

REPORTERS' ROUND-UP

FROM THE PRESS INFORMATION OFFICE
MUTUAL BROADCASTING SYSTEM
1627 K Street, N. W.
Washington, D. C.

RADIO BROADCAST TRANSCRIPT

PRESS RELEASE RELEASED BY JACK A. GERTZ
Director of Public Affairs

FOR RELEASE 7:00 PM EDT, MONDAY; SEPTEMBER 16, 1957

UNITED STATES SENATOR EVERETT M. DIRKSEN, Republican of Illinois, is the guest on nation-wide Reporters' Roundup radio program for Monday, September 16, 1957.

Senator Dirksen is questioned on numerous newsmaking topics, including:

HAS THE PRESIDENT TAKEN THE PROPER COURSE OF ACTION IN THE ARKANSAS SITUATION?

IS THREATENING INFLATION THE MAJOR DOMESTIC PROBLEM FACING THIS COUNTRY?

DO YOU BELIEVE THERE IS CAUSE FOR ALARM BECAUSE EMPLOYMENT DECLINED 800,000 LAST MONTH?

SHOULD CONGRESS CURB EXPENSIVE JUNKETS BY SENATORS AND CONGRESSMEN?

WHAT IS THIS NEW INFLATION AND WHAT IS ITS FUTURE COURSE LIKELY TO BE?

IS CONGRESS GUARDING AGAINST UNION BOSSISM WHICH MIGHT BECOME STRONGER THAN LAW-MAKERS AND THE LAW?

SHOULD FOREIGN AID BE ELIMINATED?

WHAT FEDERAL LEGISLATION IS NEEDED TO HELP LABOR'S HIGH COMMAND CLEAN HOUSE?

WHAT CHANCE DOES THE GOP STAND TO WIN BOTH HOUSES OF CONGRESS NEXT YEAR?

ARE YOU IN FAVOR OF RIGHT TO WORK LAWS OR A NEED OF A FEDERAL RIGHT TO WORK LAW?

WOULD YOU FAVOR VICE PRESIDENT NIXON OR SENATOR KNOWLAND FOR THE GOP PRESIDENTIAL NOMINATION IN 1960?

DO YOU CONCUR WITH U. S. CHAMBER OF COMMERCE PRESIDENT TALBOTT'S PROPOSAL TO ELIMINATE FEDERAL INCOME TAXES TO STIMULATE INDUSTRIAL EXPANSION?

SENATOR DIRKSEN is questioned by well-known and able newsmen of the Washington Press Corps: Mr. Clark Mollenhoff, Washington Correspondent of LOOK magazine and Cowles newspapers; and Bill McGaffin, Washington Correspondent of the Chicago Daily News. This panel program is moderated by Robert F. Hurleigh, Washington commentator and director of Mutual's News and Special Events.

Page Two

Attached is a complete transcript of Reporters' Roundup, a weekly nation-wide feature of the Mutual Broadcasting System. This program is heard 7:35 PM EDT and is broadcast on some 500 Mutual affiliates from coast-to-coast.

more

REPORTERS' ROUND-UP

FROM THE PRESS INFORMATION OFFICE
MUTUAL BROADCASTING SYSTEM
1627 K Street, N. W.
Washington, D. C.

RADIO BROADCAST TRANSCRIPT

REPORTERS' ROUNDUP

GUEST: UNITED STATES SENATOR
EVERETT M. DIRKSEN

MODERATOR: ROBERT F. HURLEIGH

PANEL: CLARK MOLLENHOFF OF LOOK
MAGAZINE AND COWLES NEWSPAPERS
BILL MCGAFFIN OF CHICAGO
DAILY NEWS

- 0 -

ANNOUNCER: REPORTERS' ROUNDUP -- where by-lines make headlines. In a moment hear the Honorable Everett M. Dirksen, United States Senator from Illinois -- answer questions fired at him by a panel of veteran reporters.

HURLEIGH: Senator Dirksen, is the threatening inflation the major domestic problem facing this country?

MOLLENHOFF: Senator, is there cause for alarm because employment declined 800,000 last month?

MCGAFFIN: Senator, why does the cost of living continue to climb?

HURLEIGH: Three of the nation's most serious domestic problems -- threatening inflation, high cost of living and taxes -- concern the American people and Congress. Top government trend watchers refuse to worry over the latest signs of slow-down in the economic boom, a sharp drop in employment and a leveling off in capital outlays for expansion. The U. S. employment declined 800,000 in August.

