

# REFLECTIONS

By THE EDITOR

## Race-Tracks

NO legislator, says the clever lawyer, ever framed a law through which another man might not drive a coach-and-four. The Miller Bill, for the regulation of racing, is a case in point. It was intended to cut down racing, but racing has increased. It was intended to lessen betting, yet betting is as prevalent as ever.

Whether it is Montreal, Toronto, Hamilton, Windsor or Vancouver, there is more horse-racing than before the Miller Bill was passed by a wise House of Commons. The business seems to be getting out of bounds. And the kind of racing seems to be more or less a joke. The horses are mostly "crocks" and the majority of them are owned by the "bookies," whose business it is to separate the common people from their money by a system of betting under which the "bookies" are sure of a handsome profit.

Legitimate race-tracks, controlled by honourable breeders of racing stock and fitted with pari-mutuel machines, are not so objectionable, but the half-mile track controlled and governed by "bookies" is a gambling invention pure and simple. It could be abolished without inflicting a loss on anyone except the daily newspapers which publish "sporting extras."

\*\*\*

## Social Survey

LONDON, ONT., is to have a "social survey" made by a trained investigator. The work is in charge of "The Men's Federation," a voluntary organization of business men. The survey will include municipal government, playgrounds, housing, foreign communities, sanitation, industrial and labour conditions, the social evil, and the organization of charities. The experiment will be watched with great interest by the reformers of other cities.

Toronto is to have a "civic survey" to find out if its administration is efficient and effective and if a dollar's worth of service is obtained for a dollar of taxes. This is another interesting experiment which will be of value to the municipal reformers elsewhere. This, too, is to be financed by a voluntary committee of citizens.

All along the line there is a general awakening to the importance of reform and progress in municipal government. The day of the yearly-elected alderman and the ward system has almost passed. Soon Canadian cities will be governed by business men elected for reasonable terms.

\*\*\*

## Sir John A., Nationalist

THERE is a clear divergence in view of the method of holding the Empire together. One set of thinkers favours a Britannic alliance of free and independent nations, another set preferring a centralized British Empire with an Imperial Parliament. The Britannic alliance idea is the older of the two. Sir John A. Macdonald was one of the first to propound it. When he was planning confederation and framing the British North America Act of 1867 with the Home authorities, he desired to make Canada a kingdom. He wanted Canada raised to the same status as the United Kingdom, but the Colonial Office objected. In the debate in the Canadian Parliament, Sir John used the following words:

"England, instead of looking upon us as a merely dependent colony, will have in us a friendly nation, a subordinate, but still a powerful people—to stand by her in North America in peace as in war. The people of Australia will be such another independent nation. . . . She will be able to look to the subordinate nations in alliance with her and owning allegiance to the same Sovereign, who will assist in enabling her to meet again the whole world in arms as she has done before." (Confederation Debates p. 44.)

It will be noted that Sir John expected Canada to be a nation. And he also expected both Australia and Canada to be in alliance with Great Britain. Thus they would have their own flag, their own army, their own navy, control their own customs tariff and stand before the world free and independent peoples in alliance with the other Britannic kingdoms.

Sir John fought the centralists of Downing Street as his predecessors, both Liberal and Conservative, had fought them. Because of these claims of Cana-

dian statesmen, the people of Great Britain did not expect Canada and Australia to remain long within the Empire. Both Gladstone and Disraeli looked forward to a break-up of the Empire. But as Sir John clearly foresaw, with almost prophetic imagination, the colonies grew more loyal with the growth of their constitutional liberty and freedom.

Sir John's idea of a Britannic alliance is as valuable to-day as it was when he propounded it. He would be tremendously shocked at some of the centralizing ideas promulgated to-day by the Montreal Star in Canada and the Round Table Club in Great Britain. Sir John was not the man to truckle to Downing Street because of petty favours, present or future. He was a sturdy Canadian, than whom there has been none greater.

\*\*\*

## Is Canada Saved?

MANY people believe that because of the good crop Canada has been saved from all financial trouble. They are wrong. The enormous crop postponed some of the trouble, it did not save Canada. A country where the cost of



AN ANCIENT CUSTOM.

A Jewish Rabbi Blowing the Ram's Horn outside a Toronto Synagogue on New Year's Day (Oct. 2).

living has gone up more than in any other country in the world cannot be saved by good crops. It can only be saved by its people discovering that they are indolent and extravagant. The discovery will come to many during January and February of 1914, when employment will be scarcer than usual and when many people will be forced to draw on their reserves. Skyscrapers, watered stock and high prices for labour and food are not evidences of prosperity only; they show prosperity combined with extravagance.

