

with my fingers crossed. Looking into the crystal ball reminds me of those distorted mirrors in a fun palace at the beach. In one you look skinny; in another you look fat; but it's the same you all the time that appears to assume several different shapes. You cannot help but laugh at these lopsided reflections of your true self.

When we turn from recreation to the more serious matters of life, we know that something of the same process is still at work. Sometimes we see only what we want to see in a given situation, ignoring other details. Trying to peer into the future is more difficult as we try to see with the mind's eye. But this we must do to prepare ourselves for the unknown, even though this combination of foreknowledge and guesswork turns out right only 80 percent of the time. That's a good batting average in any league.

In looking back to the beginning of 1952, I checked the predictions of one service that tried to gage the issues. Under the heading of personalities, or the names of those who would be most prominent in the political news, it mentioned Acheson, Boyle, Truman, McCarthy, MacArthur, and Gabrielson.

Some are still controversial right up to the closing days of this year. A couple fell by the wayside and we have a hard time trying to remember who they were. Others, unmentioned in January of 1952, are now in the news almost every day.

So as we look into the crystal ball for 1953 we know that some names and some issues that cannot be seen there will come into the picture as the year's story develops.

Confining myself to the probable factors, here's how the first session of the new Congress shapes up.

The nominal Republicans are in control by a small margin. Allied with conservative southern Democrats, they will have a much larger majority to work with. There is always a honeymoon period when a new President enters the White House. Congress is disposed to listen to him for a while. In Eisenhower's case, this harmony may continue much longer, because he will not insist on extreme measures.

From his Cabinet selections, we anticipate a businessman's approach to the problems of government. His appointment of an active union leader to the post of Secretary of Labor, on the other hand, shows that he will try to pour oil on the troubled waters of management-labor relations. Ike leans toward a stronger Mediation Service. He believes that there should be more real collective bargaining between the parties and less interference by the White House. How this works out will depend somewhat on the economic climate during his administration.

Some Congressmen, especially Democrats from industrial districts, believe that the Taft-Hartley Act should be repealed. Revision is all that can be hoped for under the new line-up.

On farm aid, the chances are that Congress will have more influence than the White House. Price supports will be maintained at 90 percent of parity as a floor. Rural electrification will continue. The farmers themselves will have more to say on the soil-conservation program. Both parties have a healthy respect for agriculture.

There will be talk from time to time on the issue of civil rights, but I fear that there will not be much progress.

Social security will go on as is. There may be some extension in coverage but no sizable increase in benefits will be approved by the conservative coalition.

An effort will be made to cut taxes, but this won't be easy. As long as Korea and the cold war continue, we cannot afford to penny-pinch our defenses. There will be some overhaul in the tax structure in an attempt to bring some order out of this chaos. Right now, it's like a cross-word puzzle that nobody can solve.

With others, I have been personally interested in securing statehood for Alaska and Hawaii. Conservatives, especially in the Senate, have heretofore blocked the recognition which these Territories deserve. The prospect, with a larger number of conservatives now on hand, is somewhat less than promising.

In the absence of any change in the international field, the draft will go on. As a law it will be effective until June 30, 1955. In my opinion it should be revised because it presently favors certain groups and discriminates against others. There is not enough opposition in sight to force a change in the selective-service law.

Universal military training will be sidestepped. This is not a popular idea.

Only the most necessary public works will be approved. A backlog will be kept in mind, ready for construction at the first sign of any drop in employment.

Controls over prices and materials are on their last legs. Controls over wages don't mean much even now.

Aid to education is a thorny issue. No one doubts the need for it, but where it should begin and where it should stop is a problem that can become very emotional. Congress will go slow on this, perhaps providing Federal construction subsidies only for certain areas in backward States.

Public housing programs will not command much attention. Present plans will continue with some minor revisions, but the need is not as urgent as it was in the post-war years. Slum clearance is always a problem but separate from the over-all housing shortage that has eased considerably.

There will be a slowdown in tariff cutting. We know that foreign trade can never be a one-way street. If we are ever to cut down on the money we give to other free nations in order to keep them going, then we must give them an opportunity to sell some of their products here. But not at the cost of throwing Americans out of work. After all, we cannot be expected to give away our money and our jobs at the same time. Federal policies have hurt some New England industries, without providing any compensatory help. This trend will be stopped.

No TVA's or Federal power-distribution networks are in the cards for New England. This area will be bypassed again, even though appropriations for projects in the West will be approved. Republican leaders from New England will have much influence in the new administration, but what they can and will do for us remains to be seen. In time they will be judged for their success or their neglect. We hope that they will not forget New England.

We thought we had enough investigations during the past year to provide daily copy for our newspapers, but the Republicans will make them look elementary. The Justice Department and the State Department are due for the Sherlock Holmes treatment. No files will be hidden from Congress.

Isolationism will not get far. Most Congressmen know that we must have allies and that we must help them. Foreign aid will continue, but not on a Santa Claus basis with no strings attached. The American people will insist that the aid given be used to the best advantage. Foreign nations will have to learn that they cannot lean on us forever without doing something to help themselves. What we do ask is that they live up to their promises. Foreign aid may be cut a bit just to show them that we mean business.

