

THOMAS L. ROBINSON, Publisher
J. E. DOWD, General Manager
B. G. CRITCHFIELD, Executive Editor
C. A. MCNEIGHT, Editor

FRIDAY, APRIL 18, 1952

WANTED — GENERAL ASSEMBLY CANDIDATES

ARE THERE but five persons in Mecklenburg County who will offer to serve in the General Assembly? Tomorrow at 6 P. M. is the deadline for filing in the County Board of Elections Office in the Court Arcade, with four checks to be filled, all but one of the candidates will be elected unless others file. The five nominees include some capable men. Possibly from them four good legislators will be elected. But certainly the odds for obtaining good Representatives would increase if the field is broadened. Some men would like to run but have decided not to because of their regular work and the small amount of pay legislators receive. Their \$12 1/2 day is usually insufficient to pay hotel, food and incidental bills and transportation costs to and from Raleigh, let alone maintain a family or compensate for time away from work. Comparatively it is much smaller than the modest salary received by County Commissioners, who get \$50 a month plus travel expenses, but live at home and keep up their usual work while devoting a relatively small amount of time to their county office. The fact that thirteen candidates have announced for the four Commission jobs (excluding the chairman-ship, which pays \$7,250 for full-time work) shows the importance of these several offices, which discourage men from running for the General Assembly. But certainly a county of almost 200,000 population has more than five persons will-

ing (to use the old phrase, quite proper in this instance) to "make the sacrifice". The community needs its best men in Raleigh. The legislators have the power to sincerely hope that several Mecklenburg citizens will choose to accept that privilege and duty, and make themselves available for these four important jobs today or tomorrow. The reasoning behind the modest remuneration for many government jobs, particularly on the state and local levels, is that public office is a privilege and duty. Realizing that legislative service in most cases results in financial loss to the individual, the State and local legislatures are citizens will choose to accept that privilege and duty, and make themselves available for these four important jobs today or tomorrow.

DULL CLUB

THE South Carolina Republicans held their convention in Columbia Wednesday. An official read the names of nominees. There was no opposition for any office. Candidates were unanimously elected. Then the presiding official handed the names of the list, prepared of course before the election, from which he had read. It was written in the past tense: "So-and-so was elected chairman. So-and-so was elected treasurer, etc." Thus the formality was accomplished. Thus the Republican Party in South Carolina, as in most of the South, continues to be nothing but a club. And what a dull one.

WAVE THEM ALL

THE Daughters of the American Revolution are on the march again. It seems that Admiral McCormick, who heads up NATO's fleet, boistered the NATO flag and, the DAR says, hailed down the U. S. flag, right here in the U. S. So the Daughters, by a vote of about 2,000 to one, asked for a Congressional investigation. Our national sovereignty, they feel, again is threatened. We're proud of Old Glory. Like to see her flying. But ladies, look around. We gave up, or shared, or pointed or where you choose to call it a little sea-ineering when the Allied troops stormed Normandy beach. Good thing we did too—going it alone gets tough. General Eisenhower, when he took over his SHIAPE job, said he was now "one

CHEAP MONEY, WELL USED

CONGRESS permitting, the Charlotte Housing Authority will set a \$6 million housing authority bond issue. The steady moderate flow of new issues into the bond market for municipal improvements continues, throughout North Carolina. During the last three months or thereabouts housing bond issues included Greensboro—\$1,785,000 and \$7,535,000, Raleigh—\$1,437,000, and Winston-Salem—\$6,271,000. And municipal improvement issues included Lenoir—\$200,000, Roanoke—\$400,000, and \$2,540,000 and \$2,433,000, Goldsboro—\$800,000, Brunson—\$180,000, Gastonia—

\$1,350,000 and \$250,000, Thomasville—\$450,000, Laurinburg—\$550,000, Andrews—\$140,000, Bassett—\$100,000, Tarboro—\$625,000, Madison—\$100,000, North Wilkesboro—\$1,250,000, Salisbury—\$800,000 and \$100,000, Kernersville—\$200,000, Mt. Airy—\$575,000, Concord—\$470,000, Rocky Mount—\$1,250,000 and \$400,000—\$475,000. The interest rates ranged from 14.037 to 2.6654 per cent, and the maturities ranged from five to 21 years. That is cheap money. That is the money that is being put to use in housing and a lot of municipal improvement in the state.

