

The Notre Dame Scholastic

DISCE · QVASI · SEMPER · VICTVRVS · VIVE · QVASI · CRAS · MORITVRVS ·

VOL. I.

NOTRE DAME, INDIANA, MAY 12, 1917.

No. 30.

COLLEGIATE DEBATE ON PROHIBITION.

Resolved: That the manufacture, sale, and importation of intoxicating liquors for beverage purposes be prohibited in the State of Ohio by constitutional amendment.

FIRST AFFIRMATIVE

FRANCIS J. BOLAND, '18.

A great movement has arisen that is sweeping the country from coast to coast. Absolute prohibition of alcoholic beverages is the demand of the hour. Town after town, county after county, state after state, realizing the danger of alcohol have banished this drug from their confines. There are now twenty-six prohibition states and eighteen of these have adopted the measure within the last five years. Public opinion has awakened to the fact that society has a needless burden in the liquor traffic. The enormity of the evils, the intensity of the alcoholic craving, the ever-increasing use and abuse have doomed the drink traffic to death.

This question involves the legal destruction of a large industry as the great American nuisance. Since to use, to make, or to sell alcoholic beverages is not in itself an evil and since large numbers of people attach great importance to their liberty to drink or carry on the drink traffic, the justification for abolishing such a large industry must be the general welfare. In the interest of the general welfare governments have the right and the duty to destroy private industries. Our Federal Government has destroyed industries; the highly profitable business of using bank notes by state banks was destroyed by the National Bank Act of 1861. The white phosphorous match industry was destroyed by a governmental act of a few years ago. For years the legal destruction of the liquor industry has been a great public question in the United

States. It is our contention that the liquor traffic of Ohio is a public menace to the state and therefore should be abolished.

The use of liquor is solely a question of pleasure. Alcohol is not a food, it is not a stimulant, it is a habit-forming drug. This is the verdict of science. View with me on one side the almost incomprehensible evils resulting from the use of alcoholic beverages, then view on the other, the pleasure of a few moments of drinking, and you will say the liquor traffic can no longer be tolerated.

Scientific experiments of recent date denounce alcohol as harmful to the individual. Harry S. Warner voices the general opinion of physicians when he says, "Alcohol interferes with nutrition, weakens the tissues of the lungs, and destroys or deadens the white corpuscles of the blood, whose function is to fight the invading germs." Tuberculosis, once thought to be retarded by alcohol, is now known to be increased by it. So close is the connection between alcoholism and this disease that the International Congress on Tuberculosis, held in Rome in 1913, saw fit to adopt the following resolution. "This congress strongly emphasizes the importance of combining to fight against tuberculosis with the struggle against alcohol!"

Pneumonia and alcohol have a similar relation. Drs. Osler and McGrae, men of repute in the world of science, have estimated that twenty-five per cent of the moderate drinkers die of pneumonia. Doctors in general proclaim that the alcoholic patient has a poor chance with this malady. Since alcohol, therefore, is injurious to the individual's health, even when used moderately, it is altogether expedient for him in the interest of his personal welfare to forego

that pleasure derived from the use of alcoholic beverages.

The evils of drink fall even more heavily upon the family. Scientific experiments have shown that the offspring of alcoholic parents are not up to the standard. Dr. Laitinen, after studying 17,394 children, says, "Alcohol drinking by parents even in small quantities (about a glass of beer a day) has exercised a degenerative influence upon their offspring." Dr. MacNichol of New York City found, that out of 20,147 cases of school children examined, fifty-three per cent of those that came from drinking homes were below the average in mental capacity.

Consider furthermore the financial loss to the family. Money spent in drink is money taken directly from the family budget. The drinker of the lower ranks of life compromises the quenching of his alcoholic thirst with the welfare, yea the preservation of his wife and children. His drinking deprives them of the necessaries of life, and as long as there are alcoholic beverages these necessaries will be wanting to his family.

There is another domestic evil traceable to drink, an evil that is increasing with each year, and one that is so momentous in its influence as to threaten the very destruction of human society. That evil is no other than divorce. According to the U. S. census report for 1910, twenty per cent of the divorces of the country are traceable directly to drink. Consider these facts and then ask yourself, is the amount of pleasure coming from the liquor traffic sufficient to warrant even consideration in the light of such evils? By all means, no.

Individual and family evils necessarily reflect upon the social life. What greater disgrace to mankind, what greater burden to the public is there, than drunkenness? Alcohol in beverages is the sole cause of this evil. See the drunkard as he lies paralyzed in the gutter, despised by his friends, disgusting to respectable citizens, devoid of every semblance of rationality, and realize that a drug so deceptive and so powerful as to lower a man to such a condition is too dangerous to be commercialized in our cities today. What of the crime, immorality, and poverty due to drink? As a cause of crime, alcohol has no equal in all history. The Committee of Fifty puts it as the "first cause" in thirty-one per cent of the cases, and as "sole cause" in sixteen per cent. The

removal of liquor means the reduction of one-half of the crime. I have said drink is a cause of immorality. A view of any of our large cities will convince us of this. What are the red-light districts but sections drenched with alcoholic beverages? As Jane Adams of Chicago has said: "Organized commercialized vice could not exist for a single day without liquor."

Finally, alcohol is continually supplying our state institutions with their unfortunate victims. The Committee of Fifty, an authority the negative will not question, reported twenty-five per cent of the poverty, thirty-seven per cent of the pauperism within almshouses, and forty-five per cent of the destitution of children as due directly to the personal use of liquors or to their use by some one else. Remove the drink traffic and you will reduce these inmates to nearly one-half the present number. Insanity is another effect of drink. Harry S. Warner states that one insane person in every four owes this condition to drink. The Lunacy Commission of New York reports twenty-eight per cent of those in the state hospitals of New York are there on account of drink. From all parts the general estimate comes that twenty-five per cent of the insanity is chargeable to alcohol. Will not the State of Ohio take practical means to cut off from its citizens this unnecessary alcoholic insanity? If not, then she is not protecting her citizens as best she can.

Look to it, gentlemen, there are twenty state institutions in Ohio, which in 1916 had over twenty thousand inmates. These do not include numerous jails, police stations, poorhouses, and other similar institutions. Who are supporting these places for social dependents? None other than the tax-payers of Ohio, and they are maintaining one-half these inmates on account of alcohol. Who maintains the police and constables necessary to catch criminals, the courts to try them, the jails and penitentiaries in which to confine them? None other than the tax-payers of Ohio, and they are supporting one-half of these on account of the drink traffic. Harry S. Warner, a man who has studied this problem as no one else has done, says that the cost of crime to this country resulting from drink, is yearly \$40,000,000. Prof. Collins, a man who studied the problem for years, shows by minute statistics that the total actual cost to the nation for the maintenance of hospitals, insane asylums, almshouses and similar public institutions, due to the drink

traffic, is \$64,700,000. Besides this, he states, there is the immense burden borne by the families and children of drunkards, amounting to not less than \$222,000,000. Add to this, the American drink bill, which is national waste, of \$2,455,000,000 and you have a sum in comparison with which the revenue forthcoming from the liquor traffic dwindles into insignificance. This, gentlemen, is a conservative estimate of the cost of the drink traffic to the citizens of this nation. I say conservative, for people are timid in exposing the facts about drink. Realize this and you will say the welfare of society demands the abolition of alcoholic beverages.

I have mentioned the great evils emanating from the liquor traffic, evils that have been recorded by the pen of the statistician. I have said nothing of the hundreds of other evils such as the sorrow, disgrace, abuse, and the loss of happiness in general to the race. Time permits us to go no farther. The good resulting from the liquor traffic is insignificant as compared with the evil. Therefore, it becomes the duty of the state, the guardian of the general welfare, to abolish the liquor traffic, the menace to its progress.