Our guest tonight is a member of two powerful committees of the U. S. Senate. He is U. S. Senator Everett M. Dirksen, Republican of Illinois, who serves on the Senate's Appropriations and Judiciary Committees. Senator Dirksen was born at Pekin, Illinois and was graduated from the University of Minnesota College of Law. He served in the Army during World War I and was elected to eight terms in the U. S. House of Representatives. Senator Dirksen was elected to the U. S.

more

Senate in 1950 and re-elected in 1956. He was elected Minority Whip of his party in January 1957. Senator Dirksen has served as a member of major Senate investigating committees.

In a moment our guest will be ready.

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

Our guest tonight is U. S. Senator Everett M. Dirksen, Republican of Illinois.

Senator Dirksen is prepared to answer the challenging questions of this panel of well-known and able reporters: Mr. Clark Mollenhoff, Washington Correspondent of LOOK magazine and Cowles newspapers; and Bill McGaffin, Washington Correspondent of Chicago Daily News. Your moderator, Robert F. Hurleigh, Commentator and Director of Mutual's News and Special Events.

And now, Mr. Mollenhoff, let's have the first question for Senator Dirksen.

MOLLENHOFF: Senator Dirksen, do you feel that there is any real cause for real alarm in the fact that there has been 800,000 decline in employment in the last month?

DIRKSEN: Well, I have no sense of alarm about it but certainly it is not a very happy thing. Now¹ some of it may be seasonal, of course, but it's one of those things and I can understand it because in various areas there has been a drop in employment. It's not exactly a general phenomenon in the country but it's sporadic.

MOLLENHOFF: What about the situation out in Illinois? Do you think that it's anything that's fraught with any possibilities of political repercussions?

more

DIRKSEN: Well I doubt it very much. I think insofar as I am familiar with it, it reflects an area condition. It could be, for instance, in the T.V. industry. It might be pulling an industry out of a given area but I doubt very much, as of now, whether it has serious political implications. Of course, I am not insensible to the fact that the voters do react to that sort of thing.

MOLLENHOFF: What do you think the political reaction is going to be to the President's veto of the Federal pay raise?

DIRKSEN: Well, obviously they are not going to be happy. I am one of 17 Senators in one case, and one of 22 in another, who voted against the bills and I did so because I had in mind what I thought was the welfare of 170 million people as distinguished from one group of our people because you do have a threatening inflation in the country, as a matter of fact -- a fever of inflation at the present time -- which can become more aggravated and if you're going to tax the budget with another 850 million dollars in a single fiscal year, then you've got a problem on your hands.

MCGAFFIN: Senator, speaking of politics, there has been a report that some of the political leaders are looking for a new name to replace Modern Republicanism. Do you think that would be a good idea?

DIRKSEN: Well, Mr. McGaffin, I haven't heard of it and I have always thought of myself as just a plain ordinary, garden-variety type of Republican and I said on other occasions I have never heard Modern Republicanism defined -- a good definition -- that you could sink your teeth into and until such time, I simply have to think of myself as a Republican and I believe most of the party members will do likewise.

MCGAFFIN: Well, Senator, in view of the rather surprising defeat of Mr. Kohler in Wisconsin the other day, do you think there is apt to be a change in the fashion of, to put it bluntly, riding Mr. Eisenhower's coattails?

DIRKSEN: Well, I don't know, as a matter of fact, it's a question of whether the course is right or wrong, whether the policies pursued are in the best interests of the country, both for the present and the future. I think it's the essential basic thing that has got to be determined finally so that it doesn't become a question of riding coattails.

MCGAFFIN: If you were to become Senate Minority leader, Senator, would you go down the line for the Eisenhower program?

DIRKSEN: Well, I must say that I have seen eye to eye with Senator Knowland, the present Minority leader for whom I have great respect and affection and I try, of course, to support the President of the United States because he is the party leader. There are times, of course, when you may share a divergent sentiment that would take you away but in the main, I think that I have supported the Administration policies pretty well.

MOLLENHOFF: Do you feel that you would go on a separate course than the President in the same way that Senator Knowland has seen fit to do on many occasions?

DIRKSEN: Well, in the future the support is already speculative, as you know, and you'll never know until you come up sharp against an issue but I anticipate no difficulties in that field.

