KANSAS PRIZE DEBATE

THE FORENSIC takes pleasure in printing the Bethany-College of Emporia debate on the McNary-Haugen Bill. This is one of the best arguments presented this season on this much discussed question. There were twenty-six teams entered in the Kansas provincial contest. This was the final debate of the tournament. The elimination of College of Emporia left two Bethany teams tied for the championship. It might also be mentioned that both Behany and College of Emporia had met and defeated teams from several other states, including some which won state or provincial honors.

First Affirmative, Merle Yowell, Bethany College

Honorable Judges, Worthy Opposition, Ladies and Gentlemen:

The question for debate is, “Resolved: that Congress should enact legislation embodying the principles of the McNary-Haugen Bill.”

As first speaker of the affirmative, I wish to make clear in the first place our interpretation of the principles of the McNary-Haugen Bill, and the stand we are taking in regard to those principles. In the formal statement of the policy of the bill itself, the bill is described as an aid in the orderly marketing and in the control of surplus of agricultural nature the bill is designed to aid farmers in or a crisis. The fact that the bill itself states definitions the plan is to be proves that it is not to

It is planned to place when there is a surplus requirements or above requirements. Now there is a surplus only when placed upon the market serious downward fluctuation is necessary for and it is only when an excessive surplus occurs that the farmer’s condition becomes serious. Thus the bill does not aim to maintain high prices.
artificially, but instead it provides a temporary control that will be used to eliminate the excessive downward fluctuations that occur with the existence of a large surplus. That this disordered marketing causing a depression occurs only with the existence of a large surplus is evidenced by reference to past conditions.

The latest serious depression in corn was in 1921. The average price a bushel that year was fifty-three cents. The average price for the five year period immediately preceding was one dollar and twenty-seven cents a bushel—a difference in price of seventy-four cents a bushel.

The latest periodic depression in wheat came in 1923. The average price of wheat that year was ninety-two cents a bushel. The average price for the preceding five year period was $1.62.

Cotton in 1926 entered into a periodic depression from which it has not yet recovered. The average price of cotton for the five year period preceding was 22.4 cents a pound; and in the period of depression that price fell to twelve cents a pound—a drop of almost 50% from the average price to the market price in 1926.

These periodic depressions are the root of the farmer's troubles, bringing as they do, such disastrously low prices. For example—because of the seventy-four cent drop in the price of corn in 1921, the corn farmer received $1,850,000,000 less than he would have received at the average price. In cotton in 1926 the loss amounted to $624,000,000; and the wheat farmer lost $560,000,000—losses suffered because the depressed price was substituted for the average price.

Such are the conditions the farmer must meet. In every case these periodic fluctuations have occurred as the result of a large surplus above normal demand. There have been three of these periodic depressions since 1900 in each of the commodities considered. In each of these cases the decline in prices has been the result of an increased surplus. There has either been a large increase in surplus in this country with world conditions remaining the same, or a large surplus here and a greatly increased production in foreign countries—either event, of course, producing an excessive supply above demand.

It is with these periodic depressions that the McNary-Haugen Bill will deal. The depressions are caused by the existence of excessive surpluses, and the McNary-Haugen Bill aims primarily at the control and disposition of these surpluses. Thus it is evident that there is a need for the principles involved in this legislation.

There is a need for these principles, secondly, because this problem of surplus is permanent. The significant fact is that a surplus over a period of years is an absolute essential to existence. The elements of nature, factors over which the farmer has no control, such as adverse weather conditions, pests, and diseases, make the control of production to meet demand unwise and undesirable. If acreage should be adjusted to make production equal demand, and conditions were favorable, the result would be beneficial to the farmer and would not exercise any harm upon the nation as a whole.
But, on the other hand, if this control were exercised and weather conditions were unfavorable, the result would be disastrous to the nation as well as to the farmer. In order to prevent famines and shortage, we must have this existent surplus over a period of years.

Furthermore, even if acreage should be decreased, it would not guarantee a corresponding decrease in production. For example, the wheat crop in 1922 amounted to 61,700,000 bushels more than that of the previous year and yet acreage had been decreased by 1,400,000 acres. Likewise with the same acreage basis in corn in 1920 and 1924, the difference in yield would have amounted to 858 million bushels—a difference beyond the control of the farmer.

I have already shown that there is a recurrence of periodic depressions. These periodic depressions and the seasonal variations in yield result in low price fluctuations which can be prevented only by some agency which has the power to carry these excessive surpluses over from years of large yield to years when the production is smaller and does not equal the demand. Thus there is a need for these principles; first, because of the recurrence of periodic depressions due to excessive surpluses; and second, because the problem of the surplus is permanent.

The second major issue of the affirmative is that the proposal is sound in principle.

This plan is sound in principle because it is in conformity with our American economic system. Our American economic policy is essentially one of protectionism. This policy was formulated with the very beginning of industry in the early days of American history, and is today the ruling policy of the American system.

Industry is protected by tariffs. Manufacturers do not need to meet foreign competition in the domestic market until they raise their price above the tariff. Thus they are, after a fashion, guaranteed a certain price for their manufactured articles. Labor is protected by immigration laws which limit the number of laborers that enter competition in the labor market, and by the Adamson law which regulates the hours of labor. Railroads are protected by the Interstate Commerce Commission, a government agency that fixes the price of transportation on almost every article that enters into human consumption, and by the Esch-Cummins law which guarantees rates high enough to give them a reasonable return on their valuation. Furthermore this valuation does not always conform to actual value. May I cite the sale last December of the Chicago, Milwaukee & St. Paul railway. This railroad capitalized on its books at $705,000,000, brought the actual sale value of $321,000,000 or approximately one-half of its capitalized value. Now when we consider that the Interstate Commerce Commission authorizes rates at 5¾% on valuation, we realize that in this case the authorized rates might have amounted to 11½% on actual value. Banking has a Federal Reserve Board, a government agency that fixes the price of credit and guarantees to it the return considered necessary. Even if we consider inventors as a separate class, we have patent laws which give a monopoly
in regard to prices to the holder of a patent. This is the system we have built up. It is not only a policy of protectionism; it is the American System.

