
MUTUAL BROADCASTING SYSTEM 1627 K Street, N.W. Telephone: Sterling 3-3800

FOR RELEASE AFTER 7:00 PM EST (6:00 PM CST) MONDAY, MARCH 21, 1955.

"REPORTERS' ROUNDUP"

GUEST: Senator Everett M. Dirksen

MODERATOR: Robert F. Hurleigh

PANEL: Charles Cleveland, Chicago Daily News

Bruce MacFarlane, Mutual's WGN Studios

-0-

ANNOUNCER: REPORTERS' ROUNDUP, where bylines make headlines! In a moment hear United States Senator Everett McKinley Dirksen, Republican of Illinois, answer questions fired at him by a panel of veteran reporters.

HURLEIGH: What are the Republican chances at the polls next year in regaining control over the Senate and House?

MacFARLANE: Will the Democrats succeed in their all-out effort to defeat President Eisenhower if he runs again?

CLEVELAND: How do you think Illinois will go in 1956?

HURLEIGH: As 1956 moves nearer, glimpses into the national political crystal ball for the future are provided almost daily by Republican and Democratic leaders along with studies by political strategists. Republicans now predict they'll hold the White House after 1956 with the re-nomination and re-election of Mr. Eisenhower. Our guest tonight is a national political authority from Illinois who stands high on the list of members of Congress. He is Republican Senator Everett M. Dirksen, who will be asked, I'm sure, to size up the Republican and Democratic chances at the polls in 1956 as the political picture looks today. Senator Dirksen, who served continuously for eight terms in Congress, was elected United States Senator in 1950. And now our guest is ready.

ANNOUNCER: REPORTERS' ROUNDUP, which comes to you transcribed this evening from Mutual's WGN Studios in Chicago, is a joint presentation ~~NEWS~~ ~~NEWS~~ of Mutual and Facts Forum. Many of the discussions heard each week on REPORTERS' ROUNDUP are also highlighted in the monthly FACTS FORUM NEWS. The March NEWS -- now available at your local news stand -- features such timely subjects as the "Right to Work Laws - "Formosa" - "Red Held

Prisoners" - "Roy Cohn and the Atom Spies" - and "The Mysterious Case of Joan Kinton". Ask for the March NEWS at your news stand or write Facts Forum, Dallas, Texas, for subscription information. May the opinions you now hear expressed by our guest prompt you to further thought. United States Senator Everett M. Dirksen, Republican of Illinois, is a member of the Senate's Appropriations and Judiciary Committees. And now Senator Dirksen is prepared to meet the challenging questions of this panel of well-known and able reporters: Mr. Charles Cleveland of the Chicago Daily News and Bruce MacFarlane of Mutual's WGN Studios in Chicago. Your moderator, Robert F. Hurleigh.

HURLEIGH: And now, Mr. MacFarlane, let's have the first question for Senator Dirksen.

MacFARLANE: All right, Senator, I'll fire ^{it} at you again as I did just a moment ago - will the Democrats succeed in their all-out effort to defeat President Eisenhower if he runs again?

DIRKSEN: Mr. MacFarlane, a political victory is always an aggregation, shall I say, of many factors or components. It embraces not only the candidate who runs - it includes also the business curve, it includes what happens in agriculture, and almost all those other things that indicate whether or not there will be a victory. I can express a hope, of course, and it is an opinion, but if President Eisenhower runs he certainly will win, and it is the universal hope of Republicans that he will be a candidate in 1956.

MacFARLANE: Well, could I go just a little further and ask if you agree with Vice President Nixon that the G.O.P. cannot win next year without President Eisenhower?

DIRKSEN: Well, I am not so sure that I would go that far, and that answer of course is based upon my own experience, because this is my twenty-second or twenty-third year in the national picture. I have sort of won and lost, when Democrats were in power. I won in 1950 in the bi-election, so it's a little difficult to categorize, I would say, in a sense, but I am one of those who believes that if you have got a sound economic basis, that the hope is always that the party will win and that your candidate at the top of the ticket will win also.

HURLEIGH: Mr. Cleveland.