MOLLENHOFF: Senator, do you feel that President Eisenhower had a real impact in changing the course of the Republican party in the last six years?

DIRKSEN: Well, I think to some extent, although as I look back, he has been fundamental.

MOLLENHOFF: Do you feel he has made you more liberal in your viewpoint on the whole with respect to legislation?

DIRKSEN: Well, I can point out one area where the President has parted company with a good many of the Republicans in both House and Senate or shall we say that they have parted company with him? Take a look at Federal aid to education -- but you have to resolve it, I think, in every instance on the basis of what you see back home. For instance,

in the State of Illinois, Governor Stratton has been uniformly and consistently opposed to Federal aid to education. He asked the legislature for a ten million dollar revolving fund. That seems to meet the problem out there pretty well. It's in line generally with the thinking of the people so you see you resolve it on the basis of that particular state. Now you may have 15 or 16 governors in that same general fix who would be opposed to it. Well what would you do, try to force a program on them or oppose the program and also because it would put an additional tax upon the Treasury for the current fiscal year. As you know from the budget, of course, the whole amount of the estimated 185 million would have been expended in the present fiscal year - 1958 - and that's a jolt that on the basis of our present fiscal problems is something that you would have to think about.

MCGAFFIN: Senator, I'd like to get your feeling about the charge that a good many Congressmen who are now on trips to Europe are actually over there having vacations at the tax payer's expense. You may recall that towards the close of Congress, Congressman Gross of Iowa, got up one day and said that he felt that many Congressmen were abusing foreign travel and that Congress was going to have a beautiful scandal on its hands if it didn't prevent this.

DIRKSEN: That's entirely possible but Mr. McGaffin, I simply have to answer that out of my own experience. I took a trip to Asia in 1953 and one in 1955. I did it mainly at the insistence of the President and his advisers and the request of the Senate Appropriations Committee. When I was a House member, I took over a committee of 20 in 1947 as the chairman. I doubt whether I ever expended so much energy in a given space of time and worked so hard in my life and when the suggestion was made just before the session ended this year whether I would like to go abroad on a trip, my answer was no because I find it is not a junket, it is not a lark. You're money out-of-pocket before you get through and you will have worked harder than you ever worked in your life in that space

of time so there was no great lure for me to go abroad.

MOLLENHOFF: Senator --

MCGAFFIN: Excuse me, Clark, I just want to pursue this for a minute if you don't mind. Senator, on some of these trips the Congressmen spend local foreign currency as called counterpart funds and when they come back, there is no public accounting of that money -- the John Q citizens who puts that up actually through taxes never has a right to know through the newspapers how that money is spent. Do you agree with that secrecy?

DIRKSEN: No, I don't, as a matter of fact, and I'll tell you why. You generate counterpart funds oftentimes by the sale of agricultural products that are in surplus here but because products were bought with money out of the Federal Treasury so just because there has been a conversion into counterpart funds, doesn't mean as you say that isn't after all a tax upon the citizenry of this country and as such, I think they are entitled to know how it is spent.

MCGAFFIN: Well, Senator, would you be in favor of some sort of legislation in the coming session which would make these accounts open to public inspection?

DIRKSEN: Well, if you need legislation then I think we should have legislation to that effect.

MOLLENHOFF: Well, Senator, apparently we need legislation in this area if we are going to get it. It has been a long time policy, as you know, in the Senate not to reveal what the Senate Committee spends on these junkets or what is spent as far as counterpart funds. Do you oppose the position Senator Hayden has taken -- a pretty sharp position -- that he doesn't want this information out? Do you oppose that?

DIRKSEN: The reason I raise that question as to whether legislation is necessary is that after all all this is handled through the State Department. I see no reason why they can't make a disclosure of it if they so decide. However, it may be custom, it may be a little timidity about it and if it requires legislation, I am quite willing that the thing be laid on the line so that people know what is spent.

more

MCGAFFIN: Would you follow that up Senator -- would you be in favor of following this up with some kind of a resolution or legislation to set out the policy of the Senate, that the State Department can make public the expenditures by the members of the Senate and the House?

DIRKSEN: Very definitely so. When I got back from Asia the last time in 1955, I had a direct question from a constituent how much money I spent. I sent him a very brief note, told him what the air ticket was, how much counterpart I had and I also told him how much I spent out of my own pocket before I got through.

