

a countenance, and we shall not fail to try and make ourselves and all around us have a good time. We shall at all suitable times praise, laud and magnify our Bowling team, our Hockey club, our Football champions, our College institutions, our students, our professors and our University. We shall display an appetite that will be a standing reproach to the Kingston boarding house system. We shall go and see our girl and every other girl that crosses our path. We shall get under the mistletoe as often as possible, and we shall attend every At Home, concert and tea meeting within fifteen miles. In a word, in the language of our beloved post-graduate theologian, "We shall do our utmost to develop our social and æsthetical character." Finally, brethren, we shall not shirk our work by leaving before the 22nd, and we shall be back to answer "Adsum" on the 9th inst. If any one can show any just cause or impediment why this may not lawfully be done let him now speak or else hereafter forever hold his peace.

* * *

The JOURNAL extends to its many friends and patrons the most kindly holiday greetings. We trust that though the memories of past ones are very pleasant, yet that this Christmas and New Year may be the brightest and happiest that you have ever experienced:

"Some say that ever 'gainst that season comes
Wherein our Saviour's birth is celebrated,
The bird of dawning singeth all night long,
And then, they say, no spirit dares stir abroad.
The nights are wholesome; then no planets strike,
No fairy takes, nor witch hath power to charm,
So hallowed and so gracious is the time."

—SHAKESPEARE.

* * *

We wish to draw attention to an article in this issue, a criticism of "Bruce's Apologetics," contributed by one of our graduates. We hope this is the first of a number of contributions from those who have gone forth from Queen's after having drunk deep from her manly, independent, truth-loving spirit. We shall always be pleased to print articles equally meritorious. Let us whisper that to some minds one lesson of last year's Theological Conference was the absolute necessity of men after leaving College continuing the careful, critical study developed while in the University. We know that too frequently the environment affords little stimulus and scant appreciation, but so long as the JOURNAL exists let no man sigh about hiding his light under a bushel.

* * *

The approaching plebiscite is drawing forth many heated arguments from both friend and foe. Some of the extreme statements on each side are at once ludicrous and deplorable. We believe that all should be given a fair hearing, and that whatever of truth there is in the arguments advanced either for

or against prohibition should receive due consideration; but we have no sympathy with the spirit of bigotry which causes prohibitionists to look upon all who do not see eye to eye with them in this matter as outside the pale of Christianity which causes them to denounce all professing Christians who oppose them as hypocrites and panderers to appetite in themselves or others. Sweeping denunciations and mean insinuations from either pulpit or platform, as to the motives of those who oppose prohibition, will do little to advance the cause of temperance.

While, however, we have no sympathy with such a spirit, we may, perhaps, partially excuse it in some men when we remember the terrible havoc which liquor has wrought. Those who have seen men with the brightest of prospects blight them with a drunkard's life and end all in a drunkard's grave, who have seen mothers with dependent little ones starved and abused by men who but for the demon, drink, would have been dutiful and affectionate husbands, may perhaps be excused, though not justified, for having extreme views and for rashly denouncing those who oppose their proposed remedies. But for that spirit which causes anti-prohibitionists to denounce total abstainers and prohibition advocates in general as "fanatics" and "enemies of liberty," there is neither justification nor excuse.

It seems to us there are two main questions to be considered in deciding how to vote upon this problem: First, is the liquor traffic, as now conducted, a sore on the body politic? Second, if so, is prohibition the best, or as good as the best, remedy?

That prohibition is an interference with personal liberty is an argument neither for nor against its adoption. If society be merely an organization formed by mutual consent for the convenience of man, then it may have to give way to individual rights, even though to do so means its destruction. But if society is a necessity of human nature without which the best in man cannot be developed, then individual rights must not be allowed to stand before public rights, but whatever threatens the life of the state must be abolished. All prohibitory laws are based upon this principle, and recognize the fact that the loss of certain personal rights is more than made up to the individuals losing them in the better form of society which these prohibitory laws procure to those individuals, and without which any high development would be impossible.

One other statement we would like to notice. It is sometimes said that prohibition is wrong, because, while it removes the possibility of evil in excessive drinking, it also removes the possibility of strengthening character by overcoming that evil. How thoughtful men can take such a position as this we cannot understand. So long as man is not deprived