CLEVELAND: Senator, in the 1952 Convention you were identified with Mr. Eisenhower's rival, the late Senator Taft. Now you say that you, with other Republicans, hope that Mr. Eisenhower will run again. Can you tell me what has happened under the Eisenhower Administration which has won your support?

DIRKSEN: Well, first of all, it's our Administration, and I have a proprietary interest in it, because I pride myself on the fact that I am a good party man, and the reason I say that is not for selfish personal purposes, but rather that I think the well-being of the country and its future is identified pretty well with a vigorous, virile two-party system. I have seen what happened in other countries of the world, and so I am always interested in a two-party system. He is our President. He has done a good job, in my judgment, and I think it's my responsibility as a Republican to go along in every case where it does not require a forfeiture of conviction. Where I have a deep and biding conviction on a given subject, I may part company with my party, but notwithstanding all that, I am still well identified with my party, and he is our party chief.

CLEVELAND: Well, Senator, here in Illinois is supposedly the heart of the conservative wing of the Republican Party - at least the Democrats attempt to make a great deal to-do about the two wings of the Republican Party. Several weeks ago, as a matter of fact -- I believe you were one of the speakers -- there was a meeting of so-called grass roots Republicans. There was an undertone of opposition to Mr. Eisenhower on several grounds -- the issue of the Bricker Amendment, for example, and the question of Senator McCarthy for another. Do you think those ~~MAN~~ differences can be reconciled?

DIRKSEN: I rather think so. As a matter of fact, I have not relented in my devotion to the enactment of the Bricker Resolution if we can bring it about. As a matter of fact, in the Senate debate on the confirmation of John Marshall Harlan to the Supreme Court, the whole thing finally wound up in a number of speeches calling for reconsideration of the Bricker Amendment as the one effective way in which to safeguard the rights of American citizens and also to offset the effect of treaty law as domestic law in this country. So I think I can be a good Republican and still be for the Bricker Resolution and still consider myself as a conservative and still go along with the Administration in Washington.

CLEVELAND: Would it be your --

DIRKSEN: The Republican tent, as you know, is large enough to embrace a good many points of view, and since it was a dissident in the first instance when it was born over a hundred years ago we have always considered that these points of view could be entertained by Republicans, but so long as we keep our eye on the larger and transcendent issues, and of course we develop that cohesiveness and unity so necessary to a political institution.

CLEVELAND: One of your earlier answers, Senator, was that you hoped that Mr. Eisenhower would run again. Since you have been considered by many as the successor of Senator Taft in the so-called conservative wing of the party, could we imply from that that you would urge Mr. Eisenhower to run and that if he did seek the nomination that he would be virtually unopposed the at/San Francisco Convention next year?

DIRKSEN: I would urge him to run as our party chief, and I would believe that he should have no difficulty in achieving the nomination and in achieving the election in 1956.

CLEVELAND: Would you also think that Vice President Nixon should be re-slated also, sir?

DIRKSEN: Well, he is our Vice President at the present time. I think he has done an excellent job. He has been a great Ambassador of good will. He has been an effective missionary for the party, and it does make a good party team.

HURLEIGH: Mr. MacFarlane.

MacFARLANE: Senator, to get away from national politics for just a moment, can I ask you about Formosa. Assuming that ~~EX~~ no war breaks out in Formosa in the next few months or year, and assuming that they do not return those American soldiers and fliers that they are holding, would you favor any kind of a blockade of the China coast?

DIRKSEN: You are referring of course to the fliers and soldiers that the Red Chinese are holding at the present time?

MacFARLANE: That's correct, yes.

DIRKSEN: They are not being held in Formosa.

MacFARLANE: No, I didn't mean that.

DIRKSEN: That is an issue that is very much in the public mind, and

I can say, judging from the number of letters that reach my desk, that there is a widespread interest in the retrieval of our soldiers. When all is said and done, of course, it is a responsibility of government to defend and to safeguard those who are put in uniform and who are called upon to fight abroad, and sooner or later we are going to have to get just a little tough on this issue, I think, if every other remedy and every other device may fail, and make it rather abundantly clear to those who are holding them that we mean business in bringing them back, unless they could affirmatively show and conclusively show that they were held because actually they had committed espionage. We recognize that, of course, under international law, but the fact of the matter is that no such case has been made, and I think the time has come for us to make it rather emphatically clear that there will be no ~~KH~~ fooling on this issue.

