

one except the boys in the gallery who could not resist making fun of Nick and his love-making at every opportunity.

Prof. Wrong now announced the debate: "Resolved, that the British aristocracy does actually render such services to the state and society as to warrant its retention of present status"; and introduced the first speaker and leader of the affirmative, Mr. S G Archibald, B.A., of McGill University.

Mr. Archibald, before opening the debate, expressed the pleasure of his colleague and himself at being present in Toronto to debate against Varsity, and assured his fellow-students in Toronto (if he might call them so) that there was no greater honor to be obtained at McGill than to be chosen to represent their college in the annual debate against the University of Toronto.

The subject for discussion, Mr. Archibald stated, divided itself into two heads, viz: Services to the State and services to society. He intended to deal with the first head, while his colleague would show the good services of the aristocracy to society. With respect to the state, the British aristocracy was synonymous with the House of Lords, and a second chamber such as it is, was of invaluable service in preventing tyranny by the majority. The British House of Lords, the speaker went on to say, was therefore efficient in the best government in the world, since by results, as well as comparisons which the debater made with France and United States, the British Government was undoubtedly the best in the world. The secret of success of the English form of government was the complete union of the legislative and executive, such a union being entirely absent in the United States government. After asking the question "Does the House of Lords play a *practical* part in the government?" Mr. Archibald proved from history that by the character and independence of the House—the Lords being above all corruption, and not having to cater to the voters at election time—it has the power of delaying and altering legislation. We see, too, from history that among the aristocracy we find, with but few exceptions, all the best debaters, orators, statesmen, etc., since they have leisure, means and political training, being born in a political atmosphere. The Lords, too, no matter what their opponents may say, are interested in good legislation, being the great landowners of the country. It has often been stated that the people of England did not want the Lords over them, but this is not so, as in great municipal councils and boards the common people had of late chosen aristocrats to fill the highest positions.

Mr. J. Inkster opened the debate for the negative by vigorously denouncing the hereditary principle upon which the House of Lords was founded. He proved by several instances from history that the Upper House had never introduced legislation except to defend its privileges, and

in every case opposed new legislation introduced by the House of Commons on the same grounds. He reviewed the Greek, Roman and Venetian aristocracy, which, however, were founded on merit, not on birth; and then dealt with the British form, starting from the aristocracy at the time of King John, where alone we find an instance of the Lords being beneficial to the state, when the Barons wrested the Great Charter from their king. But, Mr. Inkster claimed, they did this only from selfish motives, and it was a case where all things worked for good. He then proved that retention of privilege was the main motive of the Upper House. It never completely opposed a bill it saw the Commons were determined upon passing, as that would mean a sufficient number of peers would be appointed to pass the bill in the Upper House, and thus the Lords would only be committing suicide. Mr. Inkster's arguments were all vigorously stated and clinched with a zeal and force which left no doubt in the minds of his hearers that these were the real facts; and when the flight of time forced him to dam the flood of oratory with which he had upheld his side, the affirmative seemed to have no ground of argument left.

However, Mr. W. B. Heney advanced to the attack, and when he uttered a few of his well-composed sentences, bristling with points and stern facts, the audience at once climbed over to his side of the fence. In fact, so far did this smiling Irishman (which nationality he claimed) show himself a polished speaker, both in handling of argument and flow of rhetoric that all (especially those of the fair sex) admitted his to be *the* speech of the evening. As Mr. Archibald had stated he would, Mr. Heney dealt mostly with the services of the aristocracy to society. He pointed out its permanency, being based on birth and ownership of land, not on the almighty dollar as in the United States, where the leading men are nothing but boodlers, corruptionists, tyrannizing over the people's rights. Such as this the English lord could not be, from his very condition in life, his breeding and his dignity. He pointed out also, that if the House of Lords was done away with, where could we get such another second chamber? Two hundred of its members had been members of the House of Commons, and the most prominent men in England belonged to it. Mr. Heney then showed how such positions as those of Governor-General to the Colonies, ambassadors, etc., could be properly filled only by members of the peerage, as they alone could uphold the dignity and state of the British Crown.

Mr. Munroe closed the debate for the negative in an excellent address. He took the ironical vein, pointing out that we could not hope to be great or wise or dignified, for all the sunshine of this life was reserved for the aristocracy. The greater part of Mr. Munroe's speech was thus given to ridiculing the so-called benefits which the lords showered on the people at large. However, near the close of his time he so rammed home argument after argument that he completely finished the construction of the coffin which Mr. Inkster had commenced, for the now deceased aristocracy.

But Mr. Archibald, in his reply, showed that though disfigured he was still in the ring; and in a few well-put words brought the audience out of the hypnotic state in which Mr. Munroe had thrown them. Evidently he turned the tide in his favor, for Prof. Wrong, after stating his dilemma in judging between the logical clearness and oratory of the affirmative on the one hand, and the vigorous arguments and pointed irony of the negative on the other, decided that the honors rested with the McGill students.

This decision was received with great applause, the boys in the gallery declaring enthusiastically that McGill was all right, and that everybody said so.



DON'T

Carry tools, but ride Dunlop Tires, because you can slip them off or on your own wheel in a jiffy, with your own hands, and in case of an accident you can see just what and where the trouble is, and can fix it quietly and easily.

They're guaranteed, of course, and will delight you.

American Dunlop Tire Co.