SECOND AFFIRMATIVE

BERNARD J. VOLL, '17.

My colleague has shown you that the evils attendant upon the use of alcoholic beverages are enormous, while in comparison the good resulting from the liquor traffic is negligible; that not only the individual and the family but the entire social system is directly affected by the drink evil through the increased amount of crime, poverty and insanity following in its wake.

It shall be my purpose to prove to you that the evils arising from the abuse of liquor are so inseparably connected with its general use as to necessitate the total abolition of drink in order to be rid of the drink evil; that moderate drinking easily becomes immoderate and consequently any substitutes for prohibition proposed by our opponents will be inadequate because they continue to permit the beverage use of alcohol.

The general use and the evils of drink must either stand or fall together. Wherever in

America there has been widespread use there has inevitably followed widespread abuse. Even the moderate and steady use of alcohol brings with it evils of enormous proportions. It has not only an immediate effect upon the mind and body of the user but it injuriously affects the tissues and shortens life; it weakens the resistance powers of the body against the attacks of disease and makes recovery more difficult. These statements are supported by a declaration of the British Medical Temperance Association, which was signed by six hundred and sixty-four English, Continental and American scientific men and physicians. Furthermore, the vast majority of doctors throughout the entire world concede that at most alcohol is a very dangerous drug. Not only do many thousands of confirmed drunkards die yearly from its effects but also thousands of other people succumb to alcoholism who were never known as drunkards. Diseases of the arteries, Bright's Disease, and cirrhosis of the liver inevitably accompany the moderate but steady use of alcoholic beverages and annually claim thousands of victims. Not only have men died from these diseases and chronic alcohol poisoning who were never intoxicated, but, what is worse, they have in many instances left upon society the burden of caring for defective children. Yet such men were regarded as moderate drinkers.

The testimony of insurance companies shows conclusively that the moderate use of alcohol shortens life and increases the mortality. Three British companies for many years placed abstainers in a separate class. Their conclusions were that the mortality among the abstainers was from 25-40 per cent less than among the non-abstainers. The New England Mutual Life Insurance Company concludes that the relative mortality is 17 per cent less among abstainers than those who rarely use alcoholic beverages, 29 per cent less than the temperate users and 53 per cent less than the moderate users. While Mr. Emory McClintock, Actuary of the Mutual Life Insurance Company, investigated separately the non-abstainers who stated that they drank beer only, and came to the following conclusion: "The difference between those who drink beer and those who drink water is unmistakable, while the loss on beer drinkers has been almost the same as among wine and spirit drinkers." The Security Mutual Life Insurance Company concludes

from an investigation, covering the years 1900-1916, that mortality in the total abstainers' class was relatively 30 per cent less than the mortality in the general class. All of the policies in both classes were issued to persons resident in the United States, and accordingly this is a modern American experience, covering a period of sixteen years prior to January 1, 1916.

Honorable Judges, the experience of seven American insurance companies and the Manufacturers' Life Insurance Company of Canada, based upon recent investigations, to which may be added forty-three other companies whose experience I have not time to detail for you, shows conclusively that total abstainers are longer lived than non-abstainers, and that the mortality is relatively from ten to thirty per cent lower in the former than in the non-abstainers' class. In other words, Honorable Judges, not only the abuse but the use of alcoholic beverages shortens life and increases mortality.

In the industrial world alcohol is even more disastrous, because it is lowering the efficiency of the working-man and increasing industrial accidents. This factor should be of primary concern to the people of Ohio, since it is principally a manufacturing state, and whatever directly affects industry directly affects them. Many years ago the Federal Bureau of Labor reported 96 per cent of the railroads, 79 per cent of the manufacturers and 72 per cent of the agriculturalists in the United States as discriminating against the man who drinks. While today these same railroads, employing more than one million six hundred thousand men, absolutely forbid the use of liquor by their employees while on duty, and discharge a man if he be an habitual offender when off duty. A recent study of the steel industries in Ohio, Pennsylvania, Illinois and West Virginia revealed the fact that ten concerns not only prohibited drinking during working hours, but prohibited it absolutely at any other time, while one hundred other concerns discriminated in employing and advancing men, against those who used alcoholic beverages.

The National Safety Council, composed of two thousand eight hundred members, found in over two hundred industries and representing the employers of nearly three and one-half millions of people, declared in 1914 that "most industrial accidents are brought about by the use of alcoholic stimulants," and placed

themselves on record as being in favor of eliminating the use of intoxicants in the industries of the nation. Only last October the employers forced the License Commissioners of Cuyahoga County, in which Cleveland is situated, to close many of the saloons near the gate-ways of industrial plants. Furthermore, in suggestions for increasing safety recently sent to employers by the Ohio Manufacturers' Association, the following references to alcohol were made: "The use of intoxicants by employees while on duty is prohibited. Their habitual use or the frequenting of places where they are sold is a sufficient cause for dismissal."

Such is the position of the employers, and in striking contrast to their former attitude, the employees are now aiding the manufacturers in their fight against alcohol. The Lake Carriers' Association adopted a rule providing that temperance be made a consideration of promotion between men of equal merit, and that no person be allowed to carry liquor aboard a vessel. While the orders of railroad conductors, of locomotive firemen and engineers, are co-operating with their companies by aiding in the enforcement of anti-drink laws through provisions against the beverage use of alcohol contained in their constitutions. The Telegraphers' Union has gone even further and declared that "the use of alcoholic liquor as a beverage shall be sufficient cause for rejecting any petition for membership." Thus we see that not only the employers but the workmen themselves are discriminating against the men who drink. The manufacturers and the employees, the two greatest forces in the economic world, are working hand in hand to rid industry and the country of a beverage that is striking at the base of our national power, because it is destroying our business efficiency. And in this age of fierce competition, when efficiency is the key-note to success, man can little afford an indulgence which at most is a dangerous pleasure.

The conclusion is obvious, Honorable Judges: alcohol has no place in the industrial system today, which is especially applicable to Ohio. Not only does the drinking man represent a concrete loss to the employer in dollars and cents, but his very presence is a positive detriment to his fellow-workmen. The manufacturers have come to realize that the use of alcoholic beverages by their employees is costing them millions of dollars annually in

decreased efficiency and an increased number of industrial accidents; consequently, they are discriminating against the men who resort to such stimulants.

Now a ten per cent law, the Gothenburg system, regulation, high license and many other so-called remedies, may be offered as substitutes for prohibition. But these methods are ineffective, Honorable Judges, principally because they do not strike at the source of the evil. They continue to permit the beverage use of alcohol, which, as Haven Emerson, New York City's Commissioner of Health, says, "is not even second to opium or its derivatives as a destroyer of character, a disturber of function, and a degenerator of tissue." Today we are engaged in the mightiest of all wars. Those belligerent nations across the Atlantic have deemed it expedient to prohibit the manufacture of strong drink, while at the same time deprecating even the use of alcoholic beverages as being injurious to their efficiency. Sir Frederick Treves, an English army surgeon, when marching with a relief column of thirty thousand men to Ladysmith, noticed that "The first who dropped out were not the tall men or the short men, or the big men or the little men—but the drinkers, and they dropped out as clearly as if they had been labeled with a big letter on their back."