From The Richmond News-Letter

'YOUR OPS' AND ITS BLUE-EYED ECONOMISTS

SOME strange new economists are being employed by the Office of Price Stabilization to beat the market down. They're steady these days. At a time when clothing, furniture, television sets, shoes and many food items are selling from ten to 30 per cent below ceiling prices, the price agency is engaged in a full-scale campaign to drive down public OPS-consumers. Such well-known economists as Bob Hope, Vocalist Martha Tilton and Hank Thompson, leader of a hillbilly band, are busy telling the folks that it is time that everybody can fight the battle to keep prices stable. In the event the consumer hasn't had his radio turned on lately, OPS is all set to catch his eye: it has issued 300,000 cards for placement in buses and streets, 64,000 billboard posters (in three sizes) and a million display posters to be put up in stores. All this is in the interest of promoting price control (which is the only way to get out of this kicking price control out of the window) but it is just possible that the OPS also is keeping itself before the public because, unless Congress gives it a new lease on life, the agency will go out of business June 30. If that happens a lot of people will be thrown out of work. The New York office of OPS alone, for example, has on its payroll 33 attorneys, 41 accountants, 23 public information officers, 22 clerks, 100 inspectors, 290 price enforcement officers, 284 price division workers and 157 personnel, budget and finance employees—but more manpower is needed.

are either amendments to previous regulations or amendments to supplementary regulations. For example, General Ceiling Price Regulation, Supplementary Regulation 96, dated April 7, adjusting the ceiling prices on decorative Christmas tree lighting sets, came in this week. It was released, however, probably by a communication headed "Decorative Christmas Tree Lighting Sets: Ceiling Price Regulation 22, Amendment '45," which amended Appendix A of the GPCR. GPCR provides that a manufacturer's price may not sell at a price in excess of his GPCR ceiling price until 15 days after filing an OPS Public Form No. 8 which shows the higher ceiling prices. This was followed by yet another communication headed "Deletion of Decorative Christmas Tree Lighting Sets: Ceiling Price Regulation 22, Supplemental Regulation 12, Amendment '3," in which "supplemental regulation 12, Amendment '3" was deleted. To keep all this straight requires the services of a large number of people in OPS. It also requires the attention of personnel in mercantile enterprises which would be delighted if the heavy paper work necessitated by OPS regulations could be dispensed with.

The Richmond District OPS office has 75 employees—although it is entitled to 79, that figure being based on the number of local retail outlets, density of population "and other factors"—including three in the director's office, 30 in the price operating branch, two in accounting, three in the legal department, two in information, 30 in enforcement and eight in management. The OPS headquarters in Washington is reported to be swamped with work, and although few new price orders have been issued recently it is not hard to see why. Since March 30 the agency will go out on 45 price communications from OPS; three of these are new ceiling price regulations. The rest

of the "your OPS" is running to about \$69 million for the current fiscal year, which seems pretty high for machinery to control below-ceiling prices. Under the circumstances the consumers could get along without those billboards, car cards and such economists as Miss Tilton, whose pretty blue eyes wouldn't know a CPR from a hole in the ground. The first page ever printed is on display at the Gutenberg Museum. That's the one everybody wants to get their news item on—Elinor Westcott (Ky.) News. The smallest package I know is a man all wrapped up in himself—Ivys Clark, Chattanooga (Tenn.) News-Free Press.

There are many ways to commit suicide; try worrying.—Cairo (Ga.) Messenger.

Always Glad To Loan My Neighbor A Shovel'

Russell's Record

The Man Of The South

By ROLAND SAWYER



The above cartoon by Herblock (Herbert L. Block) has won for him a Sigma Delta Chi Award for outstanding newspaper work during 1951. This is the fourth consecutive year that Herbblock, whose cartoons appear regularly in The News, has been honored by the national journalism fraternity. He received the Sigma Delta Chi awards for cartooning in 1949 and 1950, and was given a special citation award last year. He has also received Pulitzer Prizes, the National Headliners Award and the Heywood Brown Award, Editors, The News.

Protest Rises Against The GOP's Southern Hierarchy

By RALPH MCGILL, Editor, The Atlanta Constitution. The strongly conservative Charleston News and Courier, which greatly admires Senator Taft, and which for years remained on the brink of secession because of the late rankin D. Roosevelt, is now less seriously upset by the steam-roller bossism of the Southern GOP state organization and the tactics employed against those South Carolinians seeking to support Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower, said the Courier: "As of today, although tens of thousands of South Carolinians are discussed the possibility of voting for the Republican presidential candidate, not more than a handful have become actively associated with the State Republican Party. Why? One answer could be that while national Republican Party policies and leaders now are acceptable to a growing number of South Carolinians, the State Republican Party policies and leaders are not."

PLANS. Prior to the National Committee to have come from Louisiana, Tennessee, Virginia, Alabama, South Carolina and Georgia. The forces have been thrown out of meetings, locked out, shouted down and otherwise harassed. But they still are fighting. So boss-ridden have been the small state GOP organizations, and so unrepresentative of the attitude of national committees, that not until eight years ago was any real reform attempted. Most of the progress has been in Florida and Georgia. But it is by no means complete there. The Senator had felt critical of the British economy even before in 1945. Great, during the war, had cautioned that the United States "should keep close check on the expensive tools of war we are sending out." He was referring in this instance particularly to Britain, and the remark stung the British. At that early date, the Senator seems to have felt that the British were working in a way that was remark foredoomed somewhat his vote against the British loan.