This system of protectionism has also been extended to the farmer, and has aided him in solving his other problems. The Packers and Stockyards Act, the Federal Farm Loan Act, Intermediate Credits Act., the Federal Warehouse Acts, all are acts which have been passed to benefit the farmer especially in the matter of credit. But now the lack of credit is not the farmer's problem. He needs legislation that will help him meet the years of depression, and thus enable him to stand upon his own feet in normal years. The McNary-Haugen Bill will do this by a control and disposition of the surplus.

Since it has been the policy of the government to aid its industries by federal legislation when it has been proven necessary to do so, the government should also extend aid to meet this present problem by legislation. At every session of Congress, millions and tens of millions of dollars are appropriated to various groups and interests. The farmer bears a large part of this burden through taxation. Now the time has come to aid the farmer, and every precedent points to the logical step of aiding him by giving him the benefit of this protective system. The McNary-Haugen Bill will give him this benefit, for it is to agriculture what the Federal Reserve Act is to banking, and the other Federal legislation is to other industries. While the method of application may differ, yet the purpose is substantially the same—to meet a specific need when that need occurs.

In conclusion, I have proved, first, that there is a need for the principles embodied in this legislation. There is a need, first, because of the recurrence of periodic depressions due to excessive surpluses and, secondly, because the problem of the surplus is permanent. I have proved, secondly, that the plan is sound in principle. It is sound in principle because it is in conformity with our American System.

FIRST NEGATIVE, JOHN YOUNG, COLLEGE OF EMPORTA

Mr. Chairman, Honorable Judges, Friends:

The affirmative this evening has attempted to show you that there is a need for some type of legislation to aid agriculture, merely by saying that there are seasonal surpluses in certain commodities. It seems to want you to believe that the existence of such surpluses, alone, constitutes a need great enough to warrant the adoption of the drastic and radical legislation it proposes. In order to justify its proposal the affirmative must show us just wherein the McNary-Haugen Bill will remedy even those surpluses.

While we of the negative neither deny nor admit a depression among the farming classes and feel that such a question is somewhat irrelevant to this debate, it is interesting to note that according to the Monthly Labor Review, Vol. 22, page 549, one dollar today will buy sixty-four cents worth of the farmers produce as compared with sixty-five cents worth of the
goods of other industries. So far as purchasing power is concerned, there is a disparity of only one cent between the products of agriculture and those of other industries, and, friends, we do not believe that so small a disparity constitutes a demand for the radical change the affirmative desires. Moreover, we must realize that there has been a noticeable increase in the farm income every year since 1920. In 1925 that increase was 7% over the income of 1924, or an increase from eleven billion to twelve billion dollars. So we must know that the condition of agriculture is steadily becoming better. The affirmative has based its argument concerning the need on the part of agriculture wholly upon its statement that there are seasonal fluctuations in the price of farm commodities. But it has not shown you that the McNary-Haugen Bill will remedy even this situation which it maintains is the cause of the farmer's trouble.

We find however, after examining the facts, that it is exportable surpluses that are causing most of the trouble. Let us take an example which our opponents themselves have mentioned—cotton. In 1924 cotton sold for twenty-four cents a pound, in 1925 cotton sold for nineteen cents and at the present time for only eleven cents, or one-half what is considered a fair price. If we eliminate cotton we find that the farmer is getting a 7% interest rate on his investments on all other commodities—as high a rate as almost any other industry receives. The Cotton Growers Exchange stands behind these statements. So we must realize that the cotton situation is the primary cause of the farmer's depression, if there is a depression. Why? Because the exportable surplus of cotton is not being disposed of nor is the growth of this surplus inhibited. It has increased from one and one-half million to six million bales in the last three years. The affirmative must show us how its plan will solve the cotton problem which is the primary cause of any need on the part of the farmer, or its plan is not practical.

But it is the object of the negative this evening to attack the proposal made by the affirmative. This plan attempts to work in exact contrast with the natural economic laws now operating which must govern all production and all conditions and situations.

We find that this is truly a price raising measure. The affirmative will have to admit that we must raise prices if we are to help the farmer. But if we raise prices, we necessarily raise the standard of living in America which is already higher than in other countries. There is a danger of incurring the disapproval of these other countries. If we give the farmer aid, the other industries, in turn, will ask for more aid. Then the farmers again will need help, and so we have the never ending process—the vicious circle of higher prices. We must realize also that the other industries can offset the effect of higher farm products upon them by raising their own wages, and then again the farmer will be in almost the same circumstance he is in at the present. The farmers, who constitute only one-third of the total population, will have to bear the whole expense of all advantages gained. If he is in need it is a need of some help from other classes. It will do him no good merely to change his money from one pocket to another.
This is also a price fixing bill. Whether that is stated directly in the bill or not, is irrelevant, for it is at least inferred. If the board must tell the cooperatives or other agencies working under it when to buy and sell and where, in order to gain the advantages claimed, it must necessarily set a price and consequently be a price fixing measure. Such operation is in direct contrast with the economic law of supply and demand—a variable law which fixes a variable price. In order to remain on a par with the other classes, the farmer must receive a price which can vary in accordance with that received by other workers. Such legislation would be dangerous for it gives no leeway for the law of supply and demand to set the price. I would like to refer you to Marshall of the University of Wisconsin, and Ely, our greatest national economist, in regard to this fact.

