

## The South Not for Protection

Mr. John H. Kirby of Texas, president of the southern Tariff association, is prophesying that the solid south will be broken unless the Democrats abandon their low tariff policy. In an interview given out from Washington, Mr. Kirby said:

"I feel commissioned to warn the Democratic leaders and members of the Senate that, unless they repudiate the tariff policy announced by Minority Leader Kitchin on the floor of the House, April 14, 1921, and accepted by a large majority of the Democratic members of the House, then the solid South will be broken."

Mr. Kirby takes exception to a sentiment expressed by Mr. Kitchin as follows: Quoting Mr. Kitchin's address to the effect that "a sensible protectionist will go to the party that has taught and practised protection for fifty years and not to the party who has always opposed it," Mr. Kirby said "against this announcement we place the demands of every productive industry in the South for a protective tariff on raw materials and the signature of 80 per cent of the bankers of our leading Southern states."

Mr. Kirby claims to represent eighty per cent of the bankers of the Southern states in his advocacy of protection. This is not the first time that Mr. Kirby has made this prediction and he is not the first Southern protectionist to speak in this vein. But he has been a false prophet heretofore like other Southerners holding his views and there is no indication that they are wiser now than they have been.

The tariff question is not a new one and the principle involved in it is quite well understood. It is taxation of the many for the benefit of the few—the few like it, the many object to it when they understand it. Not one Southern voter in ten can be benefited by a protective tariff, probably not one in fifty. Mr. Kirby happens to be one of the ones who would be benefited because he deals in lumber, but most of the people of the south buy lumber, and they are no more anxious to contribute unnecessarily to Mr. Kirby's wealth than they are to the wealth of New England beneficiaries of protection. The men who benefit by high tariff have loud voices and they make enough out of the tariff to enable them to go to Washington or to send agents there to make known their views. The taxpayers are the forgotten people who bear the burden but cannot be heard except through their senators and members. Fortunately, the senators and members from the South have, as a rule, been loyal to the masses rather than to the privileged few. Mr. Kitchin is conspicuously so, therefore he incurs the criticism of Mr. Kirby and those of this kind.

But Mr. Kitchin has incurred that sort of criticism throughout his entire career. Instead of its injuring him he fattens on it.

W. J. BRYAN.

### THE NEWBERRY VERDICT

By a small majority Mr. Newberry has escaped expulsion. He secured the votes of all the Republicans but nine (excluding those absent and paired). It was not a very glorious triumph but it was enough to assure him a senator's salary and enough to besmirch his party in the Senate. The Democratic party voted solidly to unseat him and Senators Borah, Capper, Jones, Kenyon, Ladd, LaFollette, Norbeck, Norris and Sutherland, (Republicans), voted with the Democrats. Mr. Newberry has reason to be grateful that the vote was delayed until the Republicans secured an overwhelming majority in the Senate; if the case had been decided by the last Senate he would have been thrown out.

But the interesting part of the subject is not in the vote. That might have been expected when we consider the part that money plays in Republican campaigns; the wording of the resolution is amusing. The Republican majority attempts to deodorize its vote by a condemnation of such expenditures as characterized Mr. Newberry's election. The resolution says: "That whether the amount expended in this (Michigan) primary was \$195,000 as was fully reported or openly acknowledged or whether there were some few thousand dollars in excess, the amount expended was in either case too large, much larger than ought to have been expended. The expenditure of such excessive sums in behalf of a candidate EITHER

WITH OR WITHOUT HIS CONSENT being contrary to sound public policy, harmful to the honor and dignity of the Senate and dangerous to the perpetuity of a free government, such excessive expenditures are hereby SEVERELY CONDEMNED and DISAPPROVED."

It is to be hoped that our juries will not attempt to model their verdicts after that pronounced by the Republican Senate. If the juries had as fully developed a sense of humor as the Republican leaders seem to have they could acquit most any influential man by the adoption of the same plan: Resolved; that we set the accused free but we want it distinctly understood that we heartily condemn the methods by which he ushered his victim into eternity.

If some prominent man is accused of embezzlement or other form of stealing, the jury can include in the verdict of acquittal an indignant protest against the thievish methods employed by the accused in appropriating the money of others.

If Senator Newberry is at all sensitive on the subject he WILL resign; how must he feel as he mingles with his colleagues and recognizes that those who refused to expel him tell the world that the expenditures of such excessive sums on behalf of a candidate "either with or without his consent" is "contrary to sound public policy, harmful to the honor and dignity of the Senate and dangerous to the perpetuity of a free government."

The Republicans have framed an indictment against themselves by seating a man who permitted—if he did not commit—a wrong that is disgraceful to the body in which he sits and dangerous to the perpetuity of the government from which he draws a salary.

W. J. BRYAN.

### HAM-STRINGING THE BONUS

Some of the Republican leaders are proposing to raise money for the soldiers' bonus by special tax on particular articles—an automobile tax, a gasoline tax, and a one per cent increase in postage being suggested among other forms of taxation. It would be a great mistake to attach the bonus to any particular tax; it would at once array against the soldiers those upon whom the burden would fall. They would feel, and with some justification, that they were being made to bear more than their share of the expense of the bonus. Where one soldier would be benefited a half-dozen or dozen tax payers would be irritated.