Any representative from a state which lies in the heart of a region that a decade ago was almost uniformly called "economic problem area" might be entitled to feel that social and economic problems at home should get priority over Point Four. Since World War II there has been far less talk of that and a certain amount of economic leadership, along with its neighboring states. Even so, continued pull for economic assistance remains stronger than Point Four upon a Senator from any state which still has a Negro population as heavy as that of Georgia, South Carolina, Alabama, or Mississippi. Likewise, the Senator's conservatism has been apparent in his consistent opposition to lowering immigration bars to permit Europe's displaced persons to enter the United States after World War II. Senator Russell, after a long DP legislation when the bill was in committee in 1946 as establishing a "dangerous precedent," his view has not changed measurably. In a crisis such as that confronting India in 1951, when American views on independence as heavy as Russell's internationalism comes to the fore. He vetoed for the ship-loads of wheat to India, on a loan basis. Senator Russell's position as both a parliamentarian and an expert on foreign affairs was clearly established by 1951 when he presided over the long intense hearings into the ouster of Gen. Douglas MacArthur. The Senator's astuteness had almost forecast this event as a coup.

WHY LOAN TO INDIA. In a crisis such as that confronting India in 1951, when American views on independence as heavy as Russell's internationalism comes to the fore. He vetoed for the ship-loads of wheat to India, on a loan basis. Senator Russell's position as both a parliamentarian and an expert on foreign affairs was clearly established by 1951 when he presided over the long intense hearings into the ouster of Gen. Douglas MacArthur. The Senator's astuteness had almost forecast this event as a coup. His clearest explanation of this vote came in 1947, when he reported that "British financial system is not equipped for the modern machine age." But he estimated that "the British economy is not an Anglophone, for he urged that England, Scotland, Ireland, and Wales be treated as separate nations, and that the United States as four new states, a proposition that caused an immediate and sharp reaction. Senator Russell saw World War II approaching sooner than most on Capitol Hill. He voted to end the arms embargo in 1939, voted for Selective Service in 1940, and joined with his senior Georgia colleague, Sen. Walter F. George, in supporting the Lend-Lease program in 1941. He was the first to support the administration, except on the British loan, working hard for the United States participation in the United Nations, and, after the war, voting for the Bretton Woods monetary agreement, for the Marshall Plan, and for the present Mutual Assistance Program. He is a strong advocate of universal military training. DISLIKES POINT FOUR. Sen. Russell has long been an internationalist in this indisputable. It is not representative, in the eyes of voting Americans, that not only his British loan vote shows, Dick Russell, for instance, is not happy over the fact that a strong advocate of economy, dating from his days as Governor of Virginia, has been established what is still the administrative blueprint of the state. Sen. Russell has long been a Point Four appropriations on this ground. His dimity at methods of distributing the money for Point Four during World War II is reflected again in his concern that pressed foreign aid for the periphery of Point Four, should be most judiciously watched. If this seems like straining at gnats while the camels of military spending are swallowed, one should recall that Senator Russell's home state is Georgia.

RICHARD B. RUSSELL

sequence of his trip round the world in 1943. On this he reported, upon return: "If our nation has a definite policy, which extends beyond six months after the conclusion of the war, I was unable to find anyone among our officers abroad who could define it. He also said, in September, 1945: "Present policies are continued, we are headed for complete failure in the Orient." PRESIDING OFFICER. General MacArthur was fired out of the wide breach that grew up between him and President Truman on Far Eastern policy. That is all as readily apparent to the senator. When Senator Russell's big moment came to display his powers as a presiding officer and parliamentarian in the MacArthur hearings he rose fully to the mandate, if the praise be received for anything he has done. He is a man who speaks with discolor and disagreement. Yet, Senator Russell, presiding day after day as chairman of the Senate Committee on Governmental Operations, emerged with almost universal thanks for his judicious judgment of all who testified. The same regularity mixed with independence marks Dick Russell's conduct as well as foreign policy. He stands before the nation as a distributing of the money for Point Four nomination as the father of the Farm Commodities Price Support Program in 1939, and as the pillar of American agricultural prosperity. Likewise, he stands as a farmer's Senator in matters such as flood control, soil conservation, and public works. He has been a generation and distribution by such instruments as the Tennessee Val-

Congressional Quiz

Q—Does the Federal order to channel more defense business to areas where unemployment is high mean the Government will pay more for military goods? A—Officials say no, since contracts still will go to the lowest bidder. The Office of Defense Mobilization order February 7 was intended to help labor surplus areas by giving manufacturers there a second "rush" at getting government contracts. Under that policy, contracts are awarded on a negotiated bid instead of a sealed bid basis and contractors in unemployment regions are given a chance to meet a better price offered elsewhere.