MacFARLANE: Well, would you favor using the Seventh Fleet in a blockade?

DIRKSEN: I am not so sure. I think that of course is a military question involving considerations of strategy that one doesn't advance too lightly. It ^{has} ~~has~~ ^{and} ~~been~~ advanced, ~~by~~ some of our best military minds, I notice, within the last few months have indicated a blockade would be effective and might very well bring the Red Chinese to their knees.

MacFARLANE: Well, just one other question on this line. What about a blockade of the sort suggested by Senator McCarthy, that is, withholding economic aid to those of our allies who continue trading with Red China?

DIRKSEN: Well, that of course is a matter for cooperative action with our allies, but I think we ought to make it abundantly clear that anything that is conducive to aid and comfort to the enemy ought to be stopped, and ought to be stopped without any forceful effort on our part.

HURLEIGH: Mr. Cleveland.

CLEVELAND: Senator, it's very popular these days to ask men in public office whether they are going to seek re-election. Your term expires next year. Are you going to seek re-election?

DIRKSEN: Charlie, that's a rather personal question, I would say, and maybe I ought to answer it in a rather general fashion - that is to

say, in the language of Jefferson, who said long ago of those who seek public office and who have been in public office, that few die and none retire.

MacFARLANE: Well put.

CLEVELAND: Senator, along those lines, earlier in the program the question was raised about how Illinois will go in 1956. Would you care to comment on that, sir?

DIRKSEN: Well, Charlie, there the answer would necessarily have to be the same kind of answer I would give for the country. If we have good party organization, if we have good candidates, if an effective campaign is waged to arouse people to their responsibilities and get them to the polls, I think the issues are on our side, I think the achievements are on our side, and certainly we ought to win a very substantial victory in Illinois in 1956.

CLEVELAND: In this past election for Senator we had a off-year race. I wonder if you would mind commenting on what you think happened in Illinois which resulted in an overwhelming defeat of the Republican candidate for Senator against Senator Douglas.

DIRKSEN: It's a little difficult, of course, for me to comment on that. In the first place, I had to diffuse my time, as you know, as chairman of the Senatorial Campaign Committee, over some twenty states. I was back in the state to campaign. A good many considerations were advanced as to the reason for the outcome and whether or not they were persuasive or not I do not know. Of course Senator Douglas did have this advantage - he has been in Washington, he has familiarized himself, of course, with the things that have happened in the last six years down there, and that gave him a rather material advantage in going up and down the state confronting the people and expounding his own cause.

CLEVELAND: Well, would you say on the basis of this past fall election that Illinois must be considered a doubtful state going into 1956?

DIRKSEN: Well, that may be, but I think of one phenomenon that happened in 1954. To me it's rather amazing that in the State of ~~IL~~ Ohio the Republican vote was 24 percent below 1950 and it was the smallest Republican vote in seventeen years. In Illinois, oddly enough, the Republican vote in 1954 was 24 percent below 1950 and the smallest Republican vote in

twenty years. Now something of that same force, that same trend was apparent in a good many other states, so that you may have had a national trend at that time developed largely over those frustrations with which everybody is familiar in political life that may have had something to do with it, and then too, there is the fact that you had an off year and you had no Presidential candidate at the top of the ticket.

CLEVELAND: One final question along those lines, Senator - If Mr. Eisenhower does not run, could you suggest some of the possible candidates that you think might be able to lead the Republican Party in 1956?

DIRKSEN: Oh, that would be rather difficult, I suppose, measured in many respects by the ambitions of men. As you so well know, there has been talk about Senator Knowland of California as a possible candidate; there has been some discussion of Senator Nixon, or Vice President Nixon; there have been other speculations, of course. But I have never seen the time when we approached a national Convention that you didn't have sufficient candidates.

