

not three or four thousand miles out in the Pacific.

O. W. Meier closed the debate for the negative. Mr. Meier was compelled to follow a negative speaker and was interrupted by the lights going out. He said that these islands are not favorably situated. Ships that stop at Honolulu go thousands of miles out of their road. We already have a good coaling station in Alaska. We now enjoy all of the privileges that are to be had by annexation. We could not control the Pacific without an immense navy. Our boast has been that our country is so compact that we don't need an army and navy. All other annexations have been contiguous territory. The islands would add new discordant elements and would not strengthen the republic.

Mr. McNaughton closed the debate. He claimed that the affirmative had shown three things: first, Annexation is for the best interests of both nations; second, it has been the policy of U. S. for sixty years. It is a necessity.

SATURDAY EVENING.

The Saturday evening debate was on the question "Resolved, that the United States should construct and operate the Nicaragua Canal." The program was opened by a selection by the Lincoln Business college corner band.

C. E. Matson opened the debate for the affirmative. He concisely outlined the affirmative argument, giving a brief history of what engineers thought of the project and their schemes for construction. The people are anxious for the construction as is evident by the petitions sent to congress. The canal would shorten the distance of inter oceanic trade, the hazard on merchandise would be lessened and the cost of marine insurance diminished. There would be a great diminution in the cost of transportation. Mr. Matson spoke in a cool, conversational tone.

H. E. Sackett followed on the negative with an animated speech. Mr. Sackett thought much depended upon the canal viewed as a financial venture. He thought the financial success depends upon the cost of construction and its commercial utility after it is constructed. "According to careful estimates it would cost \$150,000,000. At four per cent interest this would be \$6,000,000 expense yearly. Its commercial utility will not justify this expenditure, for it is so situated that little trade will pass that way. Sailing vessels could not be used. We could not gain exclusive military control; it would be too expensive to protect it. Our neutrality relations and the Clayton-Bulwer treaty forbid this venture. It would increase foreign complications. Mr. Sackett showed signs of nervousness and is inclined to talk too rapidly.

C. W. Taylor was the second speaker on the negative. Admitting the interest to be \$6,000,000 he quoted statistics to show that twice this amount could be saved by the lessened cost of transportation which would follow the construction of the canal. He argued that there was no question as to the feasibility of the canal. He urged that internal develop-

ment of our country and especially the development of the Pacific coast demanded the construction of the canal. Mr. Taylor has a splendid stage presence and a strong voice which made him a very effective speaker.

G. E. Hager replied to Mr. Taylor. Mr. Hager thought the questions of feasibility and commercial value were minor ones. He urged that the construction of the canal would be opposed to international law, contrary to our past policy and a dangerous step toward socialism. Mr. Hager was not at his best. He lacked his usual fluency and forcefulness of expression.

J. H. Kemp was the next affirmative speaker. He thought there were many reasons why the United States should construct the canal, the primary one being the lessening of the cost of transportation. He considered its construction of national importance as it would make New York the world's center of commerce instead of London and Liverpool. He thought the United States should build it and not some private concern. The United States could do it cheaper because its bonds bear less interest. It would make trade relations possible with 6,000,000 more people. It would bring us 2,000 miles nearer Japan and China than Liverpool. Mr. Kemp lacked energy and was inclined to pitch his voice too high.

Miss Bertha Stull next spoke on the negative. She dwelt at length upon the question of feasibility. After a careful study of the engineering problems she came to the conclusion that the canal was impractical. It was urged that the affirmative had only considered the cost from an engineering standpoint. The expense of constructing artificial dams, locks, harbors and employing imported laborers would equal the cost of the canal itself. It was held that it was not the mission of the United States government to become a philanthropic institution. We can not afford to sacrifice our national development for that of so small a country. Miss Stull has good stage presence perfect enunciation and a voice of good volume.

Mr. Ewart followed on the affirmative. Mr. Ewart thought the canal not only practical and of a commercial value, but he considered it a national necessity. He thought if the United States owned and operated the Nicaragua canal we could increase our international trade. If another nation gets it, it may be used to hinder our commercial and political advancement. Mr. Ewart is but a freshman and with the proper training will make a strong speaker.

R. S. Baker closed the debate for the negative. He replied to Mr. Ewart by urging that the canal is not a national necessity. We should direct our commerce through the heart of our country. New York, or San Francisco or Nicaragua can not be made our center of commerce. Chicago is and will continue to be the real center of our commercial interests. We must not neglect internal development and waste our national energy on matters of minor importance and foreign to our country's welfare. The highest end of a state is the development of it.

(Continued on page 10)