Drew Pearson's Merry-Go-Round

WASHINGTON. My old friend Jimmie Byrnes, the much-loved Senator from South Carolina, has released a series of letters between himself and President Truman which puts me right in the middle. In fact, I am almost sure that I helped to touch-off the current Truman-Byrnes hassle. One of the Truman letters to Byrnes, published today, states the usual Trumanite references to me. This is not exactly news. To make it news, Mr. Truman would have to say something nice about me. That would be in this letter he tells Byrnes: "I don't read Mr. Pearson or listen to him. I don't think he ever told the truth intentionally." But this letter was published by me in a column of Dec. 17, 1949, which makes that part of it even less news today. However, what now has become definite news is that Byrnes, in writing several years ago, helped to touch-off the current Truman-Byrnes hassle. In this letter he tells Byrnes: "I don't read Mr. Pearson or listen to him. I don't think he ever told the truth intentionally." But this letter was published by me in a column of Dec. 17, 1949, which makes that part of it even less news today. However, what now has become definite news is that Byrnes, in writing several years ago, helped to touch-off the current Truman-Byrnes hassle. In this letter he tells Byrnes: "I don't read Mr. Pearson or listen to him. I don't think he ever told the truth intentionally." But this letter was published by me in a column of Dec. 17, 1949, which makes that part of it even less news today. However, what now has become definite news is that Byrnes, in writing several years ago, helped to touch-off the current Truman-Byrnes hassle. In this letter he tells Byrnes: "I don't read Mr. Pearson or listen to him. I don't think he ever told the truth intentionally." But this letter was published by me in a column of Dec. 17, 1949, which makes that part of it even less news today. However, what now has become definite news is that Byrnes, in writing several years ago, helped to touch-off the current Truman-Byrnes hassle. In this letter he tells Byrnes: "I don't read Mr. Pearson or listen to him. I don't think he ever told the truth intentionally." But this letter was published by me in a column of Dec. 17, 1949, which makes that part of it even less news today. However, what now has become definite news is that Byrnes, in writing several years ago, helped to touch-off the current Truman-Byrnes hassle. In this letter he tells Byrnes: "I don't read Mr. Pearson or listen to him. I don't think he ever told the truth intentionally." But this letter was published by me in a column of Dec. 17, 1949, which makes that part of it even less news today. However, what now has become definite news is that Byrnes, in writing several years ago, helped to touch-off the current Truman-Byrnes hassle. In this letter he tells Byrnes: "I don't read Mr. Pearson or listen to him. I don't think he ever told the truth intentionally." But this letter was published by me in a column of Dec. 17, 1949, which makes that part of it even less news today. However, what now has become definite news is that Byrnes, in writing several years ago, helped to touch-off the current Truman-Byrnes hassle. In this letter he tells Byrnes: "I don't read Mr. Pearson or listen to him. I don't think he ever told the truth intentionally." But this letter was published by me in a column of Dec. 17, 1949, which makes that part of it even less news today. However, what now has become definite news is that Byrnes, in writing several years ago, helped to touch-off the current Truman-Byrnes hassle. In this letter he tells Byrnes: "I don't read Mr. Pearson or listen to him. I don't think he ever told the truth intentionally." But this letter was published by me in a column of Dec. 17, 1949, which makes that part of it even less news today. However, what now has become definite news is that Byrnes, in writing several years ago, helped to touch-off the current Truman-Byrnes hassle. In this letter he tells Byrnes: "I don't read Mr. Pearson or listen to him. I don't think he ever told the truth intentionally." But this letter was published by me in a column of Dec. 17, 1949, which makes that part of it even less news today. However, what now has become definite news is that Byrnes, in writing several years ago, helped to touch-off the current Truman-Byrnes hassle. In this letter he tells Byrnes: "I don't read Mr. Pearson or listen to him. I don't think he ever told the truth intentionally." But this letter was published by me in a column of Dec. 17, 1949, which makes that part of it even less news today. However, what now has become definite news is that Byrnes, in writing several years ago, helped to touch-off the current Truman-Byrnes hassle. In this letter he tells Byrnes: "I don't read Mr. Pearson or listen to him. I don't think he ever told the truth intentionally." But this letter was published by me in a column of Dec. 17, 1949, which makes that part of it even less news today. However, what now has become definite news is that Byrnes, in writing several years ago, helped to touch-off the current Truman-Byrnes hassle. In this letter he tells Byrnes: "I don't read Mr. Pearson or listen to him. I don't think he ever told the truth intentionally." But this letter was published by me in a column of Dec. 17, 1949, which makes that part of it even less news today. However, what now has become definite news is that Byrnes, in writing several years ago, helped to touch-off the current Truman-Byrnes hassle. In this letter he tells Byrnes: "I don't read