Many features of this proposal are absolutely impracticable and impossible. The equalization fee is one of these features. In the first place it would be extremely difficult and probably impossible to estimate a crop before it has been produced. According to President Coolidge, and other authorities on the question, estimations under the McNary-Haugen Bill could, at best, be no more exact than they have been under the Department of Agriculture, which has repeatedly missed the exact figures. The Department of Agriculture estimates have varied in spring wheat from seventy-eight million bushels too small, to sixty-five million too large; in winter wheat from one hundred twenty-six million too small, to one hundred forty million, too large; in corn from four hundred thirty million bushels too small, to six hundred fifty-seven millions, too large; and in cotton, the product which is now causing the most trouble, from three million bales below the actual production, to three million bales over it. In the second place the equalization fee would be unequally distributed. Let us consider corn as an example. Eighty-five percent of the total corn production is fed on the farm, and never reaches the primary markets where this fee is to be collected. Then the other fifteen percent, upon which the fee is collected, would have to bear the costs of the advantages gained on the whole crop. The same is true in the case of other products. Thirdly, this equalization fee would be extremely difficult to collect. In the case of corn, which has already been mentioned, it would be almost impossible to collect a fair equalization fee from fifteen percent of the crop which would bear the expense of higher prices for the whole. The methods of collecting would be exceedingly costly as well as very inefficient. The Department of Agriculture says that only fifty percent of the basic commodities ever reach the primary markets. This fifty percent would bear the cost of all advantages gained by all of the crops. According to President Coolidge this fee would have to be collected upon sixteen billion units and would not only be far too expensive, but practically impossible. So the equalization fee is an impracticable provision.

And now, friends, we come to the greatest objection to the McNary-Haugen bill. Since the exportable surplus is the most important cause of the condition of agriculture, we would be dealing a death blow to farmers by adopting any measures which might tend to increase that surplus. This,
friends, is the issue of this debate. This bill does not prohibit the increase in surplus which would naturally result in any case where the producer is guaranteed a price for all he produces. Moreover the bill does not provide any method of reducing the surplus which now exists. During the last five years, which have been a period of depression in cotton, as the affirmative claim, the cotton acreage has increased seventeen million acres. There was a four million bale surplus in 1925, and the 1926 crop has been estimated as two million bales greater than that of 1925. If we had an increased production under a depression, what would happen under high prices and guaranteed profits? During the high price period of the war, the wheat acreage increased to seventy-five million acres. What could we expect under high prices again, but a like increase? Under continued high or even fair prices the production would at least not be decreased and we know that too great a surplus in certain commodities already exists. If the farmer is in a period of depression, he will do everything in his power to get out of it, and if he knows he can get a fair price for all he can produce, he will expand his production to its limit, in an effort to make up for these years of depression, and to pay off his debts. Such is only characteristic of human nature. The economic law which states that increased price is followed by increased production, always has, and always will work. The farmer would be a fool if he did not take the advantage of the opportunity created by such legislation. My colleague will give you added proof of this contention later in the debate.

We must realize also that this would be discriminatory legislation, for it operates only in regard to those commodities termed “basic” in the statement of the bill. It overlooks dairy products of which we export three hundred seventy million pounds yearly. It does not provide for beef, poultry, hay, legumes, or for barley, of which we have a yearly surplus amounting to twenty-five million dollars, or wool, with a yearly export of two hundred sixty-nine million pounds. In Kansas in the last year, there was produced only two hundred fifty-seven million dollars worth of those commodities called basic, as compared with two hundred sixty-seven million dollars worth of those not included in the bill. Such legislation would ignore two-thirds of the farming class, and because of this discrimination would penalize the diversified farmer who tries to raise a variety of products, rather than only one “basic” commodity.

Friends, I have shown you that the adoption of legislation embodying the principles of the McNary-Haugen bill would not be wise because those principles work in direct contrast to the natural economic laws which must govern agricultural production. The bill is a vicious one for several reasons: it is a price raising and a price fixing measure, as well as discriminatory legislation. Moreover, there are many impractical and unworkable features in the bill. The equalization fee is impracticable because of the difficulty in estimating the crops to determine the amount of the fee, because it would be unequally distributed, and because it would be almost impossible as well as extremely expensive to collect. We of the negative do not believe there
is a great enough need to warrant the adoption of such drastic and radical measures, and we believe that these principles would increase rather than decrease the surplus which is causing whatever depression may exist. Our opponents must show us how their plan can function in regard to cotton before we can believe it plausible, for, as I have shown you, cotton is the greatest cause of the farmers' trouble. So far in this debate, they have not done so. For these reasons, we contend that Congress should not adopt legislation embodying the principles of the McNary-Haugen bill. I thank you.

SECOND AFFIRMATIVE, ALVIN R. YORDY, BETHANY COLLEGE

Mr. Chairman, Honorable Judges, Worthy Opponents and Friends:

Mr. Young, who has just taken his seat, has tried to show you that there is no need for the principles of the McNary-Haugen Bill. This he attempted to show by telling you that the purchasing power of agricultural commodities is getting back to an equality with the purchasing power of industrial commodities. But the affirmative has shown clearly that the McNary-Haugen Bill is an emergency measure to operate only when there is a depression in agriculture, as in cotton at the present time. We also showed that a surplus causes a depression. Thus when a depression exists surely a need exists. It is then that this bill goes into operation. Opponents said, that back on its feet. In fact, after the war depression exists due to the need for aid. But with the after-war depression, the difference before agriculture try is decreasing, but index number for cotton 58 points, while that of points. What causes cotton? The eight million surplus causes a surplus, thus the McNary-Haugen Bill would go into operation because of the need in this particular commodity.

Remember that this bill will not raise prices to an exorbitant level but will give the farmer a more stabilized average price level. Excessive fluctuations downward in prices caused by surpluses will be eliminated since surpluses will be marketed in an orderly manner under this plan.

The gentlemen of the opposition have yet to prove that every year since the war the farmer is receiving more money for his products, for according to the Department of Agriculture in the February 1927 report the farmers
received one million dollars less for their products in 1926 than in 1925. This decline is chiefly due to the great depression in cotton caused by a surplus. Again this shows evidence for the need of this emergency measure.

The opposition insists that this bill is a price fixing measure, eliminating the law of supply and demand. But the government in no way fixes the price of agricultural commodities. The government, through designated farmers' agencies, takes over the surplus and disposes of it in the best possible manner. The law of supply and demand will then operate as it always has. But if prices should be fixed definitely then surely Professor Ely's statement would be true that this measure would affect the law of supply and demand. But since nowhere in this bill is mention made of a fixed price, how can this law be affected?

