and was spoken with that emphasis and inflexion which can be obtained only by one who has completely mastered the whole subject. His arguments were grouped round the following two points: (a) Old Age Pensions had been successfully adopted in other countries whose conditions and needs resembled those of Canada. (b) Old Age Pensions had been successfully adopted in many private enterprises and in many branches of the public service, and that it was only charitable and logical that the system should be extended so as to embrace also the section of the workers of society.

The first point was admirably set forth by a detailed examination of the success of the pension system in other countries, and especially in the colonies of Australia. He concluded by placing his opponents on the horns of the following dilemma: Either his opponents would have to admit that Old Age Pensions would be beneficial to Canada, or they would have to admit that Canadians are abnormally dull, that they do not love money, and that Canadian politicians are incompetent and dishonest.

The second part was then admirably brought out by showing that many enterprises in the States and Canada had successfully adopted the Old Age Pension Scheme, that by means of it the employee became more thrifty, and especially more faithful to duty.

Mr. O'Gara, at the conclusion of his speech, was greeted with a hearty round of applause. The Queen's leader of the negative then got up and opposed the introduction of Old Age Pensions into Canada. His main objection was that conditions in Canada were not the same as in other countries, and that, therefore, the arguments of the affirmative did not apply. He also advanced stringent reasons, based upon the height of wages in Canada and the diffused prosperity of the country.

Austin Stanton then rose and seconded the proposal that Old Age Pensions should be introduced into Canada. Unlike the leader, he argued a priore, using arguments drawn from a consideration of the very nature of Old Age Pensions. He showed by sure and consecutive steps that man has a right to a living wage, that the living wage means a wage out of which it is possible to save for old age, and that in Canada the working man does not receive this living wage. Naturally, this being the key-stone of the argument, it had to be strongly proven, which was done by producing facts and figures drawn up and sanctioned by the best authorities. Mr. Stanton then showed how this want of a living wage proceeded from an unjust