

to the surprise of many, it has taken up the tariff question. There is an emergency, we are told, and therefore an emergency measure is proposed, in the enactment of which the ordinary methods of tariff making are disregarded.

U. S. Emergency Tariff Bill

The farmers of the United States, after several years of profitable business, have suddenly found themselves in a state of trouble. Their crops have been raised under all the conditions of high prices of labor, implements and supplies. When crop became ready for market there was a sharp fall in the price of most of their products. Many of them would like to hold their products for a better market which is hoped for. But the carrying over of large quantities of goods necessitates financial accommodation which the banks are unable to grant. In the North Western States many of the banks which have their resources locked up in this way have been obliged to close their doors.

A crisis has thus come to the agricultural interest, which is demanding assistance in some form. The protection of the American farmers against foreign competitors — especially against competitors from Canada, so near it hand — is one of the proposed remedies. An Emergency Tariff bill, to apply for ten months, has been rushed through the Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives, by a vote of 196 to 85. The bill proposes heavy duties on almost the whole list of agricultural products, duties which in some cases are higher even than those of the Republican tariff laws of former years. Party lines were considerably broken in the division. Some Republicans, avowed protectionists, held that tariff legislation should be left to the new Congress. Some Democrats, traditionally favorable to low tariffs, became alarmed by the complaints of the farmers and supported the Emergency Tariff bill.

There is thus a departure from the ordinarily slow process of tariff revision. But the first rush is over and the bill will now have to await more deliberate consideration. The Senate is not likely to be stampeded as the House has been. The parties in the Senate are pretty equally divided. The Republicans have a bare majority, if they have that. While there may be some break in the party lines, as there was in the House, the bolters from the Democratic standard are likely to be fewer, and in any case there will be enough opposition to the bill to oblige the promoters of it to be less hasty. The power of any considerable group of Senators to talk a measure out has more than once been exhibited. The authority of the present Congress ends on the 4th of March. The Republican leaders will find much difficulty in putting the bill through its various stages before that time.

In the end there is the President. It is hardly probable that Mr. Wilson will be willing, as one of the last acts of his Presidential career, to assent to a measure which is so much at variance with his principles. He is likely to veto the bill if it ever reaches him, and the supporters of the measure may not be strong enough to carry it over his veto.

Time is likely to favor the opponents of the measure. Indeed, the tone of the debate in the House did not indicate that the friends of the bill expected it to become law at this session. One Republican supporter frankly said he would not have voted for the bill if he had believed that it would pass the Senate. The desire to please the farmers is easy to understand. It is questionable, however, whether the measure, if enacted, would provide the relief that the farmers desire, and there are other interests which will make themselves felt when the subject is calmly considered. If the bill is to give the American farmer a higher price for his wheat, for example, he can only get it as the expense of the consumers, and any policy which aims at increasing or maintaining the high cost of living is not likely to find favor with the masses of the people.

Canada is much interested, as the American market is an important one to our farmers. It would be idle to think otherwise. The balance of trade between the United States and Canada is already largely in favor of our neighbors. Canada is one of their best customers. If in the face of that fact they undertake to virtually shut our products out of their markets, there will naturally arise on this side of the line a desire for retaliation. These things will not make for the good relations between the two countries that from every point of view are desirable.

The New Year

The condition of the world has been characterized as the mad dog world; as a terrible earthquake; as a wreck, the inevitable result of the world's greatest war; as a time when the age-long struggle between the material and the spiritual interpretation of human existence has come to a head; when self assertion has run riot and class consciousness becomes dominant.

That is one angle of view. Here is another by the eminent English Baptist divine, Rev. Dr. Clifford, who from his large knowledge, wide experience and devoted service, speaks with an insight, a vision that commands regard and confidence:

"My opinion is as keen as ever," he remarked in reference to his four score years and four, "but there is this difference. It becomes more incumbent to state the reasonable grounds on which our optimism is based. At the present juncture things are so chaotic and problems are so acute and overwhelming in magnitude that it is not surprising that

men yield to despondency and fail to maintain a mighty hope which the course of human life, from the beginning of the world until today, abundantly justifies.

"For the moment, and perhaps for two or three years, the difficulty of sincere and earnest men will be to maintain faith in the reality of the advances made in the world's life by righteousness, justice, freedom, goodwill and brotherhood. But, as Emerson says, the judgments of the days must be corrected by the judgments of the years and centuries.

"One needs to remember Burke's great saying, that the world is not ruled by force or even law, but by customs and habits of thought. One of the distinctive effects of the experiences through which we have been passing during the last six or seven years is that we are driven by circumstances out of the old grooves of thinking and feeling and raised to higher levels of idealism and aspiration. It may take us ten years to make evident this reality, but I do not bate a jot of faith or hope in the certainty that 1930 will find the human race very much further towards its predestined goal than we are in 1920."

Coleridge once remarked, that "experience is too often like the stern light of a ship; it illuminates only the path over which we have travelled, and it gives no enlightenment or guidance in the future; but the mark of wisdom is found in calling in the service of the past as an aid in treading the present and future."

As a nation the war tried the faith in ourselves. Our spirit of sacrifice and service and all were nobly vindicated. For the problems of today and tomorrow, the same principles abide and are guiding stars as we enter 1921.

The Prince of Wales, on his arrival in England from his recent tour, in his first speech made an appeal to the nation to "pull together"; and the justly proud father, the King, publicly paid a well-deserved tribute to his worthy son, "that as an ambassador of peace and goodwill, he had given of his best."

Another British ambassador, Sir Cecil Spring-Rice, just before he left Washington, and who died at Rideau Hall, Ottawa, wrote the following:

"I vow to thee, my country—all earthly things above—

Entire and whole and perfect, the service of my love,

The love that asks no question: the love that pays the price,

The love that makes undaunted the final sacrifice.

And there's another country, I've heard of long ago—

Most dear to them that love her, most great to them that know—

We may not count her armies: we may not see her King—

Her fortress is a faithful heart, her pride is suffering—

And soul by soul and silently her shining bounds increase,

Her ways are ways of gentleness and all her paths are Peace."