Mr. Pearson or listen to him. I don't think he ever told the truth intentionally." But this letter was published by me in a column of Dec. 17, 1949, which makes that part of it even less news today. However, what now has become definite news is that Byrnes, in writing several years ago, helped to touch-off the current Truman-Byrnes hassle. In this letter he tells Byrnes: "I don't read Mr. Pearson or listen to him. I don't think he ever told the truth intentionally." But this letter was published by me in a column of Dec. 17, 1949, which makes that part of it even less news today. However, what now has become definite news is that Byrnes, in writing several years ago, helped to touch-off the current Truman-Byrnes hassle. In this letter he tells Byrnes: "I don't read Mr. Pearson or listen to him. I don't think he ever told the truth intentionally." But this letter was published by me in a column of Dec. 17, 1949, which makes that part of it even less news today. However, what now has become definite news is that Byrnes, in writing several years ago, helped to touch-off the current Truman-Byrnes hassle. In this letter he tells Byrnes: "I don't read Mr. Pearson or listen to him. I don't think he ever told the truth intentionally." But this letter was published by me in a column of Dec. 17, 1949, which makes that part of it even less news today. However, what now has become definite news is that Byrnes, in writing several years ago, helped to touch-off the current Truman-Byrnes hassle. In this letter he tells Byrnes: "I don't read Mr. Pearson or listen to him. I don't think he ever told the truth intentionally." But this letter was published by me in a column of Dec. 17, 1949, which makes that part of it even less news today. However, what now has become definite news is that Byrnes, in writing several years ago, helped to touch-off the current Truman-Byrnes hassle. In this letter he tells Byrnes: "I don't read Mr. Pearson or listen to him. I don't think he ever told the truth intentionally." But this letter was published by me in a column of Dec. 17, 1949, which makes that part of it even less news today. However, what now has become definite news is that Byrnes, in writing several years ago, helped to touch-off the current Truman-Byrnes hassle. In this letter he tells Byrnes: "I don't read Mr. Pearson or listen to him. I don't think he ever told the truth intentionally." But this letter was published by me in a column of Dec. 17, 1949, which makes that part of it even less news today. However, what now has become definite news is that Byrnes, in writing several years ago, helped to touch-off the current Truman-Byrnes hassle. In this letter he tells Byrnes: "I don't read Mr. Pearson or listen to him. I don't think he ever told the truth intentionally." But this letter was published by me in a column of Dec. 17, 1949, which makes that part of it even less news today. However, what now has become definite news is that Byrnes, in writing several years ago, helped to touch-off the current Truman-Byrnes hassle. In this letter he tells Byrnes: "I don't read Mr. Pearson or listen to him. I don't think he ever told the truth intentionally." But this letter was published by me in a column of Dec. 17, 1949, which makes that part of it even less news today. However, what now has become definite news is that Byrnes, in writing several years ago, helped to touch-off the current Truman-Byrnes hassle. In this letter he tells Byrnes: "I don't read Mr. Pearson or listen to him. I don't think he ever told the truth intentionally." But this letter was published by me in a column of Dec. 17, 1949, which makes that part of it even less news today. However, what now has become definite news is that Byrnes, in writing several years ago, helped to touch-off the current Truman-Byrnes hassle. In this letter he tells Byrnes: "I don't read Mr. Pearson or listen to him. I don't think he ever told the truth intentionally." But this letter was published by me in a column of Dec. 17, 1949, which makes that part of it even less news today. However, what now has become definite news is that Byrnes, in writing several years ago, helped to touch-off the current Truman-Byrnes hassle. In this letter he tells Byrnes: "I don't read Mr. Pearson or listen to him. I don't think he ever told the truth intentionally." But this letter was published by me in a column of Dec. 17, 1949, which makes that part of it even less news today. However, what now has become definite news is that Byrnes, in writing several years ago, helped to touch-off the current Truman-Byrnes hassle. In this letter he tells Byrnes: "I don't read Mr. Pearson or listen to him. I don't think he ever told the truth intentionally." But this letter was published by me in a column of Dec. 17, 1949, which makes that part of it even less news today. However, what now has become definite news is that Byrnes, in writing several years ago, helped to touch-off the current Truman-Byrnes hassle. In this letter he tells Byrnes: "I don't read Mr. Pearson or listen to him. I don't think he ever told the truth intentionally." But this letter was published by me in a column of Dec. 17, 1949, which makes that part of it even less news today. However, what now has become definite news is that Byrnes, in writing several years ago, helped to touch-off the current Truman-Byrnes hassle. In this letter he tells Byrnes: "I don't read Mr. Pearson or listen to him. I don't think he ever told the truth intentionally." But this letter was published by me in a column of Dec. 17, 1949, which makes that part of it even less