HURLEIGH: It's rather difficult, is it not, Senator, for any candidate, if a candidate would appear on the horizon, to do much about his own position as long as the President remains silent as to his own ~~thoughts~~ thoughts on the subject?

DIRKSEN: That is precisely so. And we have seen that before in the case of President Roosevelt. Obviously nobody got his lightning rod up very seriously if there was some thought that he was going to be a candidate. I think the same would be true now. There is a prevailing popularity that President Eisenhower entertains at the present time, and certainly if he was going to be a candidate, and I trust he will be a candidate, there would be no disposition on the part of others to contest for the nomination.

HURLEIGH: And I would like to explore this a bit, Senator. A lot of people do not seem to realize that this does not necessarily mean that the President is doing wrong or that individuals who may have great followings out in the country are perhaps letting down. It's simply a situation which must be faced as realists do face situations. Would you explain that.

DIRKSEN: Well, I was going to amplify my earlier answer by saying this. This is President Eisenhower's first term. Usually we think of a

President as projecting a program over a rather substantial period of time, and four years is a rather short period of time in which to encompass and achieve all those objectives. Consequently, you think of your President, once elected, as surely seeking a second term in order to effectuate those things that he couldn't consummate in the first four years of public office.

HURLEIGH: Mr. MacFarlane.

MacFARLANE: I would like to ask you another question about Illinois politics, Senator, that might be somewhat speculative and I hope not embarrassing. There has been rumors that former Governor Adlai Stevenson might seek the Senatorial nomination on the Democratic ticket in 1956 for Illinois. Do you have any information on that?

DIRKSEN: I am like Will Rogers - all I know is what I see in the newspapers. I saw in the prints, and I think I saw it in one or two of the national magazines, but further than that, I have no knowledge cause, frankly, I have not seen Adlai with - for purposes of a visit for quite a long time.

MacFARLANE: Well, to get to another topic then, let me ask you this - Senator Potter after the Army-McCarthy hearings of last year indicated or implied that there was some sort of an agreement between the Administration and I believe the Senate, or the Senate Subcommittee, that if Roy Cohn and Frank Carr of the Subcommittee's staff were to go, John Adams, the counsel of the Army, and perhaps Secretary Stevens might go. All but one of them has since then departed. Do you think Secretary Stevens will depart?

DIRKSEN: Frankly, I do not know. But I want to comment on the first part of your question. I know of no such a deal or agreement. It could have been - I am certainly not familiar with all the undertakings and agreements that may be fashioned in Washington, but insofar as my knowledge goes - and I was rather close to the Committee and to all the developments and implications that took place from time to time - I know of no such undertaking whatsoever. Now it was my understanding that John Adams came as General Counsel for the Army for a limited period. That statement is based upon observations that he made at one time and another in my presence. Now I know, of course, they are gone and that Secretary Stevens is still there. Whether or not he proposes to leave, whether they are going to ask him to leave, I wouldn't know.

HURLEIGH: Mr. Cleveland.

CLEVELAND: Senator, along those same lines, there has been talk off and on of a possible third party in 1956. The name most commonly identified with that possible movement is that of Senator McCarthy. Do you think that that - there there is a possibility of a third party movement?

DIRKSEN: I have seen no evidences of it, either on his part or on the part of the people, and that takes us back to the seminar meeting they had here in Chicago on February 12. I was one of the speakers. I didn't know too much about the nature of the meeting, but I discovered later that they were all Republicans intending to stay in the fold. In the main they were only uttering their dissidence. They were contending that there had been a departure from the party platform adopted here in Chicago in 1952. But when the question was asked me at that time at the end of my remarks on February 12, I said I saw no hint or indication that an effort was being made to form a third party, and I do not believe there is - at least you would certainly see some of the undercover and groundwork that would be necessary to form a third party, because there are restrictions in State law that make it a little difficult, as you well know. I have seen no such efforts.

CLEVELAND: Well, as I recall, one of the speakers at that particular meeting raised the possibility of a third party if, as he said, we did not regain - meaning the people that were there and their point of view - did not regain control of the Republican Party. They were also critical of the failure, as they saw it, of the Eisenhower Administration to live up to the 1952 party platform. Do you think that's a justifiable criticism?

