Khrushchev. You will do a whole lot better by spending less and spending wisely and asking other people to help you, to cooperate in the planning and the use of that particular money.

This is the worst kind of government, may I say, just spending, spending, when we ought to be planning and working.

MR. WINAN: Sir, a moment ago you mentioned some of the issues you thought would be important in this campaign. I notice you left out the issue of Civil Rights. I wondered if you did this because of the action of the Democrats in this Congressional session and because Democrats are not acting on this at this moment.

SENATOR HUMPHREY: It was inadvertent, I assure you. I am sure I left out some other issues, too, that one could pick up very readily. I just picked out two or three. The issue of Civil Rights will be an issue in the campaign. I hope it becomes one to which both parties are pledged to far more constructive action than we have had thus far.

In so far as the present session is concerned, we had an agenda that we left here with. This is not a full session of the Congress. We are trying to clean up the legislative items that were left over from the main session. Everybody knows this. Now you know we are all grown-up people. No one is really kidding anybody. When Mr. Dirksen offered the Civil Rights proposal that he had not even supported in the general session, it becomes about as phony as a three-dollar bill. And by the way, if the President is so concerned about having federal enforcement over contracts, over federal contracts to prevent any discrimination, I can tell you he can take care of it. Call Mr. Nixon in. He is the head of the Committee on Contract Compliance. And say to him "Mr. Vice President, you are representing the Government of the United States."

The President by an Executive Order this afternoon, before we are through with this broadcast, can do everything that he is asking the Congress of the United States to do in a limited session that is only to clean up unfinished business.

Now we will pass legislation and civil rights. Mr. Kennedy is committed to it, Mr. Johnson is committed to it, Senator Humphrey is committed to it and when we come back here in January with a Democratic President, cabinet and congress, we will do better than we have done in the last

two years when we have passed two civil rights measures in the last two Congresses.

MISS RYMER: Senator Humphrey, I would like to ask your opinion on the progress of this session of Congress. You mentioned -- I would like to do it specifically on minimum wage legislation as it is now before Congress. You mentioned a moment ago we needed poised, confident and knowledgeable leadership. Do you believe that Senator Kennedy, who has been more or less in complete charge of his minimum wage bill as it has been going through, Senator Johnson has been noticeably absent from the floor of the Senate, do you believe it will be necessary for the Senate Majority Leader to have to step in -- will Senator Kennedy, in other words, have to rely on his leadership to get minimum wage legislation through at this session?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: Pam, Senator Kennedy is not the President yet. He will be, but he is not yet. He is another United States Senator with less seniority than Senator Humphrey, and we treat each other as Senators, not as Presidents. We have a Majority Leader and his name is Senator Lyndon Johnson, and he has been on the job. He has not left the city, he didn't go to Maine and he didn't go any place else. He has been working day and night to get a program through the Senate.

Now we have rules in the Senate which protect the rights

of the minority. Some people don't think that is so good if you are in the majority, but when you are a member of a minority on an issue, you like those rules in the Senate that protect the rights of the minority.

We will pass minimum wage legislation.

MISS HAGY: At what level?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: At a better level than the Administration wants, at a dollar and a quarter an hour, and we will pass it with increased coverage. It is entirely probable that the coverage will not be as great as the bill that was reported from committee, but a substantial degree of progress will be made and as a legislator, I have learned that you sometimes may hope to go ten miles, and you have to settle for a seven-mile trip, but that is better than standing still or going in reverse, and the Administration's proposal recommended little or no increase in coverage, \$1.15 an hour. We will best them 10 cents and add from three to five million more people in coverage.

MR. ROLFE: Senator, the Senate Finance Committee reported out a Medical Care proposal which many record as a bit more conservative than people in your wing of the Democratic Party would like.

I would like to know what your thoughts were on it.

SENATOR HUMPHREY: I think your description of it, Bennett, is kind and considerate. It is a far more conservative

proposal than I would want or would support. And I will give you a ray of hope because I am sure you are interested in this, that this is a more conservative proposal than will ultimately pass. We will amend this proposal on the floor of the Senate. We will --

MR. ROLFE: Do you anticipate a long fight then?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: I wouldn't say so long. It will have the kind of vitality and vigor to it though that will commend itself to the public's attention. Maybe we will need some medical care when it is all over, not only for the elderly, but for the younger.

The proposal that comes from the Finance Committee is inadequate in my mind. It does not meet the need. It still imposes the old means test. It means there will be all kinds of investigators running around to see whether you need medical care and you are on relief. I don't want that. I want medical care for the aged, for those eligible for social security benefits, within the social security framework and I want the individual to be able to select his own hospital and his own diagnostic center and his own nursing home, and I have joined in proposing such legislation, and I think we will pass it. Now here we could have the help of our Republican friends and as a sensitive, socially conscious young man, I hope you will encourage your Republican friends up here to give us a lift.

MR. WINANS: Senator, a moment ago you were mentioning the leadership of Senator Johnson in the Senate. Now if Senator Kennedy and Senator Johnson are elected President and Vice President respectively, I wonder who you think will become the new Majority Leader of the inevitable Democratic majority in the Senate next session?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: I really couldn't say. There is an abundance of talent and we in the Senate, of course, will make that decision ourselves. The expression of the new Democratic President will have some influence. You may remember when Franklin Delano Roosevelt gave Alvin Barkley a helping hand by the letter "Dear Alvin," that kind of leadership in the White House may have a very significant --

MISS HAGY: You think you might be the recipient of such a letter? You have been mentioned rather prominently for that job.

SENATOR HUMPHREY: Well, I don't know. This is a job I have not run for, may I assure you.

MR. WINANS: Would you accept it if it were offered, sir?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: Oh, yes. It would be a great honor and a tremendous responsibility. I would think that Senator Mansfield, as the Whip, might very well be elevated to the position of leader, but I am not at all sure as to whether he wants it, but we will find good leadership there.



MISS PETTY: Sir, there is going to be a new disarmament conference coming up very shortly. Do you feel there can be some real substantive issues discussed with some degree of accord? For example, apparently Russia has agreed to put 13 inspection stations open to the United States. Now do you feel that the United States could make some sort of concessions as well or do you feel that this conference is mainly for the prestige of Lodge?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: Well, let me say first quickly about the Russian proposal. That is lower than the number that was recommended by the experts. That isn't a real Russian concession. The Russians are again trying to shave off what I think is a necessary and adequate number of inspection stations within the Soviet Union.

This particular conference is being called in the United Nations a little earlier than usual. I happen to think it has some political overtones to it. I know of no proposals that our government intends to bring to this conference and in fact there were no proposals that the President intended to bring to the summit conference, according to testimony before our committee. I hope that we will not play politics with disarmament. This is one of the most important issues of our time and requires the kind of thoughtful attention that statesmen ought to give to it.

MISS HAGY: Senator Humphrey, Premier Khrushchev has indicated that he might come to the General Assembly to head up his delegation to take up the disarmament matter.

Would you favor having President Eisenhower lead the United States' delegation if this should come about?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: Well, I do think that it is always good for our President to be at the United Nations at least several times during the session, but I wouldn't want, just because old Khrushchev is coming over here, that Eisenhower has to go there.

I am kind of tired of us trying to catch up with the Russians or play games with them. We ought to have a program for the United Nations and if it is required for the President of the United States to enunciate that program, do it. If Khrushchev never got any further than the channel between Britain and France, I don't think it is particularly important what we do in relation to Khrushchev coming to the UN. However, if he comes to the UN, it surely will be an interesting session, I am sure you will appreciate that.

MISS HAGY: Well, Senator, unfortunately our time has run out and we haven't time to ask you -- I see there are hands waving all over and there are many more questions. Well, we will stay here afterwards and discuss some of them.

Thank you for coming to join us. Thank you, students, for your interesting questions. We invite all of you

to join us again next week when our guest will be Senator Hugh Scott, Republican of Pennsylvania, and a member of the Republican Truth Squad and until then good bye and a good week from Ruth Hagy and the college correspondents of COLLEGE NEWS CONFERENCE.

THE ANNOUNCER: COLLEGE NEWS CONFERENCE is created and produced by Ruth Hagy. Assistant producer, Johanne Curran. This program is directed by Richard Armstrong and originated in Washington, D. C. This has been a presentation of ABC Public Affairs.

- - - - -



# 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)