MCGAFFIN: Senator, for your information, those of us who have checked the State Department to try to get this information, were told they can't divulge it because Congress doesn't want them to.

DIRKSEN: Well, there's no legal interdiction on it -- it's only as a personal matter, perhaps that members don't want it disclosed. But why shouldn't they -- don't we live in a goldfish bowl here in every circumstance anyway?

MCGAFFIN: Of course.

DIRKSEN: And what is to be lost by making a disclosure of this thing -- so finishing what Mr. Mollenhoff asked a moment ago, yes, I would be more than happy to follow up and I want you to know that I am writing on this canary yellow paper that you gave me and that simply means that I'll be getting a resolution ready to that effect.

MCGAFFIN: I believe that's the sort of paper that Secretary Dulles uses too, isn't it?

DIRKSEN: That's right.

MOLLENHOFF: Senator, the Executive Branch of the Government has repeatedly refused to give information to the Legislative Branch in the period of the last few years on the grounds that it is confidential Executive business that can't be disclosed. Now we've seen a lot of criticism with the Truman Administration on this score and in more recent years, the Eisenhower Administration seems to have taken it and even solidified it in some respects. What's your feeling on the

secrecy in the Eisenhower Administration?

DIRKSEN: Let me make two comments. The first is that there must be some secrecy with respect to information, detailed records and so forth in government. For instance, the FBI records over which we had such a hassle during the last session is a case in point. No doubt there are secrets that the State Department must maintain and there is confidential information on which the classification stand must be maintained by the military but I am of the opinion, and this is based upon experiences on the Appropriations Committee and elsewhere, that the thing is somewhat overdone. I believe that there are disclosures that can be made and probably that whole matter ought to be reviewed. Now I think that you will admit that it's difficult to give a categorical answer and simply say on this broadcast that this ought to be released and that ought to be released.

MOLLENHOFF: Well, Senator, you've had some experience yourself in trying to carry the ball for the Administration on the Hill where this secrecy policy hampered you. Could you tell us something about that?

DIRKSEN: Well, I can tell you that last year when the Mutual Security program was before the Senate and among my chores I had to defend our action with respect to Yugoslavia. You may recall that Senator Knowland fought that very bitterly and very effectively so here I was in the unhappy position of carrying the flag on the item but not being able to use the weapons that I might have used if the secrecy tag had not been on them.

MOLLENHOFF: Senator -----

DIRKSEN: The question is how far can you go? I can't refine or resolve that question as of the moment. But it seems to me there you have a field where a rather careful study could be made by a rather select group to see just what we do and where we take off the tag so it becomes public information.

MCGAFFIN: I wonder if I can change the subject for a moment. The great issue in the news at the moment is the integration crisis in the south. Do you feel that Mr. Eisenhower could have handled the Little Rock situation any differently, any more effectively than he did?

DIRKSEN: Well, Mr. McGaffin, it's rather difficult to make a comment on that specific question. As the thing shapes up and I tried to follow it as closely as I could and read all the detail that was available, I thought the President was rather forthright in moving in on the matter -- he could have gone too far and precipitated an aggravation of the situation but I think he constantly had in mind the necessity for manifesting the Federal power where the rights of citizens of the United States were involved and rights that are protected under the 14th Amendment to the Constitution. The President didn't go overboard on the thing as I sense it and I thought there was a fine restraint about it and now it is going to head into something else if this conference does get under way between the Governor of Arkansas and the President.

MCGAFFIN: Do you think the Governor of Arkansas may have miscalculated and that the action he took was taken for reasons of political ambition -- that it may boomerang on him?

DIRKSEN: Well, I read the accounts that came from Little Rock and there was some disposition to believe that perhaps it was being bogged down a little with political considerations. That may only be conjecture but I know that the President had to assert the power of the Federal Government because if he didn't then, of course, you would have a crisis indeed.

MOLLENHOFF: Another major problem before the Congress in the next months here is going to be the one of labor. Do you favor a state ---- or ---- a Federal right to work law?

DIRKSEN: Well, let's put it this way, Mr. Mollenhoff, you know there's a section in the Taft-Hartley Act which leaves within the hands of the states certain determinations and if states want to do it, they're free to do so without any Federal

interdiction. Now frankly, there has been a sustained effort over a considerable period of time to have that section deleted from the Taft-Hartley Act. I recall when they came to me in the campaign in 1956 and very brusquely said, will you favor deleting that section, and my answer was definitely no.