news today. However, what now has become definite news is that Byrnes, in writing several years ago, helped to touch-off the current Truman-Byrnes hassle. In this letter he tells Byrnes: "I don't read Mr. Pearson or listen to him. I don't think he ever told the truth intentionally." But this letter was published by me in a column of Dec. 17, 1949, which makes that part of it even less news today. However, what now has become definite news is that Byrnes, in writing several years ago, helped to touch-off the current Truman-Byrnes hassle. In this letter he tells Byrnes: "I don't read Mr. Pearson or listen to him. I don't think he ever told the truth intentionally." But this letter was published by me in a column of Dec. 17, 1949, which makes that part of it even less news today. However, what now has become definite news is that Byrnes, in writing several years ago, helped to touch-off the current Truman-Byrnes hassle. In this letter he tells Byrnes: "I don't read Mr. Pearson or listen to him. I don't think he ever told the truth intentionally." But this letter was published by me in a column of Dec. 17, 1949, which makes that part of it even less news today. However, what now has become definite news is that Byrnes, in writing several years ago, helped to touch-off the current Truman-Byrnes hassle. In this letter he tells Byrnes: "I don't read Mr. Pearson or listen to him. I don't think he ever told the truth intentionally." But this letter was published by me in a column of Dec. 17, 1949, which makes that part of it even less news today. However, what now has become definite news is that Byrnes, in writing several years ago, helped to touch-off the current Truman-Byrnes hassle. In this letter he tells Byrnes: "I don't read Mr. Pearson or listen to him. I don't think he ever told the truth intentionally." But this letter was published by me in a column of Dec. 17, 1949, which makes that part of it even less news today. However, what now has become definite news is that Byrnes, in writing several years ago, helped to touch-off the current Truman-Byrnes hassle. In this letter he tells Byrnes: "I don't read Mr. Pearson or listen to him. I don't think he ever told the truth intentionally." But this letter was published by me in a column of Dec. 17, 1949, which makes that part of it even less news today. However, what now has become definite news is that Byrnes, in writing several years ago, helped to touch-off the current Truman-Byrnes hassle. In this letter he tells Byrnes: "I don't read Mr. Pearson or listen to him. I don't think he ever told the truth intentionally." But this letter was published by me in a column of Dec. 17, 1949, which makes that part of it even less news today. However, what now has become definite news is that Byrnes, in writing several years ago, helped to touch-off the current Truman-Byrnes hassle. In this letter he tells Byrnes: "I don't read Mr. Pearson or listen to him. I don't think he ever told the truth intentionally." But this letter was published by me in a column of Dec. 17, 1949, which makes that part of it even less news today. However, what now has become definite news is that Byrnes, in writing several years ago, helped to touch-off the current Truman-Byrnes hassle. In this letter he tells Byrnes: "I don't read Mr. Pearson or listen to him. I don't think he ever told the truth intentionally." But this letter was published by me in a column of Dec. 17, 1949, which makes that part of it even less news today. However, what now has become definite news is that Byrnes, in writing several years ago, helped to touch-off the current Truman-Byrnes hassle. In this letter he tells Byrnes: "I don't read Mr. Pearson or listen to him. I don't think he ever told the truth intentionally." But this letter was published by me in a column of Dec. 17, 1949, which makes that part of it even less news today. However, what now has become definite news is that Byrnes, in writing several years ago, helped to touch-off the current Truman-Byrnes hassle. In this letter he tells Byrnes: "I don't read Mr. Pearson or listen to him. I don't think he ever told the truth intentionally." But this letter was published by me in a column of Dec. 17, 1949, which makes that part of it even less news today. However, what now has become definite news is that Byrnes, in writing several years ago, helped to touch-off the current Truman-Byrnes hassle. In this letter he tells Byrnes: "I don't read Mr. Pearson or listen to him. I don't think he ever told the truth intentionally." But this letter was published by me in a column of Dec. 17, 1949, which makes that part of it even less news today. However, what now has become definite news is that Byrnes, in writing several years ago, helped to touch-off the current Truman-Byrnes hassle. In this letter he tells Byrnes: "I don't read Mr. Pearson or listen to him. I don't think he ever told the truth intentionally." But this letter was published by me in a column of Dec. 17, 1949, which makes that part of it even less news today. However, what now has become definite news is that Byrnes, in writing several years ago, helped to touch-off the current Truman-Byrnes hassle. In this letter he tells Byrnes: "I don't read Mr. Pearson or listen to him. I don't think he ever told the truth intentionally." But this letter was published by me in a column of Dec. 17, 1949, which makes that part of it even less news today. However, what now has become definite news is that Byrnes, in writing several years ago, helped to touch-off the current Truman-Byrnes hassle. In this letter he tells