Likewise no agency of the United States Government will get what it asks on its own say-so. When appropriations are requested a lot of why's will be asked. Military spending will come in for a close look. There is waste here that can be cut out without weakening our build-up. "Show me the real need for it" will be the attitude of the administration and the Congress toward every item in the first budget which, strangely

enough, will be submitted by President Truman early in 1953.

Government has gone so far and so fast during the past 20 years that it's time we took stock as to our position. On the domestic scene there will be few experiments. Moderation will be the cue.

In foreign policy there will be some changes. The State Department is up for an overhaul job. Instead of sitting back waiting for the Communists to make a move and then trying to counter it, our Government will now take the initiative. We will begin to make the first moves and let the Communists do a little worrying for a change.

The Voice of America will stop whispering. We won't be afraid to beam the truth to all the dark places behind the iron curtain. The United States will become stronger militarily, and it will speak out clearly from this position of strength. Arms aid will begin to flow to our allies, beefing them up and giving them more courage. Moscow will have to pull in its horns or risk real trouble. The new administration will not be pushed around by the Communists.

Christmas, the most hopeful season of the year, is just around the corner.

There are many gifts that we could ask for our Government, and not material ones because it seems to be getting all the money and things that it needs. We would ask in all sincerity that it be given character and ability. For the Government of the United States is such a big responsibility that it needs the very best men it can get.

Urgent as that need is, we will not put it first on our list, because there is something else that is much closer to our hearts.

There is one gift above all that we want—one that mankind has been seeking ever since that blessed night 1,953 years ago.

It is peace on earth, good will among men. Although it is not possible to have our men home from Korea and with us on this Christmas, there is reason to hope that the end of that treadmill war is not too many months away.

The men in Korea are not forgotten. We want them to know that.

Perhaps we were tricked into so-called truce negotiations by an enemy who scorns good will and only uses it to gain an advantage. But at least we gave that enemy a chance to cooperate for peace. That he has betrayed it is another crime added to his aggression.

The first thing that our President-elect did was to go to Korea and size up the situation first-hand.

That is the tip-off to the future.

We will not appease, and we will not go on feeding our men into an endless war.

From now on there will be stepped-up pressure against communism everywhere.

The new Congress, backed by public opinion, will work with the administration to make this Nation stronger in every way.

That is the only road to peace.

## Our Liberty Must Be Guarded

### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

## HON. JOHN W. BRICKER

OF OHIO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, January 9, 1953

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record an editorial entitled "Our Liberty Must Be Guarded," published in the Ohio State Journal of December 19, 1952. It deals with Senate

Resolution 1, which I submitted on Wednesday.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

**OUR LIBERTY MUST BE GUARDED**

To Americans their freedom seems indestructible—because they have not known a national life without it. They rely upon the Constitution and the Bill of Rights to protect them. Because the Declaration of Independence speaks of their unalienable rights they are prone to think their liberty cannot be taken away.

Today there is a very real and present threat to the freedom guaranteed to us by our Constitution and its Bill of Rights. It is in the proposed United Nations Covenant on Human Rights which is favored by the State Department under the Truman administration and which in its final form, will come before the United States Senate for ratification as a treaty.

The danger to the freedom of the American people is the danger which confronts our Constitution in general, stemming from a loophole in the Constitution by which the United Nations Charter, having been ratified by the Senate as a treaty, may be held to supersede the Constitution.

In order to limit the scope of treaties in the future and to forestall a loss of American liberty through United Nations covenants and other treaties, Senator JOHN W. BRICKER, of Ohio, several months ago, proposed an amendment to the Constitution of the United States. The Bricker amendment will be one of the most important pieces of business before the new Congress convening in January.

If submitted by Congress and ratified by three-fourths of the States, the Bricker amendment may take its place as one of the great charters of American freedom.

Unless it is adopted, the clock of American freedom may be turned back 176 years and liberty as we have known it be lost to us forever.

Senator BRICKER does not propose that the United States withdraw from the United Nations. He believes it would be a mistake to do so. But he believes that this country must bulwark itself against the loss of liberty through treaties and, further, through executive agreements by which the past two administrations have been circumventing the treaty ratification powers vested in the Senate by the Constitution.

His proposed amendment would provide that "no treaty or executive agreement shall be made respecting the rights of citizens of the United States protected by this Constitution, or abridging or prohibiting the free exercise thereof."

At the time the Constitution of the United States was written, treaties dealt only with relations between nations. They did not attempt to regulate domestic affairs and to define the rights of individuals in various nations. Rights of individuals were fixed by the various governments. The Constitution of the United States was the first written constitution guaranteeing the rights of the people of a nation and it was a great step forward in the history of man.

Therefore, Senator BRICKER points out, there was no reason at the time the Constitution was written to limit the treaty-making powers so as not to affect the freedom of American citizens. It was not conceived that the treaty-making powers would ever touch those freedoms.