MOLLENHOFF: Will you favor then leaving it with the states to determine whether there are right to work laws but not taking this into the hands of the Federal government?

DIRKSEN: Well -----

MOLLENHOFF: Is that where you draw the line?

DIRKSEN: At the moment I simply say, leave specifically the authority for states to act in that field if they want to do so.

MOLLENHOFF: You don't feel that there has been anything revealed by the McClellan Labor Racket Committee which would influence you to say that the states have not acted and that we need a Federal right to work law?

DIRKSEN: No, I think it should remain within the hands of the states. First, you're closer in the sense of responsibility to the problems that come up but secondly, look at what happened in connection with their subversion and communistic issue under the Pennsylvania statute and when it went to the Supreme Court finally, you see the Court simply said that Congress had pre-empted in that field. Now that was one reason why that section of the Taft-Hartley Act they thought they would have deleted -- because it showed that Congress did not pre-empt in that field but said that states had rights also and I think those rights ought to be preserved.

MOLLENHOFF: Do you feel that the anti-trust laws should apply to labor unions?

DIRKSEN: Well, long ago you remember the anti-trust laws did apply to labor unions and if I remember correctly, that was modified either in 1932 or 1933. Now I have an idea that that whole field is going to be carefully re-examined after the McClellan Committee has gone a little further.

MOLLENHOFF: You have no idea on that subject right now?

DIRKSEN: Well the point is that that's a rather complex and difficult field and I could give you no answer off-hand without a lot of rather careful study, I think, but I would like to see what the recommendations of this Committee are going to be -- that then will become something of a springboard and we can operate from there.

MCGAFFIN: Senator, could I cut in with just a short one? In the event the race for the Republican Presidential nomination becomes a contest between Mr. Nixon and Mr. Knowland, which man would you be for?

DIRKSEN: Well, Mr. McGaffin, that's so anticipatory that obviously I can't give you an answer. There's a convention to be held before that time ---

MCGAFFIN: I know, but if it were between those two men, which would you favor -- if it actually came down to them?

DIRKSEN: I don't know, as a matter of fact. That's about the best answer I can give you.

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

ANNOUNCER: Here's a Mutual note for you.

Every sensible, mature driver knows he should drive at a safe speed. The trouble seems to be that not all drivers know just what is meant by a safe speed. Any speed that can cause you to lose control of your car -- even for a moment -- is not a safe speed. A safe speed is one that will enable you to stop the car in the distance you can clearly see ahead to avoid any emergency that might pop up. Of course, that calls for reduced speed at night, since your assured clear distance ahead is shorter. If you're passing most of the cars on the road, you are probably going too fast. If many cars are passing you, you are probably going too slow. Too fast and too slow are both unsafe speeds, so drive with traffic.

more

The speed limit signs and state speed law are for your protection. Never exceed them. But remember, too, that they are safe speeds only under ideal conditions. Any condition of the road, weather, or traffic that is less than ideal calls for a slower speed and

Remember, Mutual is your network for news.

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

ANNOUNCER: First from Mrs. Gertrude Peterson of Baltimore, Maryland. Do you concur with U. S. Chamber of Commerce President Talbott's proposal to eliminate Federal income taxes in excess of 60 percent to stimulate industrial expansion?

DIRKSEN: That's a rather involved question and a simple answer would be very difficult. I'd take an entirely different approach. As you know, I was a co-sponsor of a Constitutional proposal to limit the power of the government with respect to income tax and to narrow and to set by law or by Constitution, the spread between the upper and the lower brackets and then the necessary emergency or escape clause in time of emergency or war, whereby those rates could be modified by a three-fourths vote in both the House and Senate. I think that's a sounder approach in bringing about some kind of tax relief and it's operating in two fields now, one from the Federal field, because we have had a number of hearings in the Senate and House Judiciary Committees and the other, is that it's been operated from the state level where you have to get the necessary number of states in order to mandate the Congress to enact that kind of a resolution so I can't pass very well upon that proposal because my own thinking has been in line with the Constitutional proposal that I made many years ago and have kept alive by reintroducing in every session of Congress since that time.