Byrnes: "I don't read Mr. Pearson or listen to him. I don't think he ever told the truth intentionally." But this letter was published by me in a column of Dec. 17, 1949, which makes that part of it even less news today. However, what now has become definite news is that Byrnes, in writing several years ago, helped to touch-off the current Truman-Byrnes hassle. In this letter he tells Byrnes: "I don't read Mr. Pearson or listen to him. I don't think he ever told the truth intentionally." But this letter was published by me in a column of Dec. 17, 1949, which makes that part of it even less news today. However, what now has become definite news is that Byrnes, in writing several years ago, helped to touch-off the current Truman-Byrnes hassle. In this letter he tells Byrnes: "I don't read Mr. Pearson or listen to him. I don't think he ever told the truth intentionally." But this letter was published by me in a column of Dec. 17, 1949, which makes that part of it even less news today. However, what now has become definite news is that Byrnes, in writing several years ago, helped to touch-off the current Truman-Byrnes hassle. In this letter he tells Byrnes: "I don't read Mr. Pearson or listen to him. I don't think he ever told the truth intentionally." But this letter was published by me in a column of Dec. 17, 1949, which makes that part of it even less news today. However, what now has become definite news is that Byrnes, in writing several years ago, helped to touch-off the current Truman-Byrnes hassle. In this letter he tells Byrnes: "I don't read Mr. Pearson or listen to him. I don't think he ever told the truth intentionally." But this letter was published by me in a column of Dec. 17, 1949, which makes that part of it even less news today. However, what now has become definite news is that Byrnes, in writing several years ago, helped to touch-off the current Truman-Byrnes hassle. In this letter he tells Byrnes: "I don't read Mr. Pearson or listen to him. I don't think he ever told the truth intentionally." But this letter was published by me in a column of Dec. 17, 1949, which makes that part of it even less news today. However, what now has become definite news is that Byrnes, in writing several years ago, helped to touch-off the current Truman-Byrnes hassle. In this letter he tells Byrnes: "I don't read Mr. Pearson or listen to him. I don't think he ever told the truth intentionally." But this letter was published by me in a column of Dec. 17, 1949, which makes that part of it even less news today. However, what now has become definite news is that Byrnes, in writing several years ago, helped to touch-off the current Truman-Byrnes hassle. In this letter he tells Byrnes: "I don't read Mr. Pearson or listen to him. I don't think he ever told the truth intentionally." But this letter was published by me in a column of Dec. 17, 1949, which makes that part of it even less news today. However, what now has become definite news is that Byrnes, in writing several years ago, helped to touch-off the current Truman-Byrnes hassle. In this letter he tells Byrnes: "I don't read Mr. Pearson or listen to him. I don't think he ever told the truth intentionally." But this letter was published by me in a column of Dec. 17, 1949, which makes that part of it even less news today. However, what now has become definite news is that Byrnes, in writing several years ago, helped to touch-off the current Truman-Byrnes hassle. In this letter he tells Byrnes: "I don't read Mr. Pearson or listen to him. I don't think he ever told the truth intentionally." But this letter was published by me in a column of Dec. 17, 1949, which makes that part of it even less news today. However, what now has become definite news is that Byrnes, in writing several years ago, helped to touch-off the current Truman-Byrnes hassle. In this letter he tells Byrnes: "I don't read Mr. Pearson or listen to him. I don't think he ever told the truth intentionally." But this letter was published by me in a column of Dec. 17, 1949, which makes that part of it even less news today. However, what now has become definite news is that Byrnes, in writing several years ago, helped to touch-off the current Truman-Byrnes hassle. In this letter he tells Byrnes: "I don't read Mr. Pearson or listen to him. I don't think he ever told the truth intentionally." But this letter was published by me in a column of Dec. 17, 1949, which makes that part of it even less news today. However, what now has become definite news is that Byrnes, in writing several years ago, helped to touch-off the current Truman-Byrnes hassle. In this letter he tells Byrnes: "I don't read Mr. Pearson or listen to him. I don't think he ever told the truth intentionally." But this letter was published by me in a column of Dec. 17, 1949, which makes that part of it even less news today. However, what now has become definite news is that Byrnes, in writing several years ago, helped to touch-off the current Truman-Byrnes hassle. In this letter he tells Byrnes: "I don't read Mr. Pearson or listen to him. I don't think he ever told the truth intentionally." But this letter was published by me in a column of Dec. 17, 1949, which makes that part of it even less news today. However, what now has become definite news is that Byrnes, in writing several years ago, helped to touch-off the current Truman-Byrnes hassle. In this letter he tells Byrnes: "I don't read Mr. Pearson or listen to him. I don't think he ever told the truth intentionally." But this letter was published by me in a column of Dec. 17, 1949, which makes