

discussion. He carefully outlined the argument of the affirmative. Mr. Cheadle urged that the highest type of government is the one which best reflects the popular will. The English allows the majority to rule at all times. Here, our constitution defeats the popular will and delays progress. Mr. Cheadle spoke in a calm conversational tone.

Mr. E. Warner followed on the negative for Nebraska. He urged that to defend their position it was incumbent upon the affirmative to show not merely that the cabinet system is superior to the congressional system—a general principle of government, not merely that it is better for England than the congressional system for America but that the English system would be better for the United States. By defining democracy and comparing the two systems Mr. Warner showed that the English system is not more democratic. The ministry and a majority of commons are legally irresponsible and omnipotent. The commons are elected on one issue. After that measure is disposed of, there may be seven years of misrule and oppression. The people are allowed to express themselves only when the commons and the ministry disagree, the people may never get to vote on an important issue. Mr. Warner clearly showed the necessity and the expediency of committees. He urged there was uniformity of action under the committee system. Mr. Warner spoke forcibly and fluently except during the last two or three minutes when he was inclined to hesitate.

Mr. W. A. Layton followed for Kansas. Mr. Layton discussed the evils of the committee system, the overgrown power of the speaker, the lack of a unity of action under the congressional system and the inability in this country to locate responsibility. Mr. Layton failed to attempt to answer any of Mr. Warner's argument confining himself to his set speech. Mr. Layton has a pleasing, forceful delivery.

E. B. Perry next spoke for Nebraska. He first disposed of Mr. Layton's propositions one by one. He urged that the English system causes instability, for it puts the power of government in the hands of transitory nominees of the Commons. Tenure of office is in England indefinite and ephemeral; there is no continuity in policy; a few can block legislation. The English system is not only subject to abrupt and unexpected changes but causes a dangerous concentration of power. Parliament is all powerful; it can deny the people their most sacred rights and the only remedy is in revolution. Parliament means

the House of Commons; the Commons means the Cabinet. This is "unity of action" but we want uniformity of action. Here our elections occur at stated times, we elect men to serve a definite time of office, we put constitutional checks upon the peoples' representatives. As a result we have continuity in legislation and efficiency in administration.

Mr. Pearl Decker next spoke on the affirmative. After an evasive reply to one of Mr. Perry's questions he commenced reciting his 'piece.' Mr. Decker has a striking personality, a musical voice, and an unlimited amount of magnetism. He simply charmed the audience and apparently the judges. However his argument was confined to a story about "Molly, the Cook, and Mrs. G." and sarcastic statements such as "In this country we measure the usefulness of our executive, not by his efficiency but by calendar months."

Mr. C. E. Matson spoke third on the negative. To the preceding gentleman's statement that it took forty years to settle the slavery question under our form of government, Mr. Matson replied that we had solved the question and that England had not solved the Home Rule question. Mr. Matson urged that to adopt the English system means to do away with our constitution, this is dangerous to individual liberty. He then carefully compared the two countries, the vast expanse of territory, the lack of homogeneity. He showed that conditions were different in the two countries demanding different forms of government. He urged that legislation should not be the result of passion and impulse, but only the sound judgment of the people, after due deliberation, should become law. He denied the statement of his predecessor that we had no statesmen in this country. He named some.

Mr. Decker made a dramatic closing for the Kansans, again charming the audience, and it may be said to his credit also that he came very nearly arguing the question in his second speech.

Mr. Warner closed the discussion making the speech of the evening at least from any just argumentative standpoint, if not from a declamatory standpoint.

The judges were Jacob Sims, J. C. Hisey and Victor E. Bender, all of Council Bluffs. The total aggregate by sides was 799 points for Kansas and 688 for Nebraska or a standing of 88 per cent for Kansas and 76 per cent for Nebraska. After the decision of the judges was announced many of the audience filed upon the platform to congratulate the victors and condole the vanquished.