DIRKSEN: Well, of course you are always going to find some people contend when you pursue a certain policy or program that it's not consonant with your platform and that it constitutes a departure. I find that people disagree with me quite often on my interpretation of the platform, so that's not at all strange, but that's quite different from any concerted move to set up a third party organization.

CLEVELAND: I was quite amazed to find that anybody ever got around to reading a party platform after the Convention.

DIRKSEN: Well, Charlie, as a matter of fact, you would be surprised how often you go back to the party platform to see whether or not the things

that appear before Congress in legislative form are in character and are consonant with the pledges that you made, and those pledges are recited in your national platform, and until a new one is adopted, that in a sense becomes your party Bible.

CLEVELAND: One final question on the matter of Senator McCarthy. Since the celebrated hearings he has been critical to some extent of President Eisenhower and his failure to act more decisively, particularly in the Far East. Do you think that Senator McCarthy will remain clearly within the Republican Party? Do you think that his differences with the President, for example, can be reconciled?

DIRKSEN: I know of no reason for him not remaining in the Republican Party, and I would have every reason to believe that he will, and the best evidence I can give as to whether or not he goes further than certain convictions he may have is the fact that he voted in favor of the nomination and confirmation of John Marshall Harland to the Supreme Court. Now I suppose there are people who thought that perhaps he would part company and go along with some others. As a matter of fact, he stayed very nicely on his party's side.

HURLEIGH: In a speech on that very same day, Senator, in which he was critical of the Administration and the White House particularly, I believe he stressed the point again that he would remain in the party - merely as confirmation of the fact that it does not appear that Senator McCarthy is attempting any third party movement or is giving even any encouragement to those who would.

DIRKSEN: That's correct, and I was on the Senate floor when that speech was delivered.

HURLEIGH: Mr. MacFarlane.

MacFARLANE: Getting to the Bricker Amendment again, Senator, that you mentioned briefly in the beginning. Do you think that it will pass again?

DIRKSEN: On the Senate floor in connection with the Harlan nomination, I terminated my speech by saying that the issue was not John Marshall Harlan - the issue was the Senate of the United States - because by a vote of 89 to 2 they ratified and gave consent to the Atlantic Charter and in the Atlantic

Charter, or the United Nations Charter, in Articles 55 and 56 and 59 you see this recital of objectives which is invoked from time to time by lawyers in cases that ultimately land in the Supreme Court, and the most recent, of course, is the so-called Sioux City Cemetery case, which has been rather freely ventilated and which was stated on a four to four non-disclosed decision by the Supreme Court of the United States, so I simply say that when it comes to the Bricker Resolution ~~AMENDMENT~~ there you do by law what you hope that men on your high court will do in safeguarding the rights and liberties and upholding the Constitution of the United States, but how much better to nail it down and to make sure that treaty law will not contravene or supersede the internal law of your country.

MacFARLANE: Most people, I think, in -- average people in the country, Senator, seem to have the impression that the Bricker Amendment will in some way limit the treaty-making powers of the President. Do you make that interpretation of it?

DIRKSEN: There will not be the slightest limitation on the President's power to negotiate treaties. After all, the important thing is the application of the treaty when it comes. Now nearly every major country and most minor countries have a provision that a treaty cannot have the effect of internal law until it's implemented by an act of Parliament or their legislative body. That doesn't obtain in the United States, and that is one of the contentions that we made in connection with the Bricker Amendment or Resolution over and over again. I sincerely hope, since it has been introduced, it's pending in the Judiciary Committee and it will come before a subcommittee of which I am a member and of which Senator Kefauver of Tennessee is the chairman, and I have importuned him now for early hearings so that we can marshal our testimony and get it back on the Senate floor.

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

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

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

ANNOUNCER: David S. Kuak, Ogden, Utah.

HURLEIGH: Do you believe, Senator, war in the Far East could come in the next few months?

