

THE HESPERIAN

Claud S. Wilson for Nebraska made keen and pointed refutations by argument, and authorities to all the important propositions of his opponent. He reviewed briefly just what his colleagues had proven and showed that competition as it is now restricted gives reasonably satisfactory results, and again challenged the negative to show cause for action. But admitting they have cause for action, he proved that their plan was not practicable nor feasible, but had proven itself a failure. Granting for sake of argument that these combinations are a success, then their evil influences overcome all possible advantages of combination, for it would enable a few railway managers to dominate our whole commercial system and subject the people to grasping monopolies.

Mr. T. M. Brady for Kansas didn't try to dodge pooling, but seemed to defend all forms of combinations as helpful in reducing prices and affording a better service. The English and European system of legalized pooling combinations he cited as being a glowing success. All the past difficulties of combinations he declared would be removed by legalizing combinations. The inevitable trend of all business is toward combinations.

F. G. Hawxby closed for Nebraska in rebuttal. He made it plain that the affirmative were not opposed to pooling combinations alone, but to all other combinations. The inconsistencies of the negative were pointed out, and every question asked was answered by argument backed up by statistics and official reports. He showed that the negative had failed to show cause for action; had not proven their system better than the present one; and had not demonstrated its feasibility. While affirmative has proved that the present system has given satisfaction; that rates are now lower and more uniform than they were during the period of the pool's greatest success. We have further shown that serious evils have always attended such combinations, and the people as well as the successful roads do not want them. Finally, such combinations are an admitted failure at home and abroad.

O. J. Lane closed for Kansas, by summing up their own arguments. He declared that small shippers needed protection which could only be secured by combinations to fix uniform rates. He read several pages from Judge Cooley to show that pooling is desirable and practicable.

The Kansas men were earnest, careful debaters. Mr. Lane's expressions reflected careful thought, and his argument showed logical analysis. Franklin Baker was the most eloquent and graceful speaker of the three and showed considerable originality and ability in his refutation. Mr. Brady made a good appearance on the rostrum and presented clearly his line of argument.

In opening for Nebraska, Hawxby talked slower than usual and outlined the question clearly, leading naturally to that phase of the argument which he developed. The position which he took for the affirmative was well sustained.

C. P. Craft spoke calmly but with such conviction and power that he soon had the audience as well as the judges

with him. The chapel was still and every one attentive while he spoke.

Claude Wilson made no mistakes but branded the inconsistencies of his opponents' argument without mercy. His speech was argumentative throughout, and his style was attractive and winning. He left no weak places to be punctured.

Missouri-Nebraska Debates.

The second annual debating contest with the Missouri State University resulted in a victory for Missouri by a vote of two to one. The debate was held in the High School auditorium on the evening of May 12 and was attended by a small crowd. Nebraska was represented by Bertha B. Stull, G. D. Talbot and F. A. Nims; Missouri by W. S. Johnson, F. C. Cleary and W. C. Barnhardt. The judges were Col. W. J. Bryan of Lincoln, Congressman Cochrane of St. Joseph, and Dean Green of the Kansas Law School at Lawrence. Nebraska lost the debate because of a lack of team work. The method of presentation of the Nebraska speakers far outranked that of their opponents but this did not win for them the decision on argument. Careful and consistent thought will generally win, but one negligent and thoughtless speaker may ruin the entire chance of his side.

Colorado-Nebraska Debate.

Colorado College again entertained our boys this year, treated them royally and took over them the decision of the debate which was held April 28. Nebraska was represented by P. B. Weaver, A. Bollenbach and W. F. McNaughton in this contest. They affirmed the question that the United States should annex the Phillipinos. The judges were all Colorado men and were imbued with anti-expansion ideas which our debaters were unable to overcome. The representatives of Colorado College were more advanced students and have attended Cornell and Columbia but are now living in Colorado to benefit their health.

Delian-Doane Debate.

The second debate of the year, held Saturday evening, May 13th, was between the Delian Boys Debating Club and the Alpha Omegas of Doane in the Congregational church in Crete. The question was: "Resolved, That United States Senators should be elected by direct vote of the people." H. A. Butler, J. G. Bennett and R. G. Cresman represented Doane in the affirmative; William Morrow, H. J. Theobald and G. P. Griffith upheld the negative on the part of the Delian boys. The debate was a warm one with much enthusiasm on both sides. The visiting delegation say they were treated right.

"Cambridge Water."

IRATE CITIZEN (*angrily*)—When I turned on my faucet to draw a glass of water, a live frog issued forth. A live frog, sir.

SUPERINTENDENT OF WATER WORKS (*calmly*)—Well, what did you expect,—brook trout? —HARVARD LAMPOON.