Briefly, then, since wherever in America there is widespread use of alcoholic beverages, there inevitably follows widespread abuse; since the moderate use of alcohol brings with it evils of enormous proportions, and easily leads to abuse; since not only the employers but the employees are discriminating against the drinking man, and finally, since any remedy proposed by the negative must be ineffective because it permits the use of drink: therefore, the only effectual means of solving this problem for the State of Ohio is to adopt absolute prohibition.

THIRD AFFIRMATIVE

FRANCIS J. HURLEY, '18.

My colleagues have pointed out the evils which are directly traceable to liquor. They have proved that these evils are inseparable from the general use of drink; that the general use of drink and the evils of the liquor traffic are so closely knit together that wherever we find the one, the other will also be found. They

have also proved that these evils are inherent, not incidental, and that all attempts at regulation have failed and always will fail because any remedy for the terrible consequences of the drink habit will be ineffective unless that remedy destroys drink. The general use of liquor will be found under any system of regulation, and my colleagues have proved that all remedies are useless which permit the use.

Now, Honorable Judges, since any adequate remedy for the liquor problem must abolish the use of liquor, and since absolute prohibition is the only remedy which can possibly do this, doesn't it logically follow that Ohio should adopt the affirmative plan? Since our remedy includes that first great requisite—abolition of the use—I shall prove that it also includes that other requisite, "effectiveness." I shall prove that prohibition will be a beneficial reform in the State of Ohio; that in actual operation it will destroy the liquor traffic and promote the public welfare.

The experience of this country with prohibition may appear vital at this point. It is a fact that the experience of so-called prohibition states, such as Maine and Kansas, is used by the liquor interests as an argument against prohibition; that the same experience is used by their opponents as an argument for it. Very conflicting evidence comes from these so-called dry states. Investigators have gone to these states to prove that prohibition was a success; others to prove that it was a failure; both seem to have succeeded to their entire satisfaction. We are not particularly concerned with this experience, because the prohibition of the past is very different from the prohibition of the present. The prohibition of the past is not the kind we advocate for Ohio, and its success or failure is not an issue in this debate. The prohibition of the past was nothing more than the abolition of the saloon. These anti-saloon laws did not prevent the importation of liquor. Hence the general use of liquor was permitted, and with it came the evils which existed before the abolition of the saloon,—the evils which were described by my second colleague. The abolition of the saloon proved to be only a partial solvent of the drink problem. The general use of liquor was still possible by the ease with which it could be imported, and since the general use of liquor together with the saloon was the cause of so many evils it was only natural that the dry legislation of

the past should be only partially successful.

However, Honorable Judges, the big outstanding fact is that till 1913 these so-called dry states did not have the constitutional power to forbid the importation. From 1913 until January 1917, the Webb-Kenyon law, which permitted a state to forbid importation, was rendered useless by injunctions compelling state officials not to enforce it. Hence, since the general use of alcohol has been permitted in every dry state previous to 1917, by the wholesale importation allowed, it is obvious that the partial failure of the so-called prohibition of the past cannot be used against the absolute prohibition which we advocate for Ohio. The anti-saloon laws of Kansas and Maine permitted the general use. It is this general use which is the cause of so many evils. It is the abolition of this general use by virtue of the Reed Amendment which makes any comparison between the anti-saloon laws of the past and the absolute prohibition of the present illogical and unsound. The brewer says the prohibition of the past is a failure; the anti-saloon league says it is a success. It is of no consequence whether either of them is right as far as this debate is concerned, because we of the affirmative are not proposing the old law which allowed importation. Our plan resembles the dry laws of the past only by way of contrast.

The Reed Amendment was passed February 21, 1917. It is a Federal law forbidding importation of liquor into any dry state. It is a significant fact that eight dry states have passed absolute prohibition since January 8, and the Supreme Court upheld the Webb-Kenyon law. The people of these dry states realized the many weaknesses of prohibition, but we do not find them returning to the wet column. That state after state in the last three months has forbidden the importation, thus becoming absolutely dry, is unanswerable evidence of the people's preference for the new prohibition when they had their choice of becoming wet, dry, or absolutely dry. This Reed Amendment will be enforced by the Federal government. If Ohio goes dry the Federal government will prevent importation of liquor. This will eliminate the big objection to the prohibition of the past.

The great catchword of our opponents, almost the sole weapon with which they seek to resist the spread of prohibition, is that prohibition doesn't prohibit. But the prohibi-

tion of the present does prohibit. The people of Ohio realize that if they vote for prohibition now they are voting for the real thing. They know that they will be unable to vote the saloon out and still import for personal use. Every ballot cast for state prohibition must be the ballot of a genuine prohibitionist—a man who is willing to deny himself the right to drink. Now it requires a majority of such men to vote Ohio dry, and with a majority of citizens sincere enough in their convictions to deprive themselves of the legal right to drink; with the great industries of Ohio crying out against drink; with the medical profession and the scientific men condemning it as a dangerous drug; with the probability that those of this majority who vote to make themselves absolutely dry intend to live that way; with all these forces working for prohibition, it is only a prophetic assertion that the law would not have sentiment back of it to enforce it. What constitutes sentiment? Doesn't the man of industrial, economic and scientific forces mold sentiment in Ohio? Have the bootleggers and the law-breakers a monopoly on Ohio's sentiment? The city of Denver is successfully enforcing her bone-dry law. Arizona is having the same experience. However, we admit that prohibition will not annihilate drinking. There may be a few illicit stills, and some confirmed drunkards may even resort to dangerous drugs. But we contend that the evils of this illicit traffic will be limited and circumscribed. They will mostly harm only those whom drink has already rendered social parasites. Now since prohibition doesn't have to annihilate drinking to be a desirable law, what weight has the argument that it will be violated when the good effects which follow far outweigh the harm resulting from those violations? The evils of prohibition are insignificant when compared with evils of drink.

The adoption of the affirmative plan will benefit the people of Ohio in many ways. But in addition to the decrease in crime, poverty and human misery there is yet another benefit which need only be stated to be proved. It is a benefit so desirable and so permanent that if every other argument for prohibition were destroyed still the results flowing from this one advantage would alone justify the destruction of the liquor traffic. This supreme good is the effect on the rising generation which will grow with the appetite for drink. The rising generation will have

no saloon with its seductive influence creating the appetite for drink. The rising generation under the new prohibition will have no means of procuring drink. The young men of tomorrow under the new prohibition will be affected by the absence of drink only to the extent of the benefits which they derive from the inability to procure it. The future generation will receive the greatest good in this as in all other widespread reforms.

Now, Honorable Judges, we of the affirmative have shown the evils which inevitably result from the general use of drink. We have shown that there is no remedy except prohibition which destroys the general use. We have shown that prohibition will be an effective remedy and promote the public welfare of Ohio's people. History in its condemnation of the old prohibition argues for the affirmative plan. Economists and statesmen have given it the stamp of their approval. Surely, then, if this government is to protect the best interests of her people, which is the one reason for which it was created, it should forbid the sale, manufacture, and importation of intoxicating liquor.

FIRST NEGATIVE

OSCAR J. DORWIN, '17.

Alcoholic liquors have been used by mankind from the earliest times. We may search back through the centuries until all records fade into oblivion and find references constantly being made to the use of alcoholic beverages. We find that miserable conditions resulting from intemperance were far worse than they are today. We discover in the annals of early England and of ancient Greece and Rome the story of riotous drinking prevailing among all classes of people. The history of our own country relates the tale of excessive indulgence in strong drink. Only a century ago drunkenness was common and tolerated in the best society. Our country today is temperate by comparison. The past century has seen an extraordinary decrease in drunkenness in spite of the fact that the production of liquors has increased far greater than the population. Society today despises and deprecates drunkenness.

