

Our contemporary remarks editorially: "It is conceded by every fair-minded observer that the Kansas debaters had a more commanding, polished and graceful stage bearing than our boys. Their ease upon the stage, their self-possession, gesticulation and fluency in language were quite noticeable, showing the care and skill of a trained and ready debater."

The "fair-minded observer" cannot, in justice to our boys, admit anything of the kind. We readily admit that Mr. McCall was entitled to first place, but it is laughable to call his monotonous tick-tock delivery, "polished and graceful." Our Ajax undoubtedly pranced around the stage more than was necessary, but it was the prancing of a war-horse in battle. In "self-possession," etc., Newbranch and Quaintance certainly compared favorably with McMurray and Guyer. Quaintance's bearing was entirely natural; it was dignified, quiet and commanding. Newbranch, perhaps, pays too little attention to rhetorical and elocutionary frills and trimmings, but we noticed that he held the attention and commanded the respect of the audience as well as any of his opponents. In force, eloquence, fluency and especially in commanding personality, our men were clearly superior to their adversaries.

McCall's speech had evidently been very carefully thought out. He stated the question fairly and defined its terms to suit his side. His speech was admirable as an opening statement. It covered the whole ground and touched upon all the arguments of the affirmative. In clearness, in logical arrangement and especially in compactness it was undoubtedly *the* speech of the evening. Kansas stock had risen several points when he closed.

Weaver's opening speech was not so strong as might reasonably have been expected of him. Mr. Weaver is strong in answering "points;" but he skips too rapidly from one point to another and seems incapable of mustering his points into solid ranks. He presents each argument clearly and forcibly but he fails to unite his arguments into a

logical system. He covers the whole ground but he does it in a hop-skip-and-jump fashion. His speech was disconnected, incoherent, "choppy." If printed it would have made a large number of short, disconnected paragraphs of about four lines each. But his confidence, his command of words and his strong personality were more than enough to compensate for this fault. Yet Nebraska stock was on the decline before he got through.

Mr. McMurray proved to be a bright, entertaining talker. The strong points of his argument were that the Referendum would check the prevailing tendency toward centralization and would prove a valuable educational factor. Most of his time was given to answering "points" and to making fun of Ajax. During the last three minutes, when he reached his own argument, he showed what he might have done had he not thrown away his chance. As it was, his speech was pleasant but weak. Kansas stock went down.

Newbranch's strong point is logic. He spoke for government by the people through the best representatives of the people. In this he undoubtedly struck the key-note of the question. The issue really was—government directly by the people against government by the representatives of the people. In confining his attention to this point Mr. Newbranch proved himself a clear thinker and a shrewd debater. The question could not be exhausted in a fifteen minute speech. Mr. Newbranch wisely selected *the* point at issue and concentrated his energies upon it. He assumed the offensive and produced a strong argument for the expert theory of government. Nebraska stock went up with a jump.

Guyer had his outline made and stuck to it. He is a speaker of considerable force and made a good impression. But he missed his chance by not locking horns with Newbranch on the critical point at issue. The burden of proof was on the affirmative and that side could not hope to win so long as Mr. Newbranch's argument on the theoretic-