

## Flays Tariff Bill as Lobby Measure

A Washington dispatch, dated May 9, says: Party lines were broken in the Senate today during the debate on the emergency tariff bill, Senator Moses, Republican, New Hampshire, delivering a scathing denunciation of it, and Senator Ashurst, Democrat, Arizona, warning his colleagues not to let "the folks back home" learn they stood for free trade. Senator Moses charged that a great lobby was pressing for passage, and attacked the leadership of his party for its part in seeking to enact such legislation. It was not a Republican measure, he said, and had no support from the white house insofar as it proposed to continue wartime restrictions on importations of dyes.

Senator Ashurst said Democrats had lost elections in the past on the issue of free trade, and the day had come when the rights of the agriculturists must be given equal consideration with those of the manufacturers.

Mr. Moses' drive against the lobby, which he said was the "largest, most highly organized, best paid and most arrogant of any this capital has seen," brought a rejoinder from Senator Knox, Republican, Pennsylvania, who sponsored the amendment restricting dye importations. Mr. Knox argued that the senator's attitude was not based on the views of future needs of the government in time of war.

Mr. Moses submitted what he described as a statement of expenditures by the American dyes institute covering, he said, its activities in behalf of the tariff bill with the dye amendment. These alleged expenditures, he said, totalled approximately \$104,000. The Dupont interests also were brought in by Mr. Moses as supporters of the dye industry. They were represented, he said, by M. R. Pouthier whom he described as enjoying a large measure of control over the dyestuff industry in the United States.

Recalling that he had opposed the bill in the previous congress, Mr. Moses said he had hoped when its reconsideration was begun by the Senate finance committee that he would be able "to swallow it, even though holding my nose while voting for it." Its appearance, however, did not justify his hopes, he said.

### THE COLOMBIAN TREATY

Thus endeth an eighteen-year-old quarrel. The United States congress had voted to build the Panama canal. It had accepted an offer to take \$40,000,000 for the rights of the French canal company, subject to the completion of an agreement with Colombia, whose territory the canal was to traverse. A treaty had been formulated under which Colombia was to receive \$10,000,000 and an annuity of \$250,000 a year. The senate ratified it. The Colombian congress stalled.

The impression prevailed in this country that the delay in Colombia had a sinister meaning. Were the Colombian congressmen waiting to be bought? No need to answer. Of a sudden there was a revolt in the Colombian state of Panama. Panama declared itself independent. Senator John Sharp Williams insisted the other day that the revolting army consisted of nineteen negroes and a mule. However that was, President Roosevelt recognized the new republic and made with it the contract which Colombia had failed to ratify. Then the canal was built.

Colombia naturally insisted that the United States had robbed it of Panama. To this day it has refused to forgive us, and its hostility has had a reflection throughout all South America. Mr. Bryan negotiated as secretary of state, a treaty of friendship with Colombia under which the latter was to receive \$25,000,000 in recompense for the loss of Panama. This treaty, minus a clause in which the United States expressed regret for the events leading up to the quarrel, has now been ratified by a republican senate. Rather, it is ratified by a combination of the Democrats and the non-Roosevelt Republicans. The group of senators who were the Roosevelt progressives of a dozen years ago voted vainly against ratification.

Whether this is an indictment of President Roosevelt's course is a question for historians to settle. The motive of the administration and of the senators had little to do with history. The Democrats, of course, were glad of the chance to vindicate the Democratic administration which negotiated the treaty. But the administration seems to be thinking of the matter wholly

A NEW DAY



—Louisville Courier-Journal.

as a basis for future trade relations with Colombia and with South America.

That may prove to be important matter. With Europe largely barred from trade with us by adverse exchange conditions, South America becomes a natural and rather essential recourse.—Nebraska State Journal.

### GENERAL JOHN J. PERSHING ON WAR

As we contemplate the causes of war and realize its horrors, every right-thinking man and woman must feel like demanding that some steps be taken to prevent its recurrence. An important step would be to curtail expenditures for the maintenance of navies and armies.

The estimates recently presented to our congress for the naval and military services contemplate an appropriation for the next fiscal year of more than \$5,000,000 for every working day in the year.

It is a gloomy commentary upon world conditions that expenditures several times greater than ever before in peace times should be considered necessary, especially when the most rigid economy in governmental administration is essential if we would avoid national bankruptcy.

The world does not seem to learn from experience. It would appear that the lessons of the last six years should be enough to convince everybody of the danger of nations striding up and down the earth armed to the teeth. But no one nation can reduce armaments unless all do.

Isn't it, then, time for an awakening among enlightened peoples to the end that the leading powers may reach some rational agreement which would not only relieve the world of this terrible financial load, but which in itself would be a long step toward the prevention of war?

