

friends, however, are making a strong fight and in the opinion of many observers his chances of success have been improved by recent discussions on the platform and in the press.

A very interesting feature of the contest is the attitude of the many German-American voters and of the candidates toward these voters. If Mr. Wilson, in his negotiations with Germany, did not go as far as some of his critics desired, he went far enough to antagonize those American electors of German blood whose zeal for their motherland is stronger than their attachment to American institutions. That this very numerous section of the American people would be against Mr. Wilson in the Presidential contest was early made apparent. Mr. Hughes, not having been called upon in his position as a judge to say or do anything at the time when the strain between Germany and the United States was greatest, seemed to be in a position as a candidate to receive the support of these German-Americans. But keen observers saw a danger to him in this, as the mass of the American people were clearly not in sympathy with Germany in her infamous methods of making war. There was danger that in winning the Germans Mr. Hughes might lose a support that he needed. There was a marked vagueness in Mr. Hughes' treatment of the questions he discussed. He displayed much severity in his criticisms of the Washington Government, but seldom gave any intelligible indication of what he thought would have been a wise policy in the cases to which he referred. This feature of his addresses has been emphasized by his opponents. At one of his meetings, in Louisville, Kentucky, Mr. Hughes was denouncing the Washington Government for their alleged weakness in relation to the Lusitania case. A citizen in his audience demanded that he state clearly what he would have done if he had been President. The question was an uncomfortable one, but in view of the criticisms that were being offered respecting his vagueness, Mr. Hughes, apparently, felt that he must answer. Thereupon he said that in the Lusitania case if he had been President he would have instantly broken off diplomatic relations with Germany. Whether such formal action would have given the United States any more substantial satisfaction than they have had from their negotiations with Berlin may be a question for debate. Mr. Hughes' answer, however, seems to have satisfied some people who had feared that he was coquetting too much with the German vote. Thus, Professor Van Tyne, of Ann Arbor, writes to the New York Times:

"Some six weeks ago you published a letter of mine expressing my unwillingness to support Mr. Hughes unless by some unequivocal utterance he made it impossible for any reasonable 'hyphenate' voter to claim him as the logical candidate of those who demand subservience to Germany. His recent reply in Louisville to the question as to what he would have done in the case of the Lusitania is very satisfactory to me.

"Any 'hyphenate' whose mind works so regardless of the rules of logic as to conclude that Mr. Hughes would have solved our diplomatic controversies with Germany more to Teutonic taste than has President Wilson is welcome to his delusion. As for me, I shall vote for Mr. Hughes and expect to see him show moral courage even in the face of 'frightful' Germany, the international 'Bugaboo Bill.'"

Prof. Van Tyne evidently was anxious to find reason for supporting Mr. Hughes, and

therefore gave much weight to the Louisville incident. That there are others who are not so easily satisfied is evident from an article which appears in the same issue of the Times from Professor J. E. Creighton, Dean of the Graduate School of Cornell University. Prof. Creighton severely condemns the German-American movement against Mr. Wilson, and calls upon Mr. Hughes for a distinct repudiation of such tactics. In concluding his article Prof. Creighton says:

"This sedition should be scattered and suppressed before election day by bold and patriotic action on the part of Mr. Hughes. If he will himself denounce its objects and methods openly and unequivocally, and will put himself squarely beside Mr. Wilson in asking that those who do not put America first should not vote for him, the movement will no longer have any centre or rallying point, and will fall to pieces and slink away like a guilty thing surprised. The voters are waiting for some declaration of this kind from Mr. Hughes. I voted twice for Mr. Hughes for Governor of New York, and feel encouraged by the fine record which he made in that office to believe that he will very soon hit out against the hyphenate party which insults him by claiming that he is its nominee, and that he is to be elected through its votes as the chosen instrument in 'punishing' the President.

"I do not believe that he is '100 per cent a candidate,' any more than I believe that Woodrow Wilson is 'too proud to fight.' These unfortunate phrases might well be buried together as twin follies. Candidate or not, Mr. Hughes, I am confident, will refuse to countenance, or even passively to profit by, the efforts of a party which is avowedly acting in the interests of a foreign nation.

"But if he fails us at this time, as I do not think he will, the unhyphenated American voters will attend to the matter themselves on election day. Whatever may become of Mr. Hughes and his candidacy, it is certain that the voters are not going to stand by and see the President 'punished' (more Germanico) for endeavoring to safeguard American lives on the high seas and to maintain international law. It is a great Prussian game, this game of Strafen, but it will find short shrift here. This isn't Belgium."

The position of the hyphenated voter seems to be the one of paramount interest in these closing days of the campaign. Each of the party organizations is accusing the other of having underground negotiations with the German element in several states. Mr. Wilson and Mr. Hughes have made further references to the subject, but neither has said anything that is likely to change the situation. The prospect is that the German-Americans will to a large extent vote for Mr. Hughes, not because they like him more, but because they like President Wilson less.

### Oleomargarine

MANY years ago Canada, by very stringent legislation, prohibited the importation, manufacture or sale of oleomargarine. In no other country, we believe, was there such complete prohibition of the trade. In the main the prohibition was good for Canada. No interest was injured. The public were protected against fraud. In those days most of the oleomargarine produced was a very objectionable article, made from the refuse of the slaughter

houses of great cities. It was neither pleasing nor wholesome. It was too often sold as butter and a fraud was thus committed on the public in places where the sale was allowed. Another reason, we believe, that influenced the passing of the Canadian legislation was that Canada, as a great agricultural country, hoped to become a large manufacturer of butter for export. It was argued, with much force, that if the fact became known abroad that the production and trade in oleomargarine were absolutely prohibited Canadian butter would carry a guarantee of purity that would recommend it in the markets to which it was shipped. All the reasons that led to the prohibition in Canada seem to have been good reasons.

To-day the situation is changed. The oleomargarine of the present day is a much less objectionable article than that of earlier times. It is made largely from vegetable oils. It is, of course, much less desirable than pure butter, but for some purposes, where its use is permitted, it has become an acceptable substitute for butter, and it is not injurious to health. Canada's reputation abroad for good butter is well established. The misfortune is that we have so little butter to export. There is therefore less need than formerly of regard for the foreign market. The condition of the home market is the more serious matter now, when war conditions are making foodstuffs very expensive. With butter commanding just double the ordinary price the question of cheaper substitutes becomes more pressing than it was in former times. There will be a demand for the privilege of using oleomargarine in quarters where there was no thought of such a thing when pure butter could be had at fair prices—a demand so strong that it will, in all probability, have to be yielded to.

If there is to be a revision of the law concerning oleomargarine care must be taken to still protect the public at home and abroad. If oleomargarine or any other substitute for butter is to be tolerated, the law should by stringent provision require that all such articles be, as far as possible, distinctly marked as substitutes, and anybody offering them as real butter should be severely punished. If we are to have these less desirable products as one of the unavoidable consequences of the war let the public know exactly what they are buying.

The London Canadian Gazette records with pleasure the appreciation by the folk in the homeland of the gallant conduct of the Canadian soldiers at the front. "British recognition of Canadian gallantry," says that journal, "has been wholehearted and expresses itself in various ways. On Monday a Canadian soldier was before the North London Police Magistrate as a somewhat disorderly absentee. The military escort waited to take him back to the depot. But the magistrate would have none of it. 'I am,' he said, 'going to discharge you; although the escort is here I shall not hand you over. I am taking this course because Canada has done so splendidly in this war. We are all so proud of the achievements of our Colonial troops that I feel that I cannot adopt the usual course.' Perhaps it is ungracious to take exception to the well meant decision of the London magistrate. But the military authorities will hardly have the highest appreciation of the magistrate's wisdom. If Canadian soldiers at the front have acquitted themselves with honor, that is the poorest kind of reason why other Canadian soldiers, not at the front, should become 'disorderly absentees.' A compliment to Canada at the expense of military discipline is not desirable.