The gentlemen of the affirmative, not content with the rapidly changing public sentiment in favor of the temperate use of alcoholic beverages, wish to enforce absolute abstinence on

the people of Ohio. Their only argument for this extreme policy is the appeal they make for the eradication of the evils of intemperance. We of the negative freely admit that these evils are enormous. The individual misery and degradation resulting, in some cases, from excessive drinking cannot be overstated, and the collective harm to society, though often exaggerated, is certainly appalling. We deplore all this suffering and misery just as sincerely as do our opponents. We are equally anxious to secure the eradication of these evils. Consequently the issue of this debate rests not on the existence of these evils, but is resolved into a discussion of the remedy by which they may be best destroyed. We maintain that the evils do not inhere in the liquor industry, and that therefore they can be destroyed without the destruction of the industry; that prohibition is drastic, premature, impractical and dangerous.

Prohibition in any form is a drastic policy. The particular plan advocated by our opponents is the most extreme prohibition measure that can be devised. They wish to force on the people of Ohio what is popularly called "bone-dry" prohibition. This is such a drastic reform that even many prominent prohibitionists are opposing it. At one swoop they would obliterate every vestige of the present prosperous liquor industry from the State of Ohio, an industry that has been built up under the protection of the law, an industry that gives employment to thousands of men, an industry that supplies hundreds of thousands with their means of a livelihood. They wish to destroy everything from the gigantic breweries and distilleries to the saloon and club bars which supply to a large extent the demand of millions for pleasure and recreation. They would deprive hundreds of thousands of their means of livelihood. They would divest eighty per cent of the people of Ohio of a means of legitimate pleasure to which they attach much importance. They would deprive the state and municipalities of a large and lucrative source of revenue. In short, they would change the taxation system of the state, annihilate a giant industry, and transform the appetites of millions of people over night in order to eradicate the evils of intemperance.

Now to do all this there can be but one justification. That is the imperative demand of the public welfare. Unless the gentlemen of the affirmative can conclusively prove that the

public welfare cries out for this drastic reform it should not be applied in Ohio. We maintain that not only does the public welfare not demand such a measure but that prohibition will endanger the public welfare. We further maintain that we have a simpler and far more adequate policy by which the evils can be eradicated.

Before we can intelligently suggest a remedy for the evils resulting from liquor we must consider the nature and causes of these evils. Everyone recognizes that they are the result of intemperance. Intemperance is the result of the lack of proper regulation. It is natural that evils should result from anything that is used improperly or to excess. No serious attempt has ever been made in the United States to prevent the improper use of alcoholic beverages. Until a century ago a general demand for temperance was unknown. Then a voice raised against excess was solitary and unheeded. Every social element that has been concerned with the liquor problem has been in practical opposition to its rational regulation since the dawn of the temperance movement.

The industrial revolution saw the inception of the modern brewing and distilling industry. It grew rapidly, spreading its influence in every direction, until it has become the mammoth industry of today. It has been actuated by one incentive, and only one—to make money. Consequently it has encouraged both moderate and excessive drinking. The price was the only requirement for the purchase of liquor. No discrimination was made between the rich and the poor, the drunk and the sober. To increase its profits was its sole purpose. To remedy the evils was inimical to its interest. Its instinctive avarice led it to augment and encourage the misery and suffering of intemperance.

While the liquor industry was thus developing itself it was unrestrained by the government. It was allowed to run wild. Neither the federal government nor the state of Ohio has ever rationally endeavored to regulate the liquor traffic. The few laws on the statutes were passed at the instigation of the liquor forces themselves, so naturally no effort was made to make them thorough or scientific. Scientific regulation of the liquor industry in an endeavor to destroy the evils of drink has never been known in the United States. Never has the government tried to destroy the incentive that

the liquor element has for personal gain. Never has the government tried to prevent the liquor forces from encouraging intoxication and the abuse of liquor. Never has it legislated for moderation. It has only legislated for its revenue. Nothing else was its concern, and the evils of intemperance have persisted without it doing a rational thing to eradicate them.

The only other element that was interested in the liquor problem was the general public. It was divided into two classes. On one side were the prohibitionists, active for the complete destruction of the industry, and consequently giving little or no thought to its regulation. Prohibition to them was the only remedy, and, oblivious of its faults, they gave no heed to an alternative. On the other side was the great mass of people, eighty per cent of whom were users of liquor. In general they were apathetic. They paid little attention to the regulation of the liquor traffic, and disposed of the prohibition question by calling the prohibitionists fanatics, thus ridding themselves of all concern and responsibility. It is evident therefore that the general public also has done nothing to destroy the evils of intemperance by scientific regulation.

With such a condition existing in the State of Ohio and also throughout the entire country, can anyone be surprised that the liquor evils have been allowed to endure? Is it any wonder that society has been suffering from poverty, crime, and insanity resulting from drink? Is it any wonder that regulation has not been scientifically attempted? The liquor element has been permitted free reign; the government has been concerned only with the collection of revenue; the prohibitionists have been opposing regulation as inadequate; and the great mass of people have been apathetic. Under such conditions it was natural and inevitable that the evils should be enormous; it was impossible for regulation to have a scientific trial.

Consistency compels our opponents to believe that the evils resulting from drink inhere in the liquor industry and that they are inseparable from it. Honorable Judges, the evils are the result of intemperance. Intemperance is the exception and moderation is the rule in modern life. Provide for the destruction of intemperance, we say, remove the cause of the evils, and the evils will disappear. The production of liquor is not that cause. The cause lies in the neglect of the government, increased by the opposition of the prohibitionists and the apathy of the

general public, to regulate rationally the inherent appetites of men for pleasure and recreation and to prevent their gratification to excess. If laws are passed providing for this regulation the evils will be eradicated. If the production and distribution of liquor is scientifically regulated the evils will be destroyed, without the risk of experimental prohibition, and the fancied need for drastic measures will have vanished.

Rational regulation has the support of experience wherever it has been fairly tried. European countries have found regulation preferable to prohibition, and in countries where regulation has been aimed at the evils of liquor drunkenness are almost unknown. Every important commission that has ever made a thorough investigation into the liquor question has concluded that regulation and not prohibition is the remedy. State-wide prohibition in the United States is admittedly a failure. The "bone-dry" prohibition proposed by our opponents has never had state-wide experience anywhere. They are advocating a reform which expert authorities are opposing, which experience with less radical forms warns us against, and their arguments consequently rest on little more than mere prophecy.

It is a sound principle of social reform that drastic measures should not be applied until the more conservative measures have been tried and found inadequate. I have shown you that prohibition is a drastic policy, and that the plan proposed by our opponents is especially extreme; that scientific, well-considered regulation has not been tried in the United States; that it nevertheless has the support of experience and investigation; that it will remove the cause of the evils. Therefore prohibition is at least premature, and we demand that this drastic measure be not adopted until well-considered regulation has been given a fair and scientific trial.

SECOND NEGATIVE

MICHAEL A. MULCAIR, '17.

My colleague has shown you that scientific, well-considered regulation of the liquor industry has never been tried in the United States. He has shown you that the evils consequent upon the liquor industry are not inseparable from the industry itself. It is my purpose to show you

that the legal destruction of that industry in Ohio would aggravate rather than alleviate social conditions in that State. This I shall prove by the most incontestable of all arguments, the argument from experience.