The principles of the McNary-Haugen Bill would be practicable in actual operation. Secretary Jardine says in his 1925 report to the President, that it is a well-known fact that surpluses exercise a depressing effect upon prices altogether dis-proportionate to their amount. This depressing effect is seen in the present cotton situation when a 10% increase in yield brought with it a 35% decrease in price. Or take the 1924 and 1925 corn crop in Iowa. In 1925 Iowa produced one hundred seventy-five million bushels more of corn than in 1924, yet the farmers received twenty million dollars less for the larger crop. Surpluses cause excessive fluctuations in price. Wheat in 1921 fluctuated from one dollar in November to two dollars and six cents in January. Corn in 1924 fluctuated from seventy-one cents to one dollar and thirty-five cents. The question arises would the McNary-Haugen Bill reduce this fluctuation and depression in price?

Today when a surplus exists it is thrown on the market. The result is a sharp decline in prices. After the majority of this surplus is in their hands, the middlemen hold this commodity until the demand is increased. Thus the commodity is sold to the consumer for a regular price. That is, cotton goods are not lower in price, materially, because of the low price of cotton today, but sell for the same price as they did in 1925. Some one must be reaping great profits and benefits, then, by gathering this cheap surplus and carrying it over to lean years. Why cannot the farmer do this? He can under the principles of the McNary-Haugen Bill, for a major principle of the bill is to aid in the orderly marketing of the surplus. Instead of being thrown on the market, causing an excessive decline in price, the surplus will be stored and marketed in an orderly manner. The bill states that this will enable producers "to stabilize their markets against excessive fluctuations." Through this minimizing of speculation and elimination of waste the farmer will then receive a more stabilized price. The Department of Agriculture found that 64% of the difference between the price received by the producer and that paid by the consumer for potatoes was absorbed in the movement through wholesale, jobbing and retail agencies. Since the McNary-Haugen Bill provides for orderly marketing the Federal Farm Board, through its designated agencies, will give the farmer the benefits of these widespread differences in consumer's and producer's prices.
Now let us put the bill in operation dealing with specific commodities and see its practicability. There are only three types of commodities. One in which there is a seasonal domestic surplus. Corn is such a commodity. The second type is one of which more is consumed on the domestic market than exported. Wheat is such an one. Then there is the type in which more is exported than consumed at home as is the case with cotton.

First, let us take corn. Since we export practically no corn, the problem in regard to this commodity is not exportable surplus. When a surplus exists it must be consumed at home. Since the McNary-Haugen Bill provides for orderly marketing, the price of corn will be kept from sinking to low levels by storing the surplus. Livestock raisers will be informed of the stored surplus and can plan their production of livestock, for they will not fear a lack of feed. This will in turn stabilize the market for corn and provide a future market for the stored surplus. This storage of the surplus will also act as a check against increased acreage. Dr. Kilgore, Chairman of American Cotton Growers' Exchange, says: "The most powerful factor in influencing production would be the price at which the surplus already stored and in the hands of the selected operating agencies would be turned back on the market."

Next, let us apply the principles of this bill to wheat. According to the statistics of the Department of Agriculture we export about one-third of our wheat. The domestic price would be stabilized through orderly marketing as with corn. The exportable surplus taken from the domestic market would also stabilize the domestic price. A feature that now characterizes the sale of exportable wheat is the dumping of the surplus on the world market at a low level while the world market is flooded with wheat from other countries. The Farm Board will have full knowledge of agricultural and economic conditions throught the world and thus will know when best to place the surplus on the world market to obtain the highest price.

If there should be a loss on the surplus sold abroad, this loss would be borne by the producers. This is only fair, for the farmers benefit from the stabilized price and in turn help bear the cost of obtaining these stabilized prices. Thus the government is losing no money and assuming no risk, but only making it possible for the farmers to control their surplus in an efficient and economical manner.

Now let us consider the third typical commodity, cotton. The United States controls 70% of the world's export trade in cotton. Since the Farm Board can, by orderly marketing through its agencies, store cotton and prevent the world market from being flooded the entire world price will be stabilized. When a surplus exists in cotton the surplus will be kept from the market and naturally the price will remain at a normal level. Then when there is a shortage of cotton in the world market this stored surplus can be placed on the market and again the price will remain at a normal level. The stored surplus will be a determining factor in the amount of acreage for the ensuing years. The Farm Board, because of its study of world conditions and markets, and home supply will be much more efficient than our present unorganized condition in the South.
In summary, the Affirmative has shown, first, the need for the principles of the McNary-Haugen Bill, because depressions are caused by surpluses and because these depressions recur permanently; and secondly, that the principles of the McNary-Haugen Bill are in accordance with our American policy of protectionism since the government has placed other industries on a stabilized basis; and, lastly, that the principles of the bill would be practicable in actual operation as shown in the three typical commodities—corn, wheat and cotton, because through orderly marketing and thru the disposition of the surplus, the normal price levels will be stabilized.

SECOND NEGATIVE, DONALD PIERSON, COLLEGE OF EMPORIA

Mr. Chairman, Friends:

This McNary-Haugen Bill threatens to drive us into the wee hours of the morning with still little possibility of a settlement. (This debate began at 10:00 P. M.) As it is the part of the negative to meet the case as presented by the affirmative, we shall waste no time in clashing immediately and directly with our opponents' argument.

In order to make the proposed legislation practicable, there must exist a definite need. The affirmative must show the farmer to be in a seriously depressed condition. It must also show this condition to be so urgent that government aid is imperative. Otherwise their plan is unnecessary. As evidence of this need the affirmative has quoted only one set of figures, viz.: that the farmers' net income had been reduced to one million dollars during the past year. This, we submit, is insufficient proof especially in face of the fact that, according to the Monthly Labor Review, Vol. 22, p. 549, one dollar at present will purchase sixty-four cents of industry's goods, or sixty-five cents of the farmer's products. Or in other words, there exists only one-cent disparity. We cannot deny this slight disparity, but we do call attention to the fact that it is not sufficient to warrant such drastic legislation as the McNary-Haugen Bill. The affirmative must establish a definite need.