DIRKSEN: Bob, that is one of those speculative questions the answer to which of course must necessarily lie in the minds of the leaders in Red China rather than here. It takes two to make a war. Certainly this peace loving country would take no aggressive action to project a war, but who shall say what is in the mind of Mao Tse-Tung, or Khrushchev in Russia, or Chou-Teh, or Chou En-Lai in Red China, and a misstep of course in this very sensitive area of the Formosa Straits might provoke some difficulty. I think that this could have been asked and answered just exactly that way for quite some time and that may be the situation in the months ahead because it is delicate, and who shall call what action they will take?

ANNOUNCER: J. N. Hines, College Park, Maryland.

HURLEIGH: Senator McClellan has called attention to statistics on the rapid growth during 1954 of trade between our allies and the Communist

countries. Aren't these points which previously came from Senator McCarthy?

DIRKSEN: That's quite true. As a matter of fact, the committee which was under the chairmanship of Senator McCarthy had Governor Stassen and others before it, so we had verified information as to the amount of trade that was being carried on by member nations of the United Nations with those who are either behind the Iron Curtain or ~~NEEKERS~~ whom we put in the category of aggressors. The whole record is there and necessarily speaks for itself.

ANNOUNCER: G. W. Olson, Jr., Denver, Colorado.

HURLEIGH: Isn't there a grave risk in our China policy with double talk? It's said there is no intention of ^{going} ~~SEEKING~~ all-out in war against Red China, yet we have drawn a line around Formosa and will fight if we must.

DIRKSEN: Yes, there is a danger in double talk, and I think that was the whole purpose of the Resolution that was approved so overwhelmingly by both branches of Congress to firm up the situation and make manifest to other countries that we did mean business. Now when we think of Formosa, of course I think of it in terms of an outpost in a very sensitive area of the world, along with the Pescadores and other islands, and of course if we ever failed there and if the morale of the troops on Formosa is destroyed, I think the rest of Southeast Asia could very well be a very easy touch and might ultimately throw us back to a kind of Gibraltar or hemisphere defense.

ANNOUNCER: Handsome Cyma Dual Purpose Clocks are being sent to Davis S. Kunz of Ogden, Utah, J. H. Hines, College Park, Maryland, and G. W. Olson, Jr. of Denver, Colorado for submitting the three prize-winning questions on this evening's broadcast. This program has been presented by Facts Forum and Mutual in the hope of stimulating a healthy interest in national affairs. You will also find the FACTS FORUM NEWS a unique source of documented information on issues in the news. The March FACTS FORUM NEWS - now at your local news stand - contains pertinent material on a variety of subjects - "Will Formosa Fall?" - "Daily Worker Off Rocker Over Harvey" - "Right to Work Laws" - and the new Facts Forum Book Review Section. Ask for your copy at your news stand - or write Facts Forum, Dallas, Texas.

Each week our listeners are invited to send in questions on a post card. Next week our newsmaking guest will be a well-known authority ~~XXXX~~ on the people of Asia and the critical situation in the Far East, Mr. John C. Caldwell, author of several best sellers, including "Still The Rice Grows Green", "China Coast Family" and "The Korea Story". The writers of the three most interesting and timely questions will each receive this handsome prize - a Cyma Dual Purpose Clock, made by the world famous Cyma Watchmakers. This Cyma Clock will be your companion at home or wherever you go. Send in your questions on the critical situation in the Far East on the back of 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 United States Senator Everett M. Dirksen, Republican of Illinois, for being our guest on tonight's REPORTERS' ROUNDUP, which came to you transcribed from the Mutual Studios of WGN in Chicago. My thanks too to the reporters on our panel: Mr. Charles Cleveland of the Chicago Daily News and Mr. Bruce MacFarlane of WGN. Be sure to send in your question on the critical Far Eastern situation for next week's program. Until then, this is your moderator, Robert F. Hurleigh.

ANNOUNCER: This broadcast of REPORTERS' ROUNDUP will make news because its guest, United States Senator Everett M. Dirksen, Republican of Illinois, has faced questions which are asked by all Americans. Next week and each week thereafter, REPORTERS' ROUNDUP will seek out the top news and the man who makes it. You'll get the story behind the headlines as our guests answer the questions of Robert F. Hurleigh and a panel of veteran reporters. This is Howard Dorsey speaking.