It is important that you keep clearly in mind the fact which I would establish tonight. I do not contend that the legal destruction of the liquor industry has been accompanied by disastrous consequences in every community where it has been attempted. I will grant that such destruction has resulted in much good in communities where it has been favorably received. I do not contend that the evils which have followed the legal destruction of the liquor industry are inherent in the principle of prohibition itself. But I do contend that prohibitory liquor laws which have not been backed by public approval have in every instance resulted in greater evils than those which they were intended to eradicate.

In a democracy, which is a government by public opinion, social legislation to be effective must be sanctioned by a whole-hearted public sentiment. This is true of all social reform, but it is particularly true of liquor regulation, for the reason that such legislation contravenes long-established customs and deep-rooted appetites of millions of people, that it destroys the livelihood of thousands of people who are interested in one way or other in the liquor industry, and finally that it depreciates the fortunes of those who have large investments in the liquor industry. All those, thus adversely affected by drastic liquor legislation, constitute an active, well-organized, and powerful minority throughout the entire state, and in the large industrial centers within the state they constitute a majority of the citizens who are ready to use both press and platform to engender and disseminate disrespect and contempt for such a law. This is not a picture of imaginary conditions but one drawn from long experience with prohibition in our own country. No legislative reform has ever been more widely or more fairly tried than prohibition. By what it has done and by what it has not done it must be judged.

Maine, the oldest prohibition state in the Union, has long since become a classic example of the failure of prohibition. Remember, I am not contending that the social and moral conditions of Maine do not compare favorably with the other New England states, but I do

contend that the healthy conditions in Maine are in no way attributable to prohibition, because Maine, as I shall show you, is in no sense, except nominally, a prohibition state. It is true that a prohibition law has been on the statute books of that state for over sixty years, but to what effect? In every city throughout that state where public opinion demands the continuance of the liquor industry saloons are run wide open in defiance of law. In the city of Bangor with a population of 24,000 there are today one hundred and twenty-three illegal saloons;—one hundred and twenty-three illegal saloons free to sell to minors and intoxicated people, free to sell whatever and whenever they wish, free to disseminate in that city all the evils traceable to the American saloon! I say free, because being illegal they defy regulation and supervision. All this is taking place because the rural population of Maine has foisted a prohibition law upon an unwilling urban people. At the last general election in that state the prohibition law which was enacted over sixty years ago by a 40 000 majority was retained by a meagre vote of less than one thousand. It is an incontestable fact says John Koren, an expert authority on prohibition, that the operators of the illegal saloons who have profited by prohibition constituted a large part of the vote which retained prohibition in Maine.

The conditions in Maine are the conditions in every prohibition state where the officers of the law have realized the fundamental truth that a drastic liquor law cannot be enforced in the face of public disapproval. But when we turn to those prohibition states where as yet the officers of the law have not learned this fundamental truth, where even now every possible attempt is being made to force such a law upon an unwilling people, we are confronted with a situation far more alarming, far more detrimental to social welfare, than that which exists even in prohibition Maine.

According to the 1916 report of the Commissioner of Internal Revenue, 3832 illicit distilleries were detected that year in a few of our Southern states. In the prohibition state of Georgia alone, 1215 such distilleries were seized. Bear in mind that the total number of legal distilleries in the whole United States in 1913 was but 821. In other words, there were detected and seized in the prohibition state of Georgia more illicit distilleries than there were legal distilleries in the whole United States. Following the enact-

ment of prohibition in that state illicit distilling increased over 300 per cent. The officers of the law, realizing their inability to check the spread of this pernicious practice, licensed beer saloons in that state. Mark you what that means. It is an admission, an important and conclusive admission, that state and even federal officers are helpless to enforce a law which public opinion does not support.

Yet, enormous as are the evils of illicit distilling, deplorable as are the social consequences of such evils, they are overshadowed by the appalling revelations of drug and dope habits which have been divulged in prohibition states. It is impossible to overestimate the baneful significance of this most recent curse of prohibition. Two years ago Judge W. W. Stark, chairman of the House Temperance Committee of the legislature of Georgia, made public the statement that in the city of Atlanta there were over 300 young girls who had become physical and mental wrecks from the use of drugs. And he estimated that in the entire state of Georgia there were over 5000 such dope fiends. So firmly entrenched have drugs become in the South that the manufacturers of one of these drugs offered to pay the state treasury of Georgia \$50,000 to prevent the sale of beer in that state. I need not rehearse for you the evils of drugs. I need not picture for you the social and moral consequence of such evils. That they exist is a fact attested to by the United States Government. That prohibition has induced them is undeniable.

It is important that you keep in mind that all those evils have sprung up under prohibition laws far less stringent than the one which our opponents are advocating tonight. They have grown up under a prohibition law which granted individuals living in prohibition territory the privilege of importing liquor for personal use. Yet under such lenient conditions the practice of illicit distilling and the use of drugs have increased to alarming proportions. We will grant for argument that in consequence of the Reed Amendment Ohio may become "bone-dry" as far as illicit importation is concerned, but what, I ask, will be the inevitable consequence? Cut off the only legal means of obtaining liquor which the people in prohibition territory now enjoy and you will thereby increase a thousandfold the incentive for illicit distilling and the use of injurious drugs. If the evils which I have enumerated have grown

up under the so-called prohibition of the past they will of a certainty exist in an aggravated form under the more drastic prohibition which our opponents are advocating.

I maintain, and I challenge anyone versed in the history of prohibition to controvert my statement, that a law which does not enjoy the support of public conviction cannot succeed. I maintain that if there are certain large industrial cities in Ohio, and we know there are such cities, which are absolutely opposed to prohibition, then a prohibition law cannot be enforced. Therefore, since the history of prohibition points to one obvious conclusion, that a prohibition law which is not supported by public opinion will inevitably result in the far greater evils of illicit distilling and the use of drugs, and since there are large industrial centres in Ohio, notably Cincinnati and Cleveland, which are determined to oppose and discredit a prohibition law, we of the negative maintain that a real and lasting reform of the liquor industry must be sought in the direction of scientific, well-considered regulation rather than in drastic prohibition.

THIRD NEGATIVE

JOHN A. LEMMER, '18.

My colleagues have shown you that the evils of drink are not inherent in the liquor traffic; that state-wide prohibition is a drastic solution of the liquor problem; that drastic liquor legislation, wherever it has not been supported by public opinion, has led to failure. It is my purpose to prove that Ohio should not adopt a prohibition law until a more conservative remedy of regulation has been tried and found unequal to the situation,—regulation such as Ohio has never had; regulation, unfortunately, such as no American state has yet experienced,—sincere, well-considered, scientific regulation.

Both sides in this debate seek the remedy that will serve best the cause of temperance. Such a remedy must make allowance for a human appetite prohibition completely ignores, man's appetite for drink. This appetite deeply rooted in the nature of the majority of Ohio residents dictates the first essential provision of any sound liquor legislation—the encouragement of the use of the milder alcoholic beverages and the suppression of the stronger.

This reform may be achieved in two ways,—

by discriminating against the stronger drinks by means of a graduated tax, or by their complete prohibition. Which of the two methods is the better we need not decide; it is an open question which the Ohio legislature can best determine. Scandinavian experience favors the discriminative graduated tax in which the excise is levied according to the alcoholic content of a drink, the tax upon the strongest beverages being almost prohibitive. The latter plan is best exemplified by the proposed Bruce Bill in Illinois which would prevent the use of liquor containing as much as ten per cent of alcohol. It is a bill based upon successful European experience with liquor legislation, supported by the leading newspapers of this country, championed by experts in the liquor problem, and favored by Canadian provinces after unhappy experience with prohibition. Indeed, Canada is now considering a dominion-wide measure permitting beer and light wines containing not more than seven per cent of alcohol. Whether the limit is placed at seven per cent or at ten does not vitally concern us, but we insist that if regulation is to be successful the use of the stronger drinks must be repressed. They are the cause of eighty per cent of the sentiment against the saloon; they are the chief cause of all the evils connected with drink. Experts in the liquor problem, and every committee that has ever studied this question,—the American Committee of Fifty, the Norwegian Alcohol Commission, the Swedish Commission,—are unanimously agreed that the use of the lighter drinks must be encouraged, the stronger must be suppressed, if temperance is to be effectively promoted.