The suggested remedy assumes the surplus to be responsible for this slight disparity. But, according to the Department of Agriculture, there are numerous other causes, which this plan in no way even proposes to remedy. Still, for the sake of argument, we will meet the affirmative upon their ground. The surplus is doubtless partly responsible. It is then up to the affirmative to show that this measure will actually handle the surplus, and that it will do so in an efficient and profitable manner.

Now if the bill is to operate at all, it must operate in certain commodities. Surely the affirmative will agree that the basic commodities mentioned in the last draft before Congress must be considered when the practicability of this legislation is called into question. Let us then take the four leading commodities mentioned and point out wherein the plan meets difficulty and evidences its impracticability.
Let us note hogs, for instance. The affirmative maintains that the plan would become operative only in an emergency. But no emergency exists here. The price has been comparatively high for several years. According to the Monthly Labor Review, Vol. 23, p. 1111 (1926), hogs have ranged during these years from 148 to 162 points, while all other commodities have averaged 150.5; or in other words, hogs have been from 2.5 below to 11.5 above the average of all commodities. Moreover, as Prof. Hibbard, Agricultural Economist at the University of Wisconsin, points out, we export hogs not as hogs but as pork and pork products. If the Bill then becomes operative in hogs, a method of marketing is imperative. The government must then either build huge packing plants to use periodically to convert hogs into exportable products or else enter into contract with the packers who are without exception hostile to the plan. In addition, there is unjust discrimination against the hog farmer compelled to deal in the corn market. For, according to the most reliable estimates, 85% of the corn is fed to livestock. And if the Bill be operative in corn, the man who feeds hogs must buy at an increased price. (For an increased price is inevitable. The affirmative maintains that a high price would not be set, rather a stabilized price. But even to stabilize a price it is necessary to raise it, and the affirmative cannot get around the fact that their plan involves raised prices.) Thus the hog farmer pays two equalization fees, one indirectly on corn, the other directly on hogs. And this is manifestly unjust discrimination.

Let us further consider corn. If the plan becomes operative only in emergencies as the affirmative maintains, corn would scarce ever be affected. For, according to Secretary Jardine, an emergency rarely exists. But the gentlemen of the affirmative say that the plan would operate to control seasonal surpluses. Very well, if you are going to store corn, you will face a serious storage problem. For, according to the Iowa and Illinois Experiment stations, one hundred bushels stored in November shrink to eighty-three bushels by the following July. This shrinkage means a decided loss, and the loss must be paid for by increased levies on the equalization fee.

Let us now note wheat. Here again there is no necessity as far as wheat is concerned. For, according to the Monthly Labor Review, wheat is listed at 161.5 points. Or, in other words, wheat is standing 11.5 points above. Now, according to the affirmative, one-third of our production is exportable surplus, and the plan of the affirmative proposes a loss be taken on such surplus and supposedly offset by the gain in increased price on the domestic supply. But, according to Representative Newton quoted in the Congress Record for May 7, 1926, p. 8837, the United States Grain Corporation operating during the War found it necessary in order to handle adequately the surplus to handle not only the exportable surplus but 15% in addition. Then if 33% is exportable (as maintained by the affirmative), the government under the McNary-Haugen Bill must dump 48% of the yearly production of wheat on the foreign market at a loss. Can the affirmative guarantee that this loss will not eat up any possible gain on the other half of the wheat? This dumping must compete with Argentine which last year poured into the world market one hundred thirty-five
million bushels—a figure nearly that of our own export—with Russia and Roumania which have doubled their production since the War, and with Canada which is coming rapidly into the world market. The larger the foreign supply, the lower the foreign price, and the greater the loss to be borne by the equalization fee.

Now how about cotton? According to the Department of Agriculture, we have on hand a vicious surplus of at least five or six million bales. The market is glutted. And it is this depression in cotton which is responsible for the slight disparity between the average price of the farmer's products and of industry's goods. The affirmative must show how its plan can work in cotton. It must show that it is practicable to store up cotton; and just how with the limited amount of money at the disposal of the board, it can handle the huge cotton market adequately. If this Bill will not work, it is obviously bad business to adopt its principles, and hence the plan is neither sane nor practicable.

According to Professor Young, Harvard economist, 67.5% of our cotton is exported, and under this plan sustains a loss. The loss on two-thirds of the crop would more than consume any possible profits on the other one-third.

Now, what has caused the present cotton situation? The cause is not far to seek. Cotton prices skyrocketed during and immediately following the War. And acreage followed by leaps and bounds until it reached the unprecedented figure of forty-six million acres, or 11.8 million more than the average acreage for the last decade. And this fact uncovers the most serious objection to the McNary-Haugen plan, viz.: that the increased price which the affirmative cannot deny is involved in the plan will stimulate production; and increased production will magnify the surplus, increase rather than solve the problem, and hence defeat the very purpose for which the Bill is intended. Call it raised price, guaranteed price, stable price—the result is inevitably the same. It is only human nature to invest more heavily where profits are guaranteed. And, according to Professor Young, there is vast room for increased acreage. He points out a twenty-two million decrease since the War in wheat acreage, all the land of which is available for further production under the virile stimulus of a guaranteed profit. Overproduction is the chief foe of the McNary-Haugen Bill.

