February 1953

... ...

Dear ...:

I am grateful for your letter with respect to rent controls and realize that some hardships may develop. However, the President made it reasonably clear that if any state wishes to continue rent controls, the State Legislature has power to do so. New York and other states have taken this position and have handled the matter on a state basis. This takes rent control to the state level where it can be best administered if the Legislature deems it desirable, and avoids the building of federal bureaucracy to administer such a function on a rather remote basis.

Sincerely,

Everett McKinley Dirksen
March 4, 1953

...  
...  

Dear ...:

This will acknowledge your recent communication.

I have previously expressed my opposition to rent control both in committee and on the Senate floor, and I shall continue to do so.

With every good wish,

Everett McKinley Dirksen
April 6, 1953

...  
...
...

Dear ......:

In 1951 and again in 1952 I expressed my opposition to rent control on the ground that its continuation could only serve to throw this country further behind in the development of both rental and owner properties.

I have expressed myself publicly and privately on this problem many times and unless other circumstances have developed since this proposal was last considered, my action in this session of the Congress would be in accord with the action taken in other years.

I do, however, appreciate your expression of interest.

Sincerely,

Everett McKinley Dirksen
Dear ...:

I presume by now it has come to your attention that federal rent control was extended to August 1 as a compromise between the termination date in existing law and the date of October 31, which was carried in the amended Defense Production Act as reported by the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency.

I feel reasonably certain that this will wind up federal control of rents except for critical defense areas as defined in existing law.

Sincerely,

Everett McKinley Dirksen
May 5, 1953

Dear . . .

I presume by now it has come to your attention that federal rent control was extended to August 1 as a compromise between the termination date in existing law and the date of October 31, which was carried in the amended Defense Production Act as reported by the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency.

I feel reasonably certain that this will wind up federal control of rents except for critical defense areas as defined in existing law.

Sincerely,

Everett McKinley Dirksen
June 24, 1953

Dear ...:

I appreciate your recent communication with respect to rent control. I have tried from the very beginning to adhere to what I regarded as a consistent course, namely, that rent control is not a proper federal function and that its very enforcement is a costly and bureaucratic proceeding which admits of too many inequities and injustices since it must be directed so far from home.

I have no quarrel with any state that undertakes this kind of a function, such as New York and others, but I have always resisted the idea of federal control of rents on a number of grounds, including the fact that rents are not invested with an interstate commerce character.

I know, of course, that there are many who take exception to this viewpoint, but it represents a conviction from which I have never relented.

Sincerely,

Everett McKinley Dirksen