Ours is not an aggressive nation. We want no territory and we have no designs on other people. If other nations have the same attitude, it seems unreasonable not to believe that all will be willing to prove it by consenting to limit armaments. Unless some such move be made, we may well ask ourselves whether civilization does not really reach a point where it begins to destroy itself and whether we are thus doomed to go headlong down through destructive war and darkness to barbarism.—Address at New York, December 29, 1920.

### LACKING DRINK, ARE FOLK NOW TAKING TO DRUGS?

In the merry old days it used to be a question what, if anything, drove this person or that to excessive drink. One of the strong questions produced by the prohibition law is whether lack of the potable alcohols, such lack as there is of them, is driving people from drink to drugs.

An expert on such a subject whom The Globe has consulted answers this question with a general No and an exceptive Yes. Commissioner Carleton Simon must be regarded as a convincing authority by reason of his experience in charge of the narcotic division of the city police department and by reason of his being a psychiatrist and criminologist.

Dr. Simon gives it as his observation and conclusion that most people accustomed to spirituous drinkables are not turned by depri-

vation or rarity of them in the direction of the narcotics. This thing is quite as true, he seems to say (and the point is a little surprising), of immoderate drinkers, even drunkards, as of temperate consumers. In short, the most comprehensive aggregation of people who can be called normal come within this rule, the rule that absence of desired drink does not open the avenue (or the alley) of vitiating drugs.

But the non-normal group which bites its sharp sector into the circle of this immensely inclusive generality is the underworld classes. Denial of liquor or difficulty in getting it does press the hypodermic syringe into the hand of the criminal. A pickpocket or a cracksman, or about any other malefactor, wants stimulus and steadying for his adventure. Formerly he got both from a stiff glass of spirits, which he could buy for a few cents, but now he often has not the multiple higher price of a whisky or brandy in his pocket. Hence he carries a heroin or cocaine outfit in his pocket.

So, as Commissioner Simon pronounces, the only member of society whom the eighteenth amendment is driving from drink to drugs is he who is only contractively a member of it at all—the criminal.

The country is both fortunate and unfortunate in this exception. It is fortunate because prohibition influences to narcoticism only the criminal few; but unfortunate because the evil will make them the more dangerous. For the narcotic renders the user clear and fearless and without conscience.

While not all who are given to the hypodermic vice are directly classifiable as criminals, Dr. Simon is startling in the proportion he attributes to those with criminal histories among all drug addicts. They number 77 2-5 per cent. If this is true, and true also the drug habit promotion by prohibition among criminals, it is evident enough that we are in for a worse underworld. But it is welcome to be assured at the same time, however, that prohibition is not acting to the drug recruitment of the crookdom class which it does bedrug.—New York Globe and Commercial Advertiser.

### BRITAIN'S GROWING DRINK BILL

Mr. George B. Wilson, Political and Literary Secretary of the United Kingdom Alliance, in his statement of "The National Drink Bill of 1920," says that the consumption of intoxicating liquors in the United Kingdom during 1920, measured in terms of absolute alcohol, showed an increase of 15 per cent over 1919, but is still about 24 per cent less than in 1913.

"The expenditure on intoxicating liquors showed an advance of 21 per cent over 1919, and of no less than 183 per cent; that is, for every £100 spent on these liquors in 1913 the nation spent £283 in 1920.

"Although the funds available have been sufficient to maintain the total consumption of alcoholic liquors at an even higher level than in 1919, there are indications that the industrial depression is already affecting consumption; and, in the opinion of the trade, is likely increasingly so to do.

"I estimate the amount spent on intoxicating liquors in the United Kingdom in 1920 at £469,700,000, as against £386,000,000 in 1919, and £166,000,000 in 1913.

"The expenditure per head of the population was therefore, in 1920, approximately £10 per adult of 21 years and upwards (including abstainers) £16, 16s., as against £3, 12s. and £5, 19s. in 1913. The expenditure for each of the three kingdoms, though not capable of strict statistical verification, was probably about:—

	Total.	Per head.
	£	£ s. d.
England and Wales...	391,000,000	10 7 0
Scotland .....	45,000,000	9 3 0
Ireland .....	34,000,000	7 12 0

"The taxation collected by the trade from consumers of intoxicating liquors in 1920 was:—Spirits, £71,000,000; beer, £123,000,000; wine, £3,000,000; or £197,000,000 in all:—

	Total Drink Bill.	Total Taxation.
	£	£
1913 .....	166,700,000	38,200,000
1920 .....	469,000,000	197,000,000
	Per cent. of Taxation to T't'l	Net Drink Bill.
	£	£
1913 .....	23	128,500,000
1920 .....	42	272,700,000

"During 1920 an increased consumption of alcoholic liquors has coincided with a marked increase in public drunkenness, both of men and women."—From an English newspaper.