First Negative Rebuttal, Donald Pierson, College of Emporia

Mr. Chairman, Friends:
The affirmative has yet to establish four vital contentions: first, it must advance adequate evidence to show a need; second, it must show that such conditions as do exist cannot be remedied without government aid; third, it must show that the enormous surplus in cotton can be adequately and profitably handled; and fourth, it must show that the guaranteed profit involved will not result in over-production.
Let us take up the argument of the affirmative as presented point by point. Its presentation of the manner of orderly marketing by which the Bill proposes to work was very fine. It then points out that this legislation is in keeping with sound American principles—that it is in conformity to our policy of protectionism and analogous to the method by which industry controls its production. Now we admit at once that it is all right for the government to come to the aid of the farmer. The government has aided agriculture in the past. But the essential point is that the affirmative must show that the farmer cannot remedy such slight difficulties as exist without the aid of the government—that government assistance is imperative. It must show that this aid will react to the farmer's benefit—that this plan will not result in over-production. But the most reliable figures available indicate the opposite. You then face the paradox in which if this Bill will actually work, its guaranteed price will defeat the very purpose of the Bill. The over-production argument is no mere statement of a debater on the platform. No less an authority than the American Institute of Economists in a report published in 1924 and covering a survey of agricultural prices during the last half century (which, we believe, you will consider a reasonable period of time), states in these very words, “In every case of an increased price there followed a corresponding increased production.” This contention is further borne out by the fact that, according to Lyon and Ras-sieur of the University of Washington, thru figures compiled from the records of the Chicago Board of Trade, a comparison of the price of spring wheat over a period of 13 months preceding seeding with the corresponding acreage, showed in the twenty-six years from 1896 to 1920 a direct acreage response to price movement in twenty-two of the twenty-six years. Moreover, according to the 1927 World Almanac, cotton acreage during the years 1910 to 1926 responded directly to price increase in every year save two. This is particularly evident in the years of 1922 with its three million acre increase, 1923 with its four million acre increase in the very face of the fact as Jardine points out that “the cotton farmer was warned continuously not to over-produce.” President Coolidge points out that “seventeen million acres of forest and pasture land were given over to cotton during the War due to increased prices.” In Brazil a similar plan in coffee found it necessary to absolutely prohibit the planting of coffee trees.

Then if you increase production, you increase the surplus, and you increase dumping on the foreign market. This dumping may result in two serious conditions: either foreign countries which have their own agriculture to protect may counter with embargoes similar to the Anti-Dumping Act passed by our Congress in 1921; or the glutted foreign market may knock down the foreign price, the foreign manufacturer will be enabled to purchase more cheaply and with the added advantage of cheap labor, be able to compete at a disadvantage to the domestic manufacturer who buys on a high market. Hence the plan eventuates in subsidizing foreign competition.

Now the affirmative has consistently built its case on the possibility of a stabilized price. But a stabilized price is impossible. It has failed to taken into consideration the fact that every bushel of wheat to be exported
must pass thru either the Chicago or the New York Board of Trade. And, according to Senate Document No. 135, "large-scale buying and selling operations (in wheat futures in Chicago) completely disrupted the market and resulted in abnormal fluctuations, which were felt in every other large grain market in the world." For instance, one trader handling over three million bushels of wheat on March 4, that day caused a price drop of seven and one-eight cents; on March 6, one trader's manipulation forced a decline of eleven and one-fourth cents; on March 13, large deals knocked down the market fourteen and three-fourths cents; and again on March 17, three men purchasing an aggregate of over ten million bushels of wheat, prostrated the market by an additional eleven and three-eighths cents drop. In other words, a few men can manipulate prices to affect the whole world situation. And therefore, a stabilized price is an impossibility. This vital fact, should the affirmative fail to meet it, is fatal to its case. Unless driven back, this wedge must split its argument. I thank you.

FIRST AFFIRMATIVE REBUTTAL, MERLE YOWELL, BETHANY COLLEGE

Mr. Chairman, Honorable Judges, Worthy Opposition, Ladies and Gentlemen:

Throughout this debate this evening, the opposition has repeatedly contended that agriculture as a whole is not in dire straits and thus there is no need for this McNary-Haugen Bill. We feel that it is not necessary to stress need. The McNary-Haugen Bill is an emergency measure, and, of course, would only be placed in operation when a need does exist. The opposition has shown that in cotton there is a depression, due, as they themselves admit, to the existence of an excessive surplus production. Now, because of that excessive surplus, a depression has resulted, consequently there is a need in that situation. It is in such instances that the McNary-Haugen Bill would be placed in operation—only when a need does exist.

The opposition has argued, secondly, that the plan is economically unsound, first because an increased cost of living would result. This argument is based entirely on the assumption that the bill is a price-raising measure. To the contrary, we have shown that the operation of this bill would not result in increased prices. The plan would be placed in operation only when an excessive surplus exists. The result would be to eliminate the excessive downward fluctuation that would otherwise occur. Thus we would have not an increased price, but instead a stabilized average price level.

The third issue of the opposition was that the bill would be impracticable, first, because of difficulties in connection with the equalization fee. The opposition have argued that the fee would be hard to collect, but we, of the affirmative, are willing to credit our government with the ability to cope with this situation. When we consider the success of the Income Tax and the Soldier's Bonus, either of them a much more intricate problem than the
equalization fee would present, we recognize that the collection of the fee does not present an impossible situation.

The opposition has argued that it would be impracticable also, because it would be impossible to estimate the amount of the surplus. Let us consider how the plan would work. It, at least, is always possible to foresee a surplus. Now, when the Farm Board, who would have an organized knowledge of the entire situation, would foresee a surplus which would depress prices, arrangements would be made with existing marketing agencies to buy up those surpluses at the prevailing market prices before the surpluses had had a chance to cause a depressed condition. Now, if for some reason, the surplus did not occur as expected, the plan would not go into operation, because a depressed condition would not result. Thus there would be no difficulty of administration on that point.

From the foregoing explanation of the bill, we may argue also, contrary to the contention of the opposition, that the bill is not a price fixing measure. The board does not set a fixed and definite price. These designated marketing agencies buy up the surplus as it comes upon the market at the prevailing market price before the surplus causes a downward fluctuation. They buy at the market price. The laws of supply and demand operate there, and thus they would have their effect under this plan.