This first essential principle of sound regulation must be combined with a second, the principle expressed in the Gothenburg system,—the elimination of profit from the retail liquor business. The American is notoriously a profit-seeker, and the American liquor dealer is no exception. Too frequently greed overrides respect for law, and greed cannot be eliminated from human nature. We must remove this conspicuous element of personal gain from the liquor industry. This, Ohio regulation has failed to do. Let liquor licenses be granted only to limited liability companies whose income from the business shall be fixed at six or seven per cent of the capital invested. Let the saloon-keepers be employees of these companies with fixed wages entirely independent of the sales

made. Let any profit remaining after the interest of the stockholders and the expenses of the business have been paid, be applied to public purposes. If the maximum income accruing from the business is regulated, the temptation to disregard closing laws, the temptation to sell to habitual drunkards, the temptation to sell to minors will be removed. That this be done in the cause of temperance, the welfare of society demands.

Not only is it necessary to eliminate excessive profit from the retail liquor business, and to encourage the use of the lighter drinks by the suppression of the stronger, but in any intelligent liquor legislation provision must be made for public opinion which in each community must determine how drastic a liquor law may be. We appreciate the fact that universal voluntary total abstinence is the ideal solution of the liquor problem, but we realize at the same time that such a solution is Utopian. We realize, and experience emphasizes, the fact that compulsory total abstinence is unwise and impracticable unless a powerful majority stands determined to enforce it. We readily admit that prohibition succeeds in some localities, but we maintain that wherever it succeeds, it does so solely because public opinion gives it vigorous support. It is often found that prohibition sentiment in rural communities is sufficiently strong to enforce rigidly a prohibition law; we sincerely believe that such communities should be bone-dry. A local option statute, or home rule for municipalities and townships such as Ohio now has, enables each locality to determine for itself whether or not prohibition is desired. Let the townships of Ohio be bone-dry if they so determine, let each municipality vote itself bone-dry—we offer no objection—but we contend that such communities should not decide for the great population centers that they too must be subjected to absolute prohibition.

Public opinion in Hamilton County and its metropolis, the city of Cincinnati, overwhelmingly opposes prohibition. In fact, Hamilton County so conclusively rejected prohibition at the 1914 election that the dry vote of forty other Ohio counties was needed to counterbalance the wet majority of Hamilton County alone. Hostile public opinion in so wet a community leaves no doubt that a prohibition law will become the object of contempt because juries will refuse to convict those who violate it. Senator Oscar Underwood of dry Alabama,

after observing the effect of prohibition in communities wet in sentiment, tells us that "no law is stronger than the sentiment of the jury in the jury-box." The affirmative ignore that profound truth in advocating a drastic dry measure which can be imposed by rural Ohio on the wet population centers. What is the force of their law if juries refuse to find the law-breakers guilty? Senator Underwood's statement will be verified in Ohio just as certainly as it has been verified in Alabama. In fact, it has been verified already in the failure of Cincinnati juries to convict violators of the Sunday-closing law. "No law is stronger than the sentiment of the jury in the jury-box."

We welcome the affirmative gentlemen as apostles of the Christian virtue of total abstinence. We welcome the discrimination of insurance companies against even the moderate drinker. We welcome the discrimination of employers who seek to promote efficiency in industry by refusing to employ the man who drinks. All such policies are educative in character and prepare the way for the legislator to solve the liquor problem. But the radical legislative policy of the affirmative defeats the end of effective legislation because it attempts to force public opinion, and because prohibition legislation is laps ahead of prohibition education.

Again we say, public opinion throughout the greater number of Ohio townships and municipalities may favor prohibition,—home rule enables them to secure it. But as long as a single great city remains wet in sentiment, so long is state-wide prohibition unwise and impracticable. And if prohibition is the wonderful remedy the affirmative would have us believe, then surely even Cincinnati will some day see the light of prohibition and be guided by it. But until that day arrives, until the majority of men in Cincinnati and the other large cities of Ohio declare themselves ready for compulsory total abstinence; until we can reasonably assure ourselves that a prohibition law will be enforced, and will not make a mockery out of legislation; until we may feel reasonably certain that a prohibition law will not plunge Ohio into evils worse than those now existing; until sincere, well-considered, scientific regulation has been tried and found inadequate, and not until then, will the drastic policy advocated by our affirmative friends be the best policy for Ohio.

THE NOTRE DAME SCHOLASTIC

Entered as Second-Class Mail Matter.

Published every Saturday during the School Term at
THE UNIVERSITY OF NOTRE DAME

Terms: \$1:50 per Annum. Postpaid

Address: THE EDITOR, NOTRE DAME SCHOLASTIC
Notre Dame, Indiana

L. MAY 12, 1917 No. 30.

BOARD OF EDITORS

HOWARD R. PARKER, '17	SPEER STRAHAN, '17
EDWARD J. McOSKER, '17	HARRY E. SCOTT, '17
MICHAEL J. EARLY, '17	JOHN A. LEMMER, '18
STUART H. CARROLL, '17	CHARLES W. CALL, '18
DELMAR J. EDMONDSON, '18	THOMAS F. HEALY, '19
F. JENNINGS VURPILLAT, '18	JOHN URBAN RILEY, '17
W. BREEN McDONALD, '18	MICHAEL A. MULCAIR, '17
EDWARD G. LINDEMANN, '18	FRANCIS FARRINGTON, '18

The Debating Season.

When the first call for debaters was issued last January seventy-one students responded. From the very beginning there was abundance of interest, and the enthusiasm steadily increased as in the process of elimination the competition for places grew more close. Probably no question chosen for debate in former years has elicited so much local interest as this of prohibition. Everyone enrolled in the contest became promptly acquainted with several phases of it; everyone had convictions, and many of even the most diffident revealed on the debating floor a wealth of forensic ability. In consequence of the large number of able debaters it was difficult several times for the judges to rank them, so evenly matched were most of the speakers in the later preliminaries. There was no "holding in reserve" this year, because from the beginning it was clear to every candidate that he had to get into the fight with his best effort if he was to have any chance of being among the fittest in the final survival.

The men who succeeded in making the teams are in every way comparable to the representative debaters of former years. All of them are talented debaters, and each of them possesses some special faculty which is a source of strength to his team. On the affirmative Mr. Boland, who won first place in the final contest, and Mr. Voll, this year's Breen Medalist, furnished the eloquence, while the strategical part was

delegated to Mr. Hurley. On the negative, Mr. Dorwin, Notre Dame's representative in the state oratorical contest, had the Websterian role, while Messrs. Mulcair and Lemmer, the best debating combination in the school, were assigned the task of subverting the affirmative arguments. By a coincidence both alternates, Mr. Havey and Mr. Ryan, are freshmen. Three of the eight men are graduated this year, but with such semi-finalists as Messrs. Hunter, Kelly, and Palmer in school there is no need to fear a scarcity of competent successors.

Unfortunately the debating season was transformed at the last moment from a fine prospect into an utter disappointment. Just as the affirmative team was ready to leave for the debate with Cincinnati University word was received that the latter for lack of preparation was obliged to cancel the contest. Our proposal of a later date was simply ignored. Naturally the Notre Dame debaters and supporters were a bit put out and were tempted to say things, but presently their irritation gave way to a sentiment of commiseration for the Ohioans' sudden case of spinal labefaction.

The set speeches with which Cincinnati was to have been met in the dual debate scheduled for the evening of April 20th last are printed in the first pages of this issue. It is the hope of everyone interested in our inter-collegiate debating that the management may be able to arrange for next year several debates with the best schools that can be had—and schools that consider it a matter of honor to live up to their agreements.

C. W. H.

An Editor's Comment on the Notre Dame Enlistment.

On its editorial page and with a heading in impressive capitals, the *Terrè Haute Post* speaks as follows of "Notre Dame and Its Patriotism": "Father John Cavanaugh, president of Notre Dame University, has notified all the students of that great Catholic institution that they will be given credits for a full term if they enlist in the fighting branches of the government. Reports say that not less than 350 of the students have signified their intention to enlist. This is no unusual manifestation of patriotism on the part of Americans who have been always loyal to their country, but against whom a great deal of calumny has been slung recently by scurrilous publications for profit."

Varsity News.

—Will the person to whom Mr. John Minavio's ring was entrusted in St. Joseph's Hospital last February please see the President's secretary about the matter?

—The marriage of Miss Frances A. Matson to Mr. Francis Michael Hogan (LL. B., '14) will take place in the Cathedral, Fort Wayne, Indiana, May 16. The SCHOLASTIC extends congratulations.

—Lost: Either on the Niles road or on the campus, a silver watch, of Swiss works, with open face, gold hands and Old English G on the back. Finder please return to Ray Girardin, Carroll Hall, and receive reward.

—The Notre Dame Press Club held its regular meeting on Tuesday, in the Journalism room. It was in the nature of a farewell to president Edward J. McOsker and William Kennedy, who were about to leave for the Officers' Reserve Training Camp.

—Professor and Mrs. Leonard Van Noppen of Columbia University were guests at Notre Dame the middle of the week. The professor is returning from an extended lecture tour at the western universities, and is shortly to resume his classroom duties at Columbia.

—A still greater interest will be shown in birds by the citizens of Mishawaka as a result of Brother Alphonsus' lecture on "The Birds of March and April" delivered Tuesday evening at the meeting of the Mishawaka Bird Club. Brother Alphonsus knows his subject thoroughly and he succeeded in arousing much enthusiasm among his hearers.

—Fifty members of the Freshman Law class, under the leadership of president Walter Miller, journeyed to the Hotel Mishawaka Thursday evening, May 3, to enjoy their first class banquet. After the banquet speech-making and music rounded out the evening. Judge F. J. Vurpillat spoke on "The Judiciary," and Major Dennis of South Bend addressed the members on "Military Training."

—For two days, May 3 and 5, Captain R. H. Wescott, U. S. A., of Chicago, was at the University accepting student volunteers for the Reserve Officers' Training Camps. More than one hundred applications were filed, including many from the leading Notre Dame athletes. The hearty response to the call was not a surprise for the spirit of patriotism at the

University has always been strong and practical.

—On Tuesday evening Reverend Father Cavanaugh, addressed the members of the Eucharistic Union in the Sorin Law Room. His talk dealt with the value of moral courage and how it could be acquired, and was of special suggestion to those members who are leaving the University for the training camps. Under the able leadership of Reverend Charles O'Donnell, the Eucharistic Union has grown steadily since its organization and has become an important part of the spiritual life at Notre Dame.

—Heretofore the initial social activities of the freshmen as a class have been confined to a banquet, but this year they are to have a dance. Their first annual frolic is to be held at the Oliver Hotel on Wednesday, May 16th. The Ragpickers' Orchestra will furnish the music. The sale of tickets and the other arrangements for the event are in the hands of a committee, composed of President Harry Denny, Barry Holton, Thomas Tobin, Thomas Beacon, Paul Conaghan, Barrett Anderson, John Woodworth John Ward and Theodore Wagner.

—The Glee Club concluded a most successful season with concerts at Indianapolis and Logansport on May 6th and 7th. It is enough to say that at Indianapolis the club outdid itself, making even a better showing than that of last year. After the concert, the glee club members and their friends were guests at a dancing party at the Hotel Severin. On the way back the special car that carried the club was switched off at Logansport. Lunch at the Elks' Club was followed by an afternoon concert at the Holy Angels' School, which attracted a crowd that filled the auditorium. Unqualified praise is due the members who have worked almost daily during the year to attain the high standard set for them by Director Ward Perrott.

—The Notre Dame cadets were commended for their excellent work on Monday by Colonel Julian Penn, U. S. A., official inspector of military schools. From eight o'clock until noon the cadets drilled and marched in review under the direction of Sergeant George Campbell with a patience worthy of regulars. The individual company drill was won by Company B, of which F. Jennings Vurpillat is captain, and to it were awarded the bronze medals given annually to the best company. Company A under Captain L. James took second place.

Celorel Fern also expressed admiration for the excellent physical drills that have been a feature of the military training this year. Among those from Notre Dame who will attend the Reserve Officers' Training Camps will be the following, most of them seniors and juniors:

Rodney Cullen, F. Jennings Vurpillat, Harry F. Kelly, John U. Riley, Emmett G. Lenihan, J. M. Rentschler, Daniel C. Curtis, N. C. Giblin, Raymond J. Graham, George F. Franz, E. R. Blackman, Daniel J. Quinlan, T. V. Holland, Frank R. Lockard, Joseph J. Feldott, William J. Egan, John Stafford, John B. Campbell, Frederick J. Slackford, Simon R. Rudolph, Edward T. Conroy, Clifford Cassidy, Walter E. Perkins, James P. Fogarty, Edward J. McOsker, W. P. Lahey, Bernard V. Háberer, Sherwood Dixon, Francis D. Jones, C. H. Murphy, Thomas C. Kasper, G. C. Witteried, Joseph P. O'Hara, A. J. Bergman, F. H. Doyle, George T. O'Laughlin, William B. McDonald, S. Makielski, Harry E. Richwine, Daniel E. Hilgartner, N. G. Monning, James L. Sweeney, Edward J. Meehan, Thomas L. Moore, Paul R. Thompson, Robert J. Ovington, Hugh O'Neill, Edmund D. Watters, Leo J. Vogel, Louis F. G. Fricke, Charles A. Zeller, Joseph W. McKenna, T. V. Dollard, Earl J. Clark, Joseph A. Gibbons, R. J. Sackley, William Baker, G. N. Noonan, J. S. Young, Edward B. Donahue, C. H. Tebbe, J. M. McNulty, Paul M. Dugan, William F. Fox, Austin J. McNichols, Louis C. Fritch, R. W. Murray, Crim O'Brien, Donald C. Grant, E. F. Bader, James E. Murphy, Leo J. Graham, F. X. Rydzewski, Charles B. Reeve, Arnold J. McInerny, George Fitzpatrick, T. Sherman May, Edward J. Reynolds, Stanley Cofall, J. J. Gary, Thomas V. Truder, John E. Cassidy, John M. Miller, James G. Wallace, Harry C. Baujan, Francis X. Keller, William Kennedy, G. N. Halmes, James T. McMahon, Frank Woods. F. S. F.

Athletic Notes.

ILLINOIS, 81 7-12; NOTRE DAME, 53 5-12.

Keen competition, close finishes, and broken track records marked the defeat of Notre Dame at the hands of Illinois on Cartier Field a week ago to-day, 81 7-12 to 53 5-12. Illinois' massed strength in the field events offset any advantage Notre Dame could gain on the track. A biting wind blew down the home stretch all the

afternoon, and though it bothered the runners, it did not seem to slow them up perceptibly.

"Eddie" Meehan was the first man to smash a mark. In the mile run he led Carlson, of Illinois, to the tape in 4:30 4-5, bettering "Joie" Ray's time for the track by one second. "Pete" Noonan was close up in the same race in 4:34. Spink, of Illinois, nosed out Captain Miller and Kasper in the quarter-mile in the best time ever made on the track, 50 1-5. The finish was exceedingly close.

Illinois won both dashes and both hurdle races. In the 100-yard dash Mulligan finished second; in the 220-yard dash John Miller was second; Kirkland was barely beaten by Captain Ames in the 120-yard high hurdles; while Starrett finished behind the Illinois captain in the 220-yard low hurdles. "Pete" Noonan found it impossible to come back in the two-mile after running a fast mile, especially after training for only the half mile all spring, and the Illini won the long race in a romp.

The half-mile was spectacular. Spink and Somers were pitted against Kasper and Meehan. From the report of the gun till the last two hundred and twenty yards the Illinois runners forced the pace to the limit of their strength. Then Kasper shot ahead and gained the pole. On the far turn Meehan pulled up from fourth place to second, and he and Kasper came down the home stretch just a step ahead of Somers and Spink. Kasper lunged into the tape first, Meehan was second, and Somers third. Spink was right behind. Kasper's time was 1:58 4-5, a new track record, while all four runners finished well under two minutes. It was a great exhibition by the Illinois men, and it gave local followers an opportunity to see in action the local men who have done so much to augment the fame of Notre Dame throughout the country in several various important relays this year.

Bachman had a good day in the weight events, putting the shot 43 feet, 6 inches, hurling the discus 135 feet, 3 inches, and taking third in the hammer throw. Illinois sprang a big surprise by presenting three javelin throwers that eclipsed Notre Dame's best. 181 feet, 5 inches, was the winning heave. The pole-vault, high jump and broad jump went to Illinois. Yeager, McKenna, and Edgren tied with Carnum, of Illinois, for third in the vault; Douglas did well in the high jump, scoring second, while Donahue and Scheibelhut

tied with Ames, of Illinois, for third in the same event; John Miller's third was the only Notre Dame point in the broad jump.

Today Notre Dame competes against the University of Chicago on Stagg Field in the first dual meet between the two schools in eighteen years. The opponents are the best team Chicago has had in years, the team that won the Western Conference Indoor Championship last winter. The summaries:

100 yard dash—Won by Carrol, Illinois; Mulligan, Notre Dame, second; Field, Illinois, third. Time, :10 1-3.

Pole Vault—Lang and Pierce of Illinois tied for first; Yeager, McKenna, and Edgren of Notre Dame, and Carnum of Illinois, tied for third. Height, 10 feet, 6 inches.

Mile run—Won by Meehan, Notre Dame; Carlson, Illinois, second; Noonan, Notre Dame, third, time, 4:30 4-5.

Shot-put—Won by Bachman, Notre Dame; Husted, Illinois, second; Frantz, Notre Dame, third. Distance, 43 feet, 6 inches.

220 yard dash—Won by Field, Illinois; Miller, Notre Dame, second; Carrol, Illinois, third. Time, :22 4-5.

High jump—Won by Webster, Illinois; Douglas, Notre Dame, second; Donahue and Sheibelhut, of Notre Dame and Ames of Illinois tied for third. Height, 5 feet, 9 inches.

120 yard high hurdles—Won by Ames, Illinois; Kirkland, Notre Dame, second; Starrett, Notre Dame, third. Time :16.

Discus throw—Won by Bachman, Notre Dame; Husted, Illinois, second; Bennett, Illinois, third. Distance, 135 feet, 3 inches.

440 yard run—Won by Spink, Illinois; Kasper, Notre Dame, second; Miller, Notre Dame, third. Time, :50 1-3.

Hammer throw—Won by Bennett, Illinois; Husted, Illinois, second; Bachman, Notre Dame, third. Distance, 138 feet, 1 1-2 inches.

Two mile run—Won by McKinney, Illinois; Stead, Illinois, second; Call, Notre Dame, third. Time, 10:16 1-5.

Running broad jump—Won by Overbee, Illinois; Friedler, Illinois, second; Miller, Notre Dame, third. Distance, 21 feet, 2 inches.

220 yard low hurdles—Won by Ames, Illinois; Starrett, Notre Dame, second; Kirkland, Notre Dame, third. Time :25 2-5.

Javelin throw—Won by Mongrieg, Illinois; Vedder, Illinois, second; Bennett, Illinois, third. Distance, 181 feet, 5 inches.

880 yard run—Won by Kasper, Notre Dame; Meehan, Notre Dame, second; Somers, Illinois, third. Time 1:58 4-5.

NOTRE DAME, 9; PURDUE, 5.

Three-baggers almost invariably win ball games. Sjoberg, Meyer, and Captain Kline

each smashed out three-baggers last Saturday afternoon, and Notre Dame beat Purdue 9 to 5 in a seven-inning game. "Swede" Edgren was assigned the task of taming the Boiler-makers, but in the first inning he gave little promise of turning the trick: In fact he was anything but tame himself, as he hit one batsman and distributed twelve balls among three others. He forced in one run during his wildness, but he also managed to strike out two men and to make another roll an easy one to Spalding, and hence the total damage was only slight.

Thereafter Notre Dame lost no time in putting the game on ice. Three runs in the first inning, and four more in the second, all gathered by concerted clouting, were sufficient to win the day. Another run in the third, and one more in the fourth, made the result sure.

After the first inning Edgren braced, and though the downstaters scored twice in the third inning and twice more in the sixth, he was not at any time in any particular trouble. The game was curtailed at the end of the seventh to allow the players and the numerous "customers" to view the track meet with Illinois. The score:

PURDUE	R	H	P O	A	E
Perrin, 3b.....	1	0	0	3	0
Barney, ss.....	1	1	3	4	0
Royce, rf.....	0	0	0	0	0
Heine, lf.....	0	1	1	0	0
Cray, 1b.....	1	2	7	0	1
Emerick, 2b.....	1	1	4	0	1
Markey, cf.....	1	0	0	0	0
Roberts, c.....	0	1	3	4	0
Eggleston, p.....	0	0	0	5	0
Totals.....	5	6	18	16	2

NOTRE DAME	R	H	P O	A	E
Keenan, cf.....	1	1	0	0	0
Dubois, lf.....	1	0	1	0	1
Allison, c.....	2	2	7	1	0
Meyer, 1b.....	1	1	7	0	0
Sjoberg, rf.....	1	1	1	0	0
Wolf, ss.....	0	2	2	2	1
Kline, 3b.....	1	2	1	1	1
Spalding, 2b.....	1	0	2	2	0
Edgren, p.....	1	1	0	7	0
Totals.....	9	10	21	13	3

PURDUE—1 0 2 0 0 2 0—5

NOTRE DAME—3 4 1 1 0 0 *—9

Two base hit—Emerick; three base hits—Sjoberg, Meyer, Kline; hit by pitcher—Barney, Spalding; Edgren, Markey; stolen bases—Sjoberg, Kline; struck out—by Edgren 7, by Eggleston 3; bases on balls—off Edgren 5; off Eggleston 5; left on bases—Notre Dame 6; Purdue 8. Umpires—Goekler and Schafer. Time—1:45. c. w. c.