

And, finally, because the people have demanded it, and to refuse to enact prohibitive legislation would, therefore, be an outrage to the principles of Democratic Government.

Before introducing the supporters in debate, the programme was varied with a solo rendered by Mr. Cutting, of the O. A. C. Mr. Cutting was obliged to respond to a very hearty encore, which he did in his usual good form.

Mr. Burke, the supporter of the affirmative, now took the platform, and in his opening remarks, was at considerable pains to explain, especially to the ladies, that, like his leader, he, too, had recently reformed, and was now a temperance man. In arguing for the affirmative, he claimed that, according to investigation, 2 ozs. of alcohol had been found to contain as much food as 1½ ozs. of cod liver oil, and, if this were true, he would prefer the alcohol. The primary object of prohibition, he argued, should be to promote the social standing of the community. Just here he made startling comparisons of the state of public morality in some of the States of the Union, with that of Ontario, especially with regard to Sabbath observance. "Prohibition," he said, "would be an infringement of personal liberties, making a crime of that which many men believe to be right." He, too, like his colleague, argued that a prohibitory law could not be enforced, unless it were supported by a large majority. If passed, it would be detrimental to the best interests of the state, as it would lead to contempt for law, and other crimes would flourish. "Ontario," he said, "is not ripe for it." He advised education and restriction, instead of prohibition.

Mr. Black, in continuing the argument for the negative, showed that all laws interfere to a certain extent with personal liberty, and that it is folly to say that prohibition would

make a crime of that which many people believe to be right. "Many men," said Mr. Plack, "beat their wives, conscientiously believing them to be the better for it, but the law interferes refusing to recognize individual beliefs in such a matter as a standard of right and wrong."

He contended that a prohibitory law should be enacted, because it would do away with the treating system. "Drunkenness," he proved, was alarmingly on the increase on account of this system. Secondly, because those addicted to the use of strong drink desire prohibition. Again, he argued for prohibition because of the injustice inflicted on those who do not touch it—wives, children, mothers, and dependants. Anything else than prohibition would be a compromise. Now we have partial prohibition. Let us have it in its entirety. Even if the law were not enforced to the letter, it would still be a means to an end, in that it would help men to become sober, industrious, law-abiding citizens. Since the principle is right, the end cannot fail to be all that is noble, righteous and just.

The leaders were then given three minutes for reply in which each criticised the arguments of his opponent.

While the judges were conferring, Mr. Klinck delivered an address on "The Progress of Liberty," in which he did ample justice to himself, and admirably sustained the honor of the O. A. C.

The judges decided in favor of Woodstock, basing their decision on their recent reading of the referendum, which had led them to conclude that such an act as that proposed in the resolution would be unconstitutional, and that, therefore, the speakers representing the O. A. C. had attempted to prove the impossible.

Refreshments were then served, after which the boys lined up in orderly procession and "hied awa hame."