The soldiers' service was to the entire country and the tax should be paid out of the general fund. If to pay the bonus it is necessary to devise new forms of taxation, let the new taxes be paid into the general fund so there will be no visible connection between the tax and the bonus.

If any special tax is imposed it should be imposed upon the fortunes created by the war; the millionaires who got rich out of the war or profited in a special way are indebted to the soldiers who fought while the profiteers made the money. It would be more than poetic justice to make those who especially benefited contribute to those who rendered special service, but it is too much to expect that this congress will tax the profiteers for the benefit of the soldiers; it was this congress that postponed consideration of the bonus bill until after the tax on excess profits was repealed.

W. J. BRYAN.

### PRESIDENT ELIOT ON PROHIBITION

On another page will be found the remarks of Dr. Charles W. Eliot, president emeritus of Harvard university, before a committee of the Massachusetts legislature. Special attention is called to Dr. Eliot's testimony because his position is somewhat different from that occupied by most others who go before such committees. He did not become a TEETOTALER until after he was EIGHTY years old. He did not become an advocate of prohibition until war prohibition was enacted. He cannot be called a "fanatic" and he expressly disclaims being a "kill-joy."

As a loyal citizen he favors the ENFORCEMENT OF LAW; he is a citizen of Massachusetts and wants his state to be in sympathy with the sentiment of the nation. He is now convinced that prohibition is not only a WISE measure but a NECESSARY measure if our nation is to be saved from intemperance and from the evils that follow in the wake of intemperance.

It is time for every friend of law and order to speak out. The line is being drawn more and more clearly between those who respect the government and obey law and those who are lawless. Dr. Eliot's appeal ought to influence all the intellectuals who are yet standing out against prohibition—if there be any such.

## Strike or What?

Mr. Gompers has spoken out strongly against any system of compulsory arbitration. He is right. Compulsory arbitration, whether the power be deposited in a board or a judge, is out of harmony with the spirit of our institutions. Arbitration implies a finding that can be enforced—how can a finding be enforced in the United States? Suppose a board or court is partial to the labor side of the dispute and issues an order that amounts to a confiscation of the property of the employer—would such an order stand? No one thinks so.

But suppose, as is more likely, the board or judge is partial to the employer's side. Can an order be enforced against an employee if, in effect it condemns him to involuntary servitude? Surely such an order would not stand. And yet these are the alternatives when arbitration is compulsory. It all depends upon the bias of the man who decides.

Everyone is more or less biased, even though unconscious of bias. He may not admit the bias, but you can prove it on him. Tell him suddenly of a dispute between capital and labor and the answer he makes before investigation will indicate his bias.

The employers will always try to secure arbitrators who are biased their way and the laboring men will try just as hard to secure arbitrators who are biased for their side. Generally, a board is made up of men all of whom, except one, are known to be biased in favor of one side or the other. The one man is supposed to be unbiased but he never is. The only question is whether both sides will gamble on his bias or whether one side will secretly know where he stands.

Mr. Gompers is right in opposing compulsory arbitration. He is right in suspecting arbitration, even when it is voluntary, because of the uncertainty as to the supposedly unbiased man. But what has Mr. Gompers to suggest as an alternative? The strike? The employers who oppose arbitration have the lockout to fall back on. But what about the public—the interested third party? It furnishes the money for the employees' wages and for the employers' profits. It is not time for it to have its day in court? Labor must not be surprised if the public, in desperation, turns to arbitration as a matter of self-protection, if it can find nothing better. The public do not regard either the strike or the lockout as the BEST thing in sight. Labor has a chance to win this fight by proposing a plan that will protect the public and at the same time do justice to employer and employee. INVESTIGATION is better than arbitration—investigation with reports that are not binding in law but which will guide the public to an intelligent expression of sympathy. A large percentage of the people desire justice between employer and employee. If they are permitted to understand the contest they will throw their influence on the side of justice, but how can they use their influence without knowing the facts? And how can they be sure of the facts if they have nothing but ex parte statements before them?

The doctrine of "investigate before you shoot" has spread over the world and is destined to exert a powerful influence in the prevention of war. Why not investigate before strike or lockout? If investigation provides a remedy for international difficulties why may it not provide a remedy for industrial disputes? Truth is not afraid of the light. The Bible tells us of those who "love darkness rather than light because their deeds are evil." Why not seek light through investigation and then leave the findings of the board to rest upon their merits and to persuade according to their weight? The principle embodied in this remedy has received practically unanimous endorsement in this country and throughout almost the entire civilized world. Why not apply it to industry? If it can bring peace between different races and languages, may it not bring peace between citizens and neighbors?

W. J. BRYAN.

### A BOY'S REPORT

On another page will be found a report of one of Mr. Bryan's speeches made by Francis J. Duke, of Richmond, Va., a student at Saint Christopher's Boy's School and published in The Pine Needle, the school paper. It is reproduced because it is one of the most accurate and faithful pieces of condensed reporting that has come to Mr. Bryan's notice. The boy who did it displayed unusual journalistic talent.

This report was scheduled to appear in the January issue of The Commoner, but was omitted owing to lack of space.