

of the College, we are to have two skating rinks. We need not say that this thought has caused us considerable sorrow, for we have watched the building of the first rink with far more than ordinary interest, awaiting results which yet we hardly dared hope for. We had even anticipated buying a pair of skates for our own use. But now—now all is changed. We are to have two rinks. We understand, however, that the second rink is at a decided disadvantage, because there is no place to put it: hence it is that we are led to offer the following suggestion. Why not flood the new rink over the old one? We trust this will not be considered an interference on our part. The suggestion is made solely with the desire to help remove embarrassments if we can.

### — — — VARSITY vs. MCGILL.

#### THE ANNUAL INTER-COLLEGIATE DEBATE.

This annual contest was held in the Molson Hall, McGill University on Friday evening, the 1st of February, when the Varsity men were successful. Before the appointed hour—eight o'clock—the Hall began to fill with those invited to the evening's entertainment, and by the time the programme was begun the Hall was crowded to its utmost capacity with a most enthusiastic audience. The Students enlivened matters till the chairman, Mr. Hanson, Arts '95, President of the Undergraduates Literary Society, opened the proceedings with a few pointed and well-timed remarks.

Prof. N. W. Trenholme, O.C., D.C.L., Dean of the Faculty of Law, kindly acted as judge. This year, instead of merely summing up the arguments adduced by both sides, and leaving the decision with the audience, the judge was to give the verdict.

Before the chief part of the programme, the debate, was taken up, Mr. A. E. Heney gave an excellent recitation, and Mr. E. A. Burke, Arts '98, rendered a song in a very capable manner.

The question of debate was: "That it would be unwise to abolish the Canadian Senate." Messrs. W. W. Craig and M. C. Hopkins of McGill spoke on the affirmative side, and Messrs. H. Greenwood and R. L. McKinnon spoke for the negative. Mr. W. W. Craig opened the debate for the affirmative, and in an eloquent manner contended that in life there were many things which, however much our reason might rebel against, could nevertheless not be totally eradicated. One of these evils was, he contended, the division of society into orders and classes which was imposed upon us by the laws of nature, even though contrary to the laws of humanity. The speaker then briefly surveyed the forms of government which had existed since the beginning of history

to the present day, showing that the ruling power which in early times had been vested in one man had gradually come to be exercised by the people. Hence second chambers became an absolute necessity, as was instanced in all governments of the present day, for checking the power which a lower house possessed, and the masses through the lower house. Of such second chambers, the English House of Lords Mr. Craig considered was the most efficient type, and the Canadian Senate, being modelled on lines closely allied to those of the House of Lords, was therefore, as far as practicable, the best second chamber which could exist.

Mr. R. L. McKinnon, who led for the negative, eloquently and severely attacked the arguments set forth by the previous speaker, and maintained that Ontario was a most conspicuous example of an efficient government without a second chamber. This form of government, it was contended by the speaker, aided quick and honest government. The fact that the Canadian Senate was the product of one man was dwelt on, as also the fact that the men appointed were of the same opinions politically as the man who had appointed them, and thus in case of a change of government the Senate would in all probability veto the acts of such a government, even though it, through its lower house, was expressing the popular will of the day.

Mr. M. C. Hopkins followed for the affirmative, and pointed out that all the great nations of the world had found the bi-chamberal system absolutely necessary. The speaker emphasized the fact of the extremely vacillating character of popular will, and claimed that without a second chamber, laws which were the result of years of experience might be swept away without due consideration by the caprice of the people under some pressing momentary excitement. It was only by having a second chamber composed of men who are not affected by every change of party that a stable and efficient form of government could be upheld.

The last speaker, Mr. H. Greenwood of Toronto, who followed for the negative, ably maintained that as the Canadian Senate was wholly out of touch with the electorate, its abolition would be a benefit. It was an insult to the Canadian people to inform them that the men whom they elected to represent them were dishonest and incompetent to govern their country. More especially was the maintenance of a second chamber out of place in a country so thoroughly democratic as Canada, where such a chamber did not represent the opinion of the majority of the electors.

Dean Trenholme, before giving verdict, complimented the speakers on both sides for their very able handling of the question. He reviewed the arguments pro and con, pointing out that the affirmative