The opposition have argued further that the plan would be impracticable because overproduction would result. This argument is based essentially upon the assumption that prices would be raised. I have shown previously why prices would not be increased under this plan. With high prices, production naturally would increase. That is why there was an increase of seventeen million acres in cotton between the years 1920 and 1926—the producers were attempting to maintain a war-time level of prices. The opposition cited the 23 million acres increase in wheat. This increase was due in the main to a shifting of acreage from corn to wheat—twenty-two million acres were shifted from corn production to wheat production during the war and back again since the war. This shifting was due to higher war prices although there were other contributing factors, such as patriotism and war-time feeling. Under the McNary-Haugen Bill even this situation would not be affected. There would be no incentive to shift production because both crop prices would be stabilized. Furthermore, let me repeat, these cases of overproduction were caused by an increased level of prices—a situation that will not occur under the McNary-Haugen Bill.

Again, there would be no tendency to overproduce because the equalization fee would be a valid check against the tendency. It would constitute a check identical to the check that exists today. Today, if the farmer overproduces, he knows that low prices will result and that he must go through a period of depression. Under the McNary-Haugen Bill, if the farmer would overproduce, the equalization fees would grow so large that it would cause the same result—low net prices. Thus, in the first place, there would be no incentive to overproduction, and, in the second place, a check is provided
should the tendency develop. Thus overproduction will not result under the McNary-Haugen Bill.

Thus far I have considered in detail the proof upon which the first three issues of the opposition were based. The opposition has spent the rest of its time attempting to show the plan would not work in specific commodities. They have stressed the cotton situation and have admitted that if we show practicability in cotton, we have established our case. In regard to cotton, my colleague made specific efforts to show how the Bill would work. Yet the opposition has refused to consider our plan of application. For example, the opposition contended that because of the higher price at home, we would have to take a loss upon 70% of our cotton crop. They have overlooked the fact that my colleague showed specifically that we are not to have a higher price at home, but instead, a control of the world price. Thus every unit would bear the cost and every unit would have advantage of the stabilized price level. My colleague will consider further the practicability of the bill in regard to these commodities cited by the opposition.

SECOND NEGATIVE REBUTTAL, JOHN I. YOUNG, COLLEGE OF EMORIA

Honorable Judges, Friends:

Let us consider the debate this evening in the order of its presentation. The affirmative at first went upon the mere assumption that the farmer is in a bad depression, and needs government aid. While we of the negative do not deny such a need we do not believe that the need is great enough to warrant the adoption of the McNary-Haugen Bill, which we believe, would endanger those whom it is intended to help. We mentioned the steady increase in the farm income in 1929, and the fact that there is a disparity of only one cent in the purchasing power of the farmer’s dollar, as compared with that of other industries, and they did not meet these facts, but later in the debate the second speaker spent most of his time trying to show the need of the farmer, and the justice of government aid. We do not deny either, but we feel that we should not look to the principles of this bill for aid. However, if the depression is due, as they say, to seasonal depressions, they must show us that this bill will remedy those depressions and they have not done so. They contend that this bill would be put in operation only in these periods of seasonal depression, which is true, but my colleague has shown you by specific examples that it cannot handle even these situations.

We do not deny that it is the policy of our government to aid those industries that are in need and believe that such aid is advisable, but we do not believe, for reasons we have already given you, that we should try to give that aid through such dangerous and impracticable legislation as the McNary-Haugen Bill.

The affirmative has attempted to show you that this is not a price fixing measure, by contending that it is intended merely to stabilize prices
and not to definitely fix them. But if we stabilize prices over a period of years there will be some years in which that price will have to be brought down to the average, and others in which it will have to be raised to the average, and this can only be done by definitely setting the price each year. Moreover, we would like to remind the affirmative of the fact that in the World Almanac, we find that in corn, in five years since the war, increased production has been followed by an increase in price. The natural situation which usually follows is that low prices follow increased production. But this was not so in these years. This was particularly true in 1919, and 1923. Authorities have attributed the cause of this situation to the fact that world market conditions affect prices in our country even when there is no exportable surplus in the particular product. The McNary-Haugen Bill cannot do away with this, cannot stabilize prices, and give the farmer a fair price every year unless it definitely sets the price for each year. Moreover, as my colleague has already told you, one man alone, working through the Chicago and New York Boards of Trade, has been able to cause the price of wheat, per bushel, to fluctuate as much as fourteen and three-fourths cents in one day. This is revealed in the reports of the Boards of Trade themselves. The Bill cannot do away with such control as this unless it does set a price. So we see that the bill must be price fixing in order to function at all.

The affirmative has attempted to prove to you that its bill will work, but my colleague has shown you, by using the very examples it mentioned, that it cannot function to gain in actual operation the advantages claimed. The affirmative must also face the fact that this bill guarantees profits to the processors and middlemen, regardless of their own inefficiency, waste, or profiteering methods.

Our opponents must show us that this bill will work in regard to cotton which is the primary cause of the farmer's condition today. It cannot work because it would take at least twelve hundred million dollars to handle the cotton crop, and to deal adequately with the surplus, while there is but two hundred fifty million dollars in the revolving fund. The affirmative has attempted to get around this fact by telling you that the cooperatives will buy up this cotton, but it has admitted that they have been unable to do so in the past. If the government is to enable the cooperatives or other agencies to buy, store, and sell in order to gain the desired advantages, it must furnish funds with which to handle this crop.

We of the negative have shown you this bill will cause overproduction and the affirmative so far in the debate has failed to answer this contention. It will probably say that the equalization fee and the crop information dispensed will prevent the farmers from overproducing, but, friends, as long as there is a margin between the added profit gained, and the amount lost on the equalization fee, it stands to reason that the farmer will continue to produce to his limit. My colleague has shown by authoritative figures that it is an economic law that increased price is followed by increased production, that it always has been and always will be. This is the vital issue
of the debate, and unless our opponents can prove to us that the McNary-Haugen bill will not create overproduction, we cannot afford to adopt their plan.