ANNOUNCER: Now from Mr. George B. Derrick of Phoenix, Arizona. Do you think we -- the taxpayers -- shall not in time see the end of foreign economic and military aid?

DIRKSEN: I trust that it will diminish -- when we'll see the end of it is difficult to say. You see when you call it foreign aid, I think it's hardly this name, because I think of it as Mutual Security and seek to justify it on the thesis that it projects the defense of the U. S. beyond its own borders. It finally has to be justified on that ground and I have an idea that Mutual Security as such, considering what we get for every dollar expended, notwithstanding the waste -- and I concede that waste creeps into a program of that kind -- that it does expand and augment the security of this country and that we do get our money's worth.

ANNOUNCER: Mrs. Byron C. Irving of San Diego, California. Sweden has adopted a plan to reduce prices and wages by a certain percentage to halt inflation. Do you think such a plan feasible or possible in this country? Mr. Reuther only proposed price reduction.

DIRKSEN: I would applaud the course that that kind of plan would call for -- some kind of Federal control and when you have control, you have parted of course with our concept of free economy, and the chances are that in proportion if you put the country in a straight jacket you do infinitely more harm than good. Now we do have some controls, of course, the Federal Reserve System, the Treasury Department, in its effort to cut down on Federal spending so that there will be no unbalanced budget and the expenditure of borrowed funds for current needs -- all those things, together with a restriction upon money is designed through the manipulation of monetary authority, to control inflation wherever you can.

ANNOUNCER: For submitting these prize-winning questions, we are sending Mrs. Gertrude Peterson of Baltimore, Maryland and Mrs. Byron C. Irving of San Diego, California, the glamorous Benrus "Embraceable" wrist-flattering and fashionable watch. And for Mr. George B. Derrick of Phoenix, Arizona, we have a Benrus water-proof watch. This is the world-famous Benrus water-proof watch which was towed around the world under water and stayed perfectly water-proof.

ANNOUNCER: Mutual has brought you this public affairs program with the hope of stimulating your interest in the matters you have heard discussed and in all other issues.

Next week our newsmaking guest will be the President of the United States Chamber of Commerce, Philip M. Talbott, who will be questioned on the American economic Business Outlook.

The writers of the three most interesting and timely questions for our guest will each receive handsome Benrus watches. Send in your questions on a postcard with your full name and complete address. Mail it to Reporters' Roundup, Mutual Broadcasting System, Washington, D. C. The decision of the board of judges will be final. All questions remain the property of Reporters' Roundup.

HURLEIGH: I want to thank U. S. Senator Everett M. Dirksen, Republican of Illinois -- for being our guest on Reporters' Roundup, which came to you transcribed from the Senate Radio Gallery in your nation's capital.

And my thanks, too, to the reporters on our panel: To Mr. Clark Mollenhoff, Washington Correspondent of LOOK magazine and Cowles newspapers; and Mr. Bill McGaffin, Washington Correspondent of the Chicago Daily News.

Be sure to send in your questions for our guest next week -- President of the United States Chamber of Commerce, Philip M. Talbott, who will be questioned on the American economic Business Outlook. Until then, this is Robert F. Hurleigh.

ANNOUNCER: To further your interest in Reporters' Roundup, we have a message on safety and the need for good driving visibility from the Anderson Company of Gary, Indiana, manufacturers of the famous ANCO windshield wiper blades. Their familiar yellow ANCO service cabinet is displayed in most of the good service stations from coast-to-coast. The Anderson people are experts in automotive visibility problems, and they say, if your wiper blades start to streak your windshield, and don't stop streaking, the rubber is dead and will get constantly worse. This is the time to change your wiper blades and to be safely set for rain or blinding splash. You can

make better time safely in stormy weather if your wiper blades are wiping your windshield clear and clean. And remember that even the finest wiper blade rubber goes dead often in six months or less due to sun, wind, road film and exposure, so at the first sign of streaking, have a new, live pair of wiper blades snapped on your car. Wherever you see a bright yellow wiper blade service cabinet, you will get prompt, courteous windshield wiper service.

Next week, and each week thereafter, Reporters' Roundup will seek out the top news and the man who makes it. You'll get the story behind the headlines as our guest answers the questions of Robert F. Hurleigh and a panel of veteran reporters.

Reporters' Roundup is produced and directed by Robert F. Hurleigh and Jack A. Gertz.

This is Jaffray Ford speaking.