

WSM Broadcast
July 1, 1945

C Congress has had a very busy week. The fiscal year ended last night at midnight and as usual, Congress faced a log jam of legislation and appropriation bills which it was necessary to pass before the fiscal year ended. This brought about long sessions running into the night and also Saturday sessions by both the House and Senate. Every year at this time Members of Congress resolve that the next time they will do better and keep ahead of the schedule so that they will not have to jam through legislation at the last minute with inadequate consideration. This is seven years now that I have heard these resolutions made but the log jam continues to occur every year as the fiscal year ends.

The Senate had the spectacle of a filibuster conducted by Senator Bilbo of Mississippi against a bill making appropriations for the Fair Employment Practice Committee, better known perhaps as the FEPC. In the House of Representatives there is a rule prohibiting anyone from speaking more than one hour. And during the consideration of a bill for amendments, the House operates under what is known as the five minute rule which means that each Member is recognized to make a five minute speech for or against an amendment. With 435 Members, it would be wholly impossible for the House to operate with any dispatch unless there was a limitation of debate. The Senate, however, has unlimited debate, *a Senator can speak endlessly,* unless cloture is voted. Under the Senate rules the length of speeches can be limited to one hour for each Senator if two-thirds of the Senate vote^s to impose the rule of cloture. The Senate is very reluctant, however, to impose cloture. ~~I believe it was~~ The last time it was voted was in 1927. I have often thought that if they would make it a permanent rule the Senate ^{procedure} would be improved. There

is nothing democratic or fair about a filibuster. Now, I happen to agree with Senator Bilbo's desire to abolish the FEPC, but being devoted to the democratic principles of letting the majority rule, I do not agree with either the principles or the practice of a filibuster.

On yesterday the Congress finally passed the bill extending the OPA for another year, and on yesterday the new Secretary of Agriculture, ~~Secretary~~ Clinton P. Anderson, and the new Attorney General, Tom Clark, and the new Secretary of Labor, Judge Schwollenbach, assumed their new duties.

The United States delegates to the San Francisco Conference returned to Washington during the week and both Senators Connally and Vandenberg made stirring speeches in the Senate urging the ratification of the Charter. Secretary Hull, a delegate to the Conference, though he was unable to attend, left his hospital room and affixed his signature to the Charter which was flown from San Francisco to Washington locked in a fire-proof, steel safe making its preservation sure, even against the eventuality of a plane wreck or fire. So, all in all, this has been an eventful week in Washington.

The most important thing before the country and the Congress now is the question of ratification of this San Francisco Charter. It is a source of gratification that the outlook for ratification is bright. Some people are ~~making~~ making the prediction that not more than 10 Senators will oppose its ratification. In this connection, however, it must be recalled it was estimated that the League of Nations was supported by 85% of the American people, but after long Committee hearings, after long drawn-out debates, enough doubts were raised,

enough partisan fires were fanned into flaming heat, enough bickering jealousies and narrow attitudes had their sway, ^{that} ~~until~~ the League of Nations Treaty was ^{finally} killed in the Senate.

I hope and pray the country will be spared repetition of this spectacle. Even Senator La Follette who ^{was} followed in the foot steps of his father, ~~as~~ ⁱⁿ being a political and economic isolationist, announced during the week that he would support ratification of the Charter.

After Senator Vandenberg's speech, which was eloquent, persuasive, and logical, the Senate Republicans met and agreed to support quick action on the Charter. These favorable signs are indeed encouraging and pleasing not only to Members of Congress who believe this is a favorable step toward an effective, collective security, but, I believe, it is encouraging, too, to the people of the United States and, ~~yess, too~~ the war weary people of the world who look to the United States to lead the way in ratifying the principles and the agreements just as they ~~lead~~ the way in calling the Conference and in its deliberations.

The Charter will function through four major instruments. First, there is a general assembly, a sort of representative body, not exactly legislative in its character, but an Assembly in which each signatory nation will have one vote. This General Assembly by this democratic process can determine the collective will of the fifty nations which signed the Charter. The executive agency of the organization is a Security Council. This is the agency which will take and direct action. On this Security Council the five largest nations -- Great Britain, Russia, The United States, France and China--have permanent seats.