that part of it even less news today. However, what now has become definite news is that Byrnes, in writing several years ago, helped to touch-off the current Truman-Byrnes hassle. In this letter he tells Byrnes: "I don't read Mr. Pearson or listen to him. I don't think he ever told the truth intentionally." But this letter was published by me in a column of Dec. 17, 1949, which makes that part of it even less news today. However, what now has become definite news is that Byrnes, in writing several years ago, helped to touch-off the current Truman-Byrnes hassle. In this letter he tells Byrnes: "I don't read Mr. Pearson or listen to him. I don't think he ever told the truth intentionally." But this letter was published by me in a column of Dec. 17, 1949, which makes that part of it even less news today. However, what now has become definite news is that Byrnes, in writing several years ago, helped to touch-off the current Truman-Byrnes hassle. In this letter he tells Byrnes: "I don't read Mr. Pearson or listen to him. I don't think he ever told the truth intentionally." But this letter was published by me in a column of Dec. 17, 1949, which makes that part of it even less news today. However, what now has become definite news is that Byrnes, in writing several years ago, helped to touch-off the current Truman-Byrnes hassle. In this letter he tells Byrnes: "I don't read Mr. Pearson or listen to him. I don't think he ever told the truth intentionally." But this letter was published by me in a column of Dec. 17, 1949, which makes that part of it even less news today. However, what now has become definite news is that Byrnes, in writing several years ago, helped to touch-off the current Truman-Byrnes hassle. In this letter he tells Byrnes: "I don't read Mr. Pearson or listen to him. I don't think he ever told the truth intentionally." But this letter was published by me in a column of Dec. 17, 1949, which makes that part of it even less news today. However, what now has become definite news is that Byrnes, in writing several years ago, helped to touch-off the current Truman-Byrnes hassle. In this letter he tells Byrnes: "I don't read Mr. Pearson or listen to him. I don't think he ever told the truth intentionally." But this letter was published by me in a column of Dec. 17, 1949, which makes that part of it even less news today. However, what now has become definite news is that Byrnes, in writing several years ago, helped to touch-off the current Truman-Byrnes hassle. In this letter he tells Byrnes: "I don't read Mr. Pearson or listen to him. I don't think he ever told the truth intentionally." But this letter was published by me in a column of Dec. 17, 1949, which makes that part of it even less news today. However, what now has become definite news is that Byrnes, in writing several years ago, helped to touch-off the current Truman-Byrnes hassle. In this letter he tells Byrnes: "I don't read Mr. Pearson or listen to him. I don't think he ever told the truth intentionally." But this letter was published by me in a column of Dec. 17, 1949, which makes that part of it even less news today. However, what now has become definite news is that Byrnes, in writing several years ago, helped to touch-off the current Truman-Byrnes hassle. In this letter he tells Byrnes: "I don't read Mr. Pearson or listen to him. I don't think he ever told the truth intentionally." But this letter was published by me in a column of Dec. 17, 1949, which makes that part of it even less news today. However, what now has become definite news is that Byrnes, in writing several years ago, helped to touch-off the current Truman-Byrnes hassle. In this letter he tells Byrnes: "I don't read Mr. Pearson or listen to him. I don't think he ever told the truth intentionally." But this letter was published by me in a column of Dec. 17, 1949, which makes that part of it even less news today. However, what now has become definite news is that Byrnes, in writing several years ago, helped to touch-off the current Truman-Byrnes hassle. In this letter he tells Byrnes: "I don't read Mr. Pearson or listen to him. I don't think he ever told the truth intentionally." But this letter was published by me in a column of Dec. 17, 1949, which makes that part of it even less news today. However, what now has become definite news is that Byrnes, in writing several years ago, helped to touch-off the current Truman-Byrnes hassle. In this letter he tells Byrnes: "I don't read Mr. Pearson or listen to him. I don't think he ever told the truth intentionally." But this letter was published by me in a column of Dec. 17, 1949, which makes that part of it even less news today. However, what now has become definite news is that Byrnes, in writing several years ago, helped to touch-off the current Truman-Byrnes hassle. In this letter he tells Byrnes: "I don't read Mr. Pearson or listen to him. I don't think he ever told the truth intentionally." But this letter was published by me in a column of Dec. 17, 1949, which makes that part of it even less news today. However, what now has become definite news is that Byrnes, in writing several years ago, helped to touch-off the current Truman-Byrnes hassle. In this letter he tells Byrnes: "I don't read Mr. Pearson or listen to him. I don't think he ever told the truth intentionally." But this letter was published by me in a column of Dec. 17, 1949, which makes that part of it even less news today. However, what now has become definite news is that Byrnes, in writing several years ago, helped to touch-off the current Truman-Byrnes hassle.