There are two questions we should like to ask the affirmative. First, since storing is such a vital factor in the working of its plan, will it please show us how it is practical to store when we know that there are always losses involved in storing, and that according to the Iowa and Nebraska Agricultural Experiment Stations, the shrinkage on one hundred bushels of corn stored for one year is as much as seventeen bushels? Is this feature of the bill wise? Second, what new aid will the McNary-Haugen bill give that is not already given in such legislation as the War Finance Act and the Webb-Pomerene Act, which give the farmers power to organize to deal with the agricultural surpluses?

Friends, we have shown you that this proposal attempts to work in conflict with natural economic laws, that it is a price fixing and price raising measure, that many of its vital features are impracticable and impossible, and that it will not work in regard to those products and conditions for which it was designed.

The affirmative, in order to justify the adoption of such legislation must show two things: that it will work in regard to cotton, which is the greatest cause of the farmer's poor condition, and that overproduction will not result. It has failed so far to do this. I thank you.

SECOND AFFIRMATIVE REBUTTAL, ALVIN R. YORDY, BETHANY COLLEGE

Honorable judges and friends:

Let us summarize the debate as it now stands.

The affirmative contend that there is a need for aid when a surplus of agricultural commodities exist. The McNary-Haugen Bill is an emergency measure going into operation only when that need exists. The measure provides for the orderly marketing and disposition of the surplus. My colleague proved that these depressions due to a surplus occur periodically through the years. Thus our first major contention has not been refuted by the negative.

Secondly, the affirmative proved that this measure is in accordance with the American system of protectionism. The opposition hasn't considered this argument but have granted that if the measure will benefit the agricultural class it is sound. My colleague thus in his constructive speech and rebuttal has established and clearly upheld the first two contentions of the affirmative. Mr. Pierson, of the opposition, after attempting to attack the practicability of the McNary-Haugen Bill has agreed with us that the cotton farmer is in a depression and that his condition is due to the surplus. Then he tells us that if we can show that this measure will be practicable in cotton the affirmative has established its case.

Although I proved in my constructive speech the practicability of the measure in three typical commodities, I shall again deal with cotton in de-
tail and show how the bill in actual operation will work with this commodity.

According to the statistics of the Department of Agriculture, the United States controls seventy percent of the world's export trade in cotton. Under the McNary-Haugen Bill the Farm Board will select its export agencies. When a surplus exists the government will not buy every unit of the commodity but will take from the market the surplus cotton. This surplus will be stored by the designated agencies who buy this surplus. The expense involved in handling and storing the surplus will be paid from the equalization fund. Although the amount of the equalization fund is a mere detail of this plan, yet we see that it is adequate to pay the cost of handling and storing the surplus. This surplus will then be kept from the flooded world market which will cause the world market to remain at a stabilized price level fluctuating according to the law of supply and demand. Since the world price level will remain at a normal level no foreign countries will take retaliatory measures against the United States as some are doing against England because of the British rubber monopoly. The opposition has based its argument of retaliatory measures on the assumption that the McNary-Haugen Bill is to raise the average price level, but the affirmative has clearly shown that the McNary-Haugen Bill only prevents the excessive decline of prices caused by a surplus, thus maintaining a normal price level.

The opposition then advanced the argument that if these higher prices are given to the cotton farmer, he will continue to produce a surplus. Again they are arguing a higher price level which of course would lead to increased acreage as it did in 1923, 1924 and 1925. But the prices of cotton during those years was above normal due to post war conditions. Again the opposition said that there are no lean years in cotton, but in 1924 the Agricultural Year Book shows a shortage of eight million bales during 1921 and 1922. Thus there are lean years in cotton as in other commodities. Furthermore, the cotton farmers have agreed at the last cotton conference to reduce acreage. The Farm Board will be influential in advising the amount of acreage in accordance with world conditions. However, should there still be an argument left on the negative in regard to over-production there remains the great check of the equalization fee. Mr. Davis, representing the North Central Agricultural Conference, says: "The McNary-Haugen Bill ties together the production of a surplus with the responsibility of taking care of it through the equalization fee."

In summary, honorable judges, the affirmative has shown the need for the principles of the McNary-Haugen Bill because it controls and disposes of the surplus which is the crucial agricultural problem; and have shown that its principles are in accordance with the American system of protectionism; and finally we have proved that the bill is practicable in the three typical commodities—corn, wheat, and cotton. Therefore legislation should be adopted embodying the principles of the McNary-Haugen Bill.
THE KANSAS CONVENTION

Province one, composed of all the Kansas chapters, met in convention at Ottawa University, March 30 and April 1. There were present about one hundred fifty delegates representing all thirteen chapters of the state. In addition the following institutions took part in the contests as the invited guests of the province: Friends University Wichita; and McPherson College, McPherson.

The governor of the province, Professor J. H. Lawrence, College of Emporia, presided at the meetings. Martin J. Holcomb, Bethany College, acted as secretary. National President Alfred Westfall attended the meetings of the convention and spoke at the banquet.

New officers elected are: Governor, Dean LeRoy Allen, Southwestern College; and Secretary Prof. Geo. R. R. Pflaum, Kansas State Teachers College of Emporia.

LOUISE PENNINGTON
Emporia Teachers Women’s Extempore

Men’s Debate Tournament

Question: “Resolved: that the essential principles of the McNary-Haugen Bill should be enacted into legislation.”

(The affirmative team is mentioned first in each debate listed).

Round one:

1. Kansas Wesleyan, Team 1, (won), vs. Baker Team 3.
2. Wichita, Team 2, (won) vs. Washburn, Team 1.
3. Kansas Wesleyan Team 2, (won) vs. Kansas State Teachers College Emporia, Team 1
4. College of Emporia, Team 1, (won) vs. Bethany, Team 3.
5. Baker, Team 1, (won) vs. College of Emporia, Team 2.
6. Friends, Team 1, vs. Kansas State Teachers College of Pittsbugh, Team 1, (won).
7. Friends, Team 2, (won) vs. Southwestern, Team 1.
8. Washburn, Team 2, vs. Southwestern, Team 2, (won).
9. Ottