

can boast of having done as much for the O.H.A. as Queen's, not only by her representative teams, but also through her representatives or the executive, and in the latter capacity we refer chiefly to Mr. Aleck H. Beaton, '93, who has proved himself a worthy and faithful official. It is therefore like parting from a lifelong friend for Queen's to break the old associations, but as professionalism is entering more and more into this and other unions, and as the Colleges have asserted themselves strongly on that point, the time for Intercollegiate hockey is certainly at hand.

* * *

THE INTERCOLLEGIATE DEBATE.

What the *Mail and Empire* calls "the first annual debate between Queen's University and University College," took place in Toronto on the evening of the 24th ult. The files of the JOURNAL show that it took place in Convocation Hall here on Feb. 12th, 1887. The press, even in Toronto, does not know everything, but sometimes it is willing to be corrected. Did not an editor, who had declared officially in his paper that Mr. X had been hanged, on meeting him in his office next day, offer to insert an additional item to the effect that he had been cut down before life was extinct? Yes, Toronto sent down two good men to us in 1887, to inaugurate an Inter-Collegiate Annual Debate; and in 1888 Queen's returned the compliment by sending up Horsey, popularly known as "the Orator," and Patterson, now Principal of Carleton Place High School. Apparently, Toronto was then satisfied, for no one appeared the year following or in any year since, to continue what had been so well inaugurated. This Session, however, we were asked to begin again, and the Alma Mater, not standing on our turn or ceremony, agreed. Cannon and Anthony were sent up to the oratorical contest, and the Judges, consisting of two Professors of University College and our good friend Dr. Milligan, awarded the palm to the Queen's men.

It is interesting to look back upon what occurred in 1887, as we find the record in the JOURNAL, for we get another illustration of how history repeats itself, and that "there is nothing new under the sun." The resolution affirmed by Messrs. Gandier and Rattray was:

"That it is desirable to secure the permanent unity of the British Empire, and in order to that some form of federation or alliance, to defend common rights, secure common interests, and discharge common duties, is requisite, sooner or later."

On that occasion Messrs. Ferguson and Acheson, for Toronto, declined to take a positive stand against the main contention of their opponents, and they therefore had no case worth speaking of. In the words of the JOURNAL, "They chose to admit the position of the affirmative that the permanent unity of the Empire was desirable, and based their arguments against Imperial Federation on the ground that present relations between the mother country and the colonies have in them the elements of permanency.

"In opposition to this position, the speakers of the affirmative had not much difficulty in showing that for present relations to continue much longer would be contrary to the genius of free or representative government; that before long the colonies would be equal to Great Britain in population, wealth and power, and must, therefore, come by degrees to assume their full share in guiding the destinies and bearing the burdens of the Empire, if unity were to be maintained.

"The speakers of the negative then aimed to show that Imperial Federation was impossible, but failing to accept the only other issue, viz., independence or annexation, their argument became simply an effort to point out the difficulties in the way of effecting any particular form of Federation."

But the affirmative gathered up their arguments—permanent unity is desirable, both for the sake of the different members of the empire and for the sake of the world as a whole. If unity is to be permanent we must have some form of Federation sooner or later. Once the people of the Empire are convinced that unity is desirable and that it can be maintained only by some form of Federation, who will dare to say that it is impossible for them to effect it?

Federation is impossible only if we, who constitute the different members of the Empire, lose our lofty ideals and become narrow and self-seeking.

This year the subject of debate was, "That Imperial Federation is practicable and advisable from a Canadian point of view." It was chosen by the Toronto students out of a list of five, sent up by Queen's, the Toronto men asking that the last six words be added. This was done, and our representatives took the affirmative. Again, the Queen's men pressed for something positive from their opponents, as they insisted that full self-government implied a share in the supreme affairs of national life and not merely local self-government; that the highest elements of national character can be developed only where supreme responsibilities are felt; and that the question really amounted to whether it was better to