\*\*\*

## Patriotism

WHAT does patriotism or love of country imply? Surely it implies one thing at least, that a man shall place country before party. This is a point which requires careful consideration and serious thought. If the voters are to continue to prefer party slavery to individual freedom, then there can be no high form of patriotism in Canada. The Conservative or Liberal who obeys blindly the dicta of his party leaders, and neglects to think for himself may be a decent citizen, but he is no patriot. If the majority of Liberals and Conservatives place party loyalty before their duty to the country, then our national life will be stunted

and dwarfed, and our light among the nations will be dim and unnoticed.

If you want to see party loyalty at its worst go to Mexico. There men are so loyal to their party and their leaders that they go out and fight and die. That is party loyalty at its highest point, but it is not patriotism. These men have the most highly developed party loyalty, because they have never been taught to be patriotic. In Canada we have a little patriotism, therefore our party loyalty does not demand that a man shall die for his party.

But our patriotism needs developing. There is still too much party loyalty and too little patriotism. "Our party right or wrong" is a doctrine which party leaders preach and teach, but it is an accursed doctrine. "Our party when it is right and our country always" is a much better doctrine. To bring this newer policy into general acceptance is the work now being done by the Canadian Club movement, by the Canadian League, and other developing influences.

\*\*\*

## Duty on Foodstuffs

WOODROW WILSON has precipitated a new discussion in Canada—shall the Canadian duties on foodstuffs be reduced? The situation since the adoption of the new Wilson tariff by congress last week is now as follows:

Article	New U. S. Duty.	Canadian Duty.
Cattle .....	Free	\$12.50 per head valued at \$50 or less; 25 per cent. general
Sheep .....	Free	25 per cent.
Swine .....	Free	25 per cent.
Bacon .....	Free	2c pound
Beef (fresh) .....	Free	3c pound
Canned Meat .....	Free	27½ per cent.
Hams .....	Free	2c pound
Lard .....	Free	2c pound
Mutton .....	Free	3c pound
Pork .....	Free	3c pound
Poultry .....	Live 1c pound	20 per cent.
Poultry .....	Dead 2c. pound	20 per cent.

In September, 1911, Canada voted against a reduction in the duty on foodstuffs, but the reasons given may not now hold good. There was a fear that Canada would be tied by a reciprocity treaty, until some inconvenient period and then we should suddenly be released, to find new markets. This was the case with the old Reciprocity Treaty. But this situation is different. The United States have given our foodstuffs free entry into their country regardless of what we do or shall not do. The only exceptions are wheat and potatoes, which are subject to a countervailing duty of ten cents a bushel; and flour, on which is a countervailing duty of 45 cents a barrel. Should Canada take off her duty on wheat, flour and potatoes, there would be free interchange of these articles also.

The newer question before the Canadian people is, "Shall we remove the Canadian duties on cattle, sheep, swine, bacon, beef, mutton, pork, poultry, wheat, flour and potatoes?" It is not an easy question by any means. It requires most careful consideration. If we do not make these articles free, the United States may buy our foodstuffs freely whenever they are needed, while the Canadian consumer will not have a reciprocal advantage. The American farmer loses his protection and the Canadian farmer retains his.

Does the Canadian farmer desire to retain protection on his products? So far as can be gathered, he does not. He has talked that way on many occasions, although his votes are somewhat contradictory. It would seem tolerably clear, however, that if the farmer is willing to give up his protection, the Government will hardly stand in his way.

This only clears up a portion of this list. There is still the question of flour, canned meat, ham and other prepared food products. Here enter the packer and the miller. Their interests must be considered. Will they give up their protection? Not without a struggle.

The net result, then, will probably be that the Canadian Government will immediately remove the duty on wheat, cattle, sheep, swine, poultry and potatoes, but retain it on manufactured food products. The only difficulty in regard to wheat is that a removal of our duty on it may not satisfy the United States requirements without also removing the duty on flour, bran, and shorts. If this turns out to be the case, then the situation becomes complicated.

Some may say that the Conservatives would be inconsistent if they make tariff reductions. The objection will not make a strong appeal to the party managers who desire to cultivate the good-will of Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta. The others, higher up, do not mind being inconsistent if they think they are doing what is right,