

will not be generally accepted. There will come a time, let us hope, when our country will be so unified that the dividing lines to which we have referred can be obliterated. It is not likely, we fear, to come soon. It certainly has not yet come.

There is an unwritten law that the Speakers of the two Houses shall be changed with every Parliament, and that the Speaker of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Commons shall not be of the same faith. If the Speaker of the Senate is to be a Roman Catholic the unwritten law requires that the Speaker of the House of Commons shall be a Protestant. And vice versa. Regard must be had also at times to the respective claims of French and English in the filling of the two offices.

Ridiculous rules, many will say; but rules they are which are less likely to be set aside now than at any previous time in the Dominion's history. These are not unity making days. The theory of the permanency of the Speakership seems all right, but the idea is not practicable.

The Primary

THE "primary" is one of the modern inventions of American politics. To those familiar with the British system the primary is a queer thing. A curious fact in the British method is that, while party government is in normal times the very essence of British politics, parties are absolutely unknown to the British statute-books. There is a great Liberal party, a great Conservative party, and a great Labor party, each well recognized in the management of public affairs, each playing a large part in the making and unmaking of governments, but all are entirely ignored in the laws of the country. The laws deal with the citizen as such and leave him to work through parties or independently of them as he may see fit. It is otherwise in the United States. There it not infrequently occurs that in a law providing for the creation of some commission or other body a condition is imposed to secure representation of the great parties of the nation. In the laws respecting the primary there is further recognition of political parties. In fact the primary is intended to officially control the action of parties. It was designed to do away with the convention system of nomination, to abolish "bossism", and to secure the nomination of candidates of each party by the free action of the members thereof. In many States before a man can present himself as a Republican or Democratic candidate at the polls, he must be nominated by the vote of a primary conducted under the provisions of law.

Whether this system has given the public better candidates and better representatives than the old convention system is open to doubt. Just now the people are afforded an amusing illustration of how things do not work out as intended. Mr. Charles E. Hughes, recently a candidate for the Presidency, was a chief advocate of the primary system and as Governor of New York signed the law applying that system to the State. Mr. Theodore Roosevelt also was a warm advocate of the primary system. It was under this system that Mr. John Purroy Mitchell, the present efficient Mayor of New York City, had to seek primary approval of his candidature for nomination on the Republican ticket. Although supported by the most prominent men of the Republican party he failed to get this nomination. A rival candidate, Mr. Bennett, was chosen by the primary voters. Now we find Mr. Hughes and Mr. Roosevelt, champions

of the primary as a means of preventing "bossism", obliged to come out against the primary's candidate, thus virtually repudiating their own child. They are calling on the Republican voters, and all other voters, of New York to reject the primary candidate and elect Mr. Mitchell, whose nomination the primary refused to accept.

Where do the Allies Stand?

WHERE do the Allies stand, after three years conflict, is a question discussed by the London New Age. In what position are the Allies and what is the outlook? As to men, generally, the man-power, it is claimed that, outside of the United States, the maximum has been reached, that to replace inevitable losses will be all that can be done. Had not Russia broken down so badly with that Empire's vast man-power, it is thought 1917 would have seen the end of earth's greatest tragedy. The joining of the forces of the United States cannot be over-estimated, as respects men, munitions and means. While victory was certain after the Marne, and, never doubted, the aid of the United States makes assurance doubly sure.

As to the man-power of the enemy, the contention is, "that long ago the maximum of effectives has been reached, and is now rapidly declining."

General Smuts, in an interview, published lately in a Paris Journal, made this statement:

"The military aspect of the situation is satisfactory. To-day we have conquered, the victory is ours. The Germans understand that perfectly; they are able to foresee the final result of our persistent military pressure."

The New York Nation, of a recent date, said: "For nearly a year the German Government, convinced that it cannot win the war and that even prolonged fighting means ruin, has been bidding for peace."

In regard to munitions, the New Age says: "Whether we have regard to military or civil supplies, to munitions of the field or to munitions of the factory, the conclusion is the same that, whereas our supplies are increasing and our capacities for producing them on the increase also, the total output of supplies by the enemy is decreasing both absolutely and relatively."

A. G. G., of the London Daily News, has made a visit to the front and the following is his impression:

"It is not easy from such a swirl of experiences to find the main current of things; but the effort is worth making and comparison with the past will assist the task. It is more than a year since I was on the French front, and two years since I was last on the British front. What is the capital change that has happened in the interval? I think it can be stated in four words. The Germans are going. In a general way we know this here; but there it is a visible fact. It is not a thing worked out on the map, but a thing present to the eye—a living fact which you seem to breathe and feel and know with that kind of assurance that defies analysis. It is this sense of victory, subtle, all-pervasive, which marks the fundamental difference between September, 1915, and September, 1917. Then the dominant note was the sense of the power of the enemy. He seemed like a rock against which the waves of attack broke impotently. To-day the

rock is crumbling and turning to sand. You feel the waves creeping forward, slowly, it is true, but with cumulative power. The moral balance is reversed." Another London Journal of a late date is equally optimistic.

"We all want peace. We are fighting for peace. That is the very reason for the war. If it were not to secure peace there would be no reason for going on with the war. We went to war to relieve Europe from the menace of militarism, and until that menace has gone, and the world has been made safe for the peoples as against the princes, there can be no peace. That end is probably a good deal nearer than it looks."

As to the economic position of the Allies, the superiority is beyond question, and calls for no elucidation, for practically it is a world against the enemy.

Oleomargarine

FOR many months the Journal of Commerce has been urging the repeal, or at least the suspension during war-time, of the ancient regulations forbidding the manufacture, importation or sale of oleomargarine in Canada. These regulations, wise enough when they were made, had outlived their usefulness, and during the war operated to prevent the people obtaining a useful substitute for the butter which had become so costly as to be beyond the reach of the poorer classes. That the regulations remained so long, and that the recent long session of Parliament passed without any serious effort to remove them, should have been a surprising fact. At last the matter is being dealt with, by an order of the Food Controller. There is no reason for action now that did not exist many months ago. However, it is satisfactory to find, even at this late day, some effort to grant relief to the public.

The use of oleomargarine is to be allowed under regulations most of which are, no doubt, proper. There is one limitation that may need explanation. A recent report from Ottawa, forecasting the Food Controller's action, stated that the manufacture of oleomargarine was to be allowed, but not the importation. The regulations as now announced are not entirely in line with the forecast, but there is one provision which suggests a possibility that the same result may be reached indirectly. One of the rules says that "no oleomargarine may be imported unless it has been manufactured under Government supervision in the country of production." The only country from which oleomargarine can conveniently be imported is the United States. There are pure food laws in the United States. If their character and the manner of their operation form such a "government supervision" as to comply with the condition laid down in the Canadian Food Controller's regulation, all will be well.

DOUBLE SALARY. — City learns of police officer who draws fireman's salary:—There is a police officer in Montreal who is drawing salary as such, and also a pension from the fire department. This fact came to light this morning when the Board of Control was discussing pensions. The case of the officer, who is a lieutenant, is being investigated.—Montreal Star.

Surely the case of this lieutenant should be investigated. It is only in the highest ranks of the public service that a man can be allowed to draw both pension and salary.