

# COMMON MARKETS:

*The United States pursues  
a free-trade policy while  
Europe adopts our sound  
"common market" plan.*

## **LET US KEEP OUR OWN**

*by E. F. Tompkins*

HERE IS an issue with which Congress must soon grapple: Europe is adopting the abandoned American policy of protecting its home markets, while America is pursuing further the New Deal's visionary free-trade practices.

The White House has announced its intentions to a House Subcommittee which is completing a two-year study of our tariff and trade laws. The Administration will ask Congress to extend again, probably for five years, the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act under which our protective tariff system has been virtually demolished. This decision has been made despite the facts that the Tariff Commission has before it numerous appeals from American industries injured by foreign competition under the low-tariff policy and, in several instances, has recommended remedial action.

The Administration will also ask Congress again to vote the United States into a proposed Organization for Trade Cooperation, an international agency that will put our overseas commerce under the jurisdiction of competitor foreign countries. The OTC is to enforce decrees of GATT (General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade) in which the United States now participates by action of the State Department without the assent of Congress.

Meantime, in Europe the four Scandinavian countries are combining into a "common market" to embrace free trade among themselves and to exclude foreign competition by use of tariffs or embargoes.

The Scandinavian action follows a similar program elsewhere.

Seventeen nations of Western

Europe comprise what is called OEEC (Organization for European Economic Cooperation).

Last year, six of these nations—Belgium, France, Italy, Luxemburg, The Netherlands and West Germany—agreed to set up a “common market” in which they will trade without tariffs against each other, but will impose a “common tariff” against imports from other countries, including the United States.

Obviously, therefore, Europe is adopting the very policy which the United States has been renouncing.

**T**HE European projects are sound economically—for Europe.

That is proved by America’s historic example. Under the Federal Constitution, this country is itself a free-trade area. One State may

not lay tariffs or embargoes against the products of another State; and this, together with a great and growing population, has been the basis of our immense domestic industry and commerce. But our free-trade area has been bounded by the oceans. Our protective tariffs, from 1789 until 1933, prevented ruinous alien competition and fostered our American standards of wages and of living.

Western Europe is adopting the American system while America seeks to pursue a world-wide free-trade fantasy which, as current events prove, is unattainable.

West Europe, with its 225 million population, should have its own “common market.”

But 190 million Americans need a “common market” too.—From the New York *Journal-American*.

### *School Daze*

The Red Bank New Jersey School Board decided it would be good for teachers to instruct children in The Lord’s Prayer after some of the moppets were heard to recite: “Harold be Thy name . . . give us this day our jelly bread and lead us not into Penn Station.”

A student at Furman University, Greenville, South Carolina, was unable to identify the author of the Revolutionary War pamphlet, “Common Sense” (Thomas Paine). The student’s name? *Thomas Payne*.

In New York, a teacher asked a geography class how America’s topography had shaped its history. “Well,” replied one young genius, “if it hadn’t been for the Delaware River, Washington couldn’t have crossed it.”

Reporting on Shakespeare’s play, “Julius Caesar,” a Los Angeles student declared, “The noble Brutus agreed with the crafty Cassius one hundredth percent.” And Ibsen’s play, “A Doll’s House,” was said to teach “a lesson to people who are married and even to those who are singular.”

—Jerry Klein

# IN DEFENSE OF JURIES

by Robert Gardner

# 12

SEVERAL years ago I tried a case in which a man lost both eyes because of the alleged negligence of someone else. He was in the prime of life, had an excellent earning capacity and was the sole support of a wife and two daughters. He sued for \$400,000.00. The jury brought in the shockingly inadequate verdict of \$14,500.00. This verdict excited no particular comment in the public press. Had the jury brought in a verdict in the neighborhood of \$400,000.00 (hardly overpayment for total blindness resulting from the fault of another), it would have hit the headlines. The difference—the big verdict makes news, the small verdict does not.

At about the same time I tried a particularly revolting murder case involving the death of a young child. Apparently everybody in the world except one person thought that the defendant should be executed. That one person just happened to be on the jury. Result: a hung jury and hysterical headlines. In the meantime I have tried several cases in which the juries

*That ominous looking jury may be your best friend*

have brought in death penalties which resulted in conservative newspaper coverage.

These two cases point up the difficulty the average man has in evaluating the true worth of the jury system. The casual impression the average person receives from reading newspaper headlines and magazine articles is that the jury spends its time awarding monumental judgments to non-deserving personal injury litigants and acquitting guilty criminals. It will probably come as a shock to learn the true facts—that the majority of jury verdicts in personal injury cases are defense verdicts and the majority of verdicts in criminal cases are convictions. Everyone gives lip service to the historical desirability of the jury system, but there is a great deal of misinformation, ill-balanced publicity and ill-considered, thoughtless and harmful conversation among the gen-