

the College was ours, and for an hour, staff and students alike vied with each other in their courteous treatment of the visitors, who could not help being impressed with the air of culture, dignity and refinement, which characterised, not only, the Faculty but also, the student body of the W. B. C.

Long before the hour when the programme was advertised to commence, the spacious audience room was packed to its utmost capacity with the best of Woodstock's citizens.

After being entertained by music, both vocal and instrumental, and a well rendered reading in Habitant dialect, the interest centred on the principal feature of the evening's entertainment, which, was a debate between the Literary Societies of the two colleges, on the question, "Resolved, that the Government of Ontario should not enact a law prohibiting the importation, manufacture, and sale of intoxicating beverages." The affirmative of the question was defended by Messrs. McDonald and Burke, representing Woodstock College, while Messrs. Ketchen and Black, on behalf of the O. A. C., argued the negative.

Mr. McDonald, the leader of the affirmative, was careful to explain in his opening remarks, that he was strictly temperate in his habits, though not a prohibitionist. He considered that the Government would not be justified in enacting such a law without due deliberation. We require a certain amount of pure liquor which can not be had outside of Ontario. We supply Manitoba and Quebec, and to prohibit manufacture would be to cut off a valuable export, besides being an injustice to the people of these Provinces. Again, we would throw a large number of men out of employment. He opposed prohibition because it would be necessary to compensate those whose business would be destroyed. He claimed that no Provincial Government had a right to enact such a law, and even if enacted, it could not be enforced, because at

the time of the plebiscite the cities had declared against prohibition. He also cited the Scott Act as a failure.

Mr. Ketchen introduced the negative side of the argument by first explaining away the failure of the Scott and Dunkin Acts. He then went on to show that prohibitive legislation had been successfully enforced in Maine, Kansas, Iowa, and other States, and argued that what the people of these States had done so well, the people of Ontario could do just a little better. He went on to say that the question is not as to whether or not we *can* prohibit—that goes without saying—the question is as to whether or not we *ought* to prohibit. Is prohibition in the public interest? If it is, we will find a way to prohibit.

He proceeded to argue the question from an economic point of view, contending that the Ontario Legislature should prohibit the importation, manufacture, and sale of intoxicating beverages:

Because we would thereby prevent an enormous waste of national wealth in the form of raw material which is annually consumed in the manufacture of liquor. We would effect a saving of the time and energy of the men employed in the traffic, and would divert that energy into other more productive channels.

Because the capital invested in the manufacture and sale of liquor would, if invested in other industries, employ more men, and pay more wages;

Because these men, instead of spending their money over the bar, would expend it in the building and maintenance of homes, and homes are the bulwarks of the nation;

Because total abstainers are more efficient producers, and we would thereby increase the wealth-producing capacity of our people;

Because prohibition would diminish crime and poverty;

Because we would effect a saving in the cost of administration of justice, and the maintenance of the poor,