But nowadays there is a "new fashion in international law" Senator BRICKER says, which is to the effect that "the relationship among citizens of the same government and between the individual and his government are appropriate subjects for negotiation, definition, and enforcement by multilateral treaties." Under such a theory of the func-

tion of international law, no economic or political rights are beyond the reach of the treaty-making power as it now resides in our Government under the Constitution.

"Our State Department," Senator BRICKER has said, "is promoting this revolutionary legal theory by statements that the distinction between foreign and domestic affairs is virtually nonexistent."

At the time the Constitution was submitted to the States for ratification in 1787-88, there was a widespread feeling that it did not give sufficient guarantees of liberty to individual citizens and it was necessary for the sponsors to promise early submission of a Bill of Rights to the people in order to get the Constitution ratified. Such a Bill of Rights was promptly submitted and joined to the Constitution.

The Bill of Rights in our Constitution protects the people against any abridgment of freedom of speech, freedom of the press and freedom of religion. It guarantees them trial by jury, protects their property from seizure without due process of law and shields them from cruel and inhuman punishments.

Let us look at a few examples of how the Bill of Rights and the proposed U. N. Covenant on Human Rights would be in conflict.

The Bill of Rights says: "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof."

But if the U. N. Covenant were to become our "supreme law" by treaty, here is what freedom of religion would mean to the more than 250 faiths in America today:

"Freedom to manifest one's religion or beliefs shall be subject only to such limitations as are pursuant to law and are reasonable and necessary to protect public safety, order, morals, or the fundamental rights of others."

Under such a broad clause, religion could be suppressed on the grounds that public safety was threatened—and thus a Communist or Fascist war on religion could be rationalized.

Our Bill of Rights says: "Congress shall make no law . . . abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press."

But the U. N. Covenant reads: "The right to seek, receive, and impart information and ideas carries with it special duties and responsibilities, and may therefore be subject to certain penalties, liabilities, and restrictions, but these shall be such only as are provided by law and necessary for the protection of national security, public order, safety, health or morals or of the rights, freedoms, and reputation of others."

Hitler could have helled such a clause, and Peron would cheer it. Senator BRICKER points out that this provision would "stamp the approval of a United Nations treaty on the trial and imprisonment of William Oatis," the Associated Press correspondent now imprisoned in Czechoslovakia in one of the most disgraceful episodes in our international relationship through the years.

Fifty-eight Senators joined Senator BRICKER in sponsoring his proposed amendment to the Constitution which would prevent the abridgement of American freedoms through treaties under "the new fashion in international law."

There is not much chance of the U. N. Covenant of Human Rights being ratified by the Senate in the new Congress. The Eisenhower administration certainly will not stand for ratification. John Foster Dulles, who will be Secretary of State in the new administration, is on record against ratification of the covenant.

But the Constitution should be amended now to forestall a loss of freedom to our children and to oncoming generations through the power of treaties and Executive agreements designed to circumvent the Constitution.

We should be at least as concerned about the freedom of our posterity as were our forefathers who insisted on a Bill of Rights.

We should not hesitate to amend the Constitution now to guarantee that freedom any more than did our forebears when they amended it with the first 10 amendments, the Bill of Rights.

Statement of Policy by Joseph H. Freehill,  
Director of Price Stabilization

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL H. DOUGLAS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, January 9, 1953

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement issued by Joseph H. Freehill, newly appointed Director of Price Stabilization, with reference to the policy which that office will follow.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

We constantly hear and read claims that inflation is no longer a fact or a danger in this country, and that the price stabilization program has served its usefulness.

These statements, in my honest opinion, just aren't true, and I, for one, am certainly not planning to direct the operations of the Office of Price Stabilization as though they were.

First, I want to make it clear that we are still very much in business. About 72 percent of all items on the BLS wholesale price index as of November 26, were under price controls.

Moreover, practically every major statistic shows that prices are high, that pressures to force them even higher still exist strongly and that all the underlying factors that could make for a new and very serious round of both consumer and industrial price spirals are present.

Thus, the Consumer Price Index, which measures what each household must pay for the normal items of everyday living, stood at 190.9 on October 15, up 0.1 percent from September 15, and indications are that it hit a new peak again by November 15. Some 50 percent of all items on the wholesale price index are within 2 percent of their 2-year peaks. With prices at these levels, with accumulated savings and expenditures at record high, with the tense international situation, we cannot afford to be complacent about inflation or to weaken our price control efforts.

Certainly, were we to do so, prices would increase substantially in many major areas.

I am particularly concerned by the great number of applications for price ceiling increases and decontrol which hit the OPS every week.

Through October OPS had received more than 18,000 applications for individual price adjustments, some 3,000 of which are still outstanding.

In addition, since September, we have had applications by 35 entire industries for surveys to determine if every company within the industry should receive ceiling increases under the industry earnings standards. Industry advisory committees representing some 35 other industries have met with OPS since September 1, and almost without exception have requested pass-throughs on