

THE HESPERIAN

The Final Debates

On account of the exceedingly stormy weather, the attendance at the final debates was much smaller than the debaters deserved. However, those present felt more than compensated for the strong work in argumentation done by the students.

WEDNESDAY EVENING.

Mr. Edgerton presided. The question was: "Resolved, That combinations of railroads to determine rates are undesirable and should be prohibited by law."

W. H. O'Connell said that the prosperity of society depended very largely upon the transportation question. Railroads have a business twelve times as large as the postal system. Mr. O'Connell was somewhat unnatural in the opening—but as he proceeded gained in naturalness and force, leaving an excellent impression.

C. M. Barr, on the negative, agreed with his opponent in regard to the importance of the question. He maintained that the trouble with the railroads was the discriminations. He read from a number of authorities to sustain his position.

Both Mr. Hawxby and Mr. O'Connell, the next speakers, had charts by means of which they illustrated their talk. Mr. Hawxby began very deliberately but became very earnest later on. If anything, he spoke too rapidly. He made an excellent impression.

E. C. Craft urged that political bias should not influence one in the discussion of this question. His quietness was in marked contrast to the style of his opponent who immediately preceded him. He argued that the benefit of combination was shown by the fact that dealers at large centres get better rates than dealers at points where there is only one road. The conditions in England are not comparable to the conditions in America. If you do not allow combination, you will have consolidation.

G. D. Talbot desired to get on common ground. How can railroads injure a man? By taking more money than they deserve? More absolutely, or more relatively? Either is robbery. Mr. Talbot was not at his best. As the University's representative in the State Oratorical Contest, he evidently had not given as careful attention to preparation as usual.

E. J. Motis made sport of his opponents. If rates are now ruinous, how will they be bettered by combination? If railroads are in such bad condition, why not cut down the number of passes and reduce official salaries? He was opposed to the surrender of the rights of the people to the railroads.

Claude Wilson closed for the negative. He spoke of four different kinds of contracts for railroad combination. His contention was that pools are to the interest of both the railroads and the people. The trouble now is in the weakness of the combination.

Mr. O'Connell, in a five minutes speech in rebuttal, devoted himself to a strong restatement of the points in favor of the affirmative. His delivery was full of vim and his arguments were driven home vigorously.

THURSDAY EVENING.

The same question was debated to a larger audience. R.

Sampson was the first speaker. He said that both sides desire uniformity. The only difference lies in the means of procuring it. He said the affirmative advocated a commission to regulate combinations.

W. F. McNaughton contended that rural traffic is not affected by pools. Trade of towns is sacrificed to cities. He dwelt on the fact that the Interstate Commerce Commission have two laws to enforce: 1. Against unreasonably high rates. 2. For uniformity of rates.

F. A. Nims claimed that local rates are unreasonably high and that there is unjust discrimination in all branches of industry. He cited the case of railroads discriminating in favor of Boston and Baltimore against New York. He said pools bring about an artificial system of rates.

P. B. Weaver said that roads discriminate in favor of large shippers. As a result of this, the roads discriminate against the people. He cited the case of Standard Oil Co. vs. Rice to show this discrimination.

Miss Bertha Stull made a good point when she showed that the negative had only cited instances in which great trunk lines were in competition with water-routes. She thought that competition would bring the greatest good to the greatest number. She claimed that pools are an incentive to bad service on the part of the roads. Weak roads are kept up by the pools for the amount of local traffic they contributed to the association.

G. P. Griffith thought that the financial interests were enough incentive to keep the stock up. He said that the government had granted eminent domain to railroads and in return had exacted the right of governmental control. He thought the English cleaning house system would be a good pool system. Railroad are the only industry that is prohibited from combining.

A. Bollenback said that pools are the cause of the evils of discrimination and hence could not be advocated as a remedy. Pools do not extend to local traffic. There is discrimination between persons, localities and commodities. He thought than competition establishes the only just rate.

H. D. Landis gave more statistics than any other of the contestants. A touched up all departments. He spoke earnestly and emphatically.

R. Sampson closed the debate in a short, logical and well-delivered talk. The following are the marks of the judges:

	Reese	Sherman	Hill	Ansley	Caldwell	Total
1. Talbot.....	3	1	2	1	4	11
2. Craft.....	1	4	1	3	3	12
3. Stull.....	2	2	4	4	6	18
4. Hawxby.....	4	3	6	8	2	23
5. Wilson.....	5	6	5	5	5	26
6. Nims.....	8	7	8	6	1	30
7. Weaver.....	7	8	3	7	8	35
8. Bollenbach.....	6	9	7	11	7	40
9. McNaughton.....	9	5	9	9	9	41
10. O'Connell.....	11	12	11	2	15	46
11. Barr.....	10	10	12	12	11	55
12. Griffith.....	15	11	10	10	12	58
13. Motis.....	12	13	15	13	14	67
14. Landis.....	12	15	14	14	13	69
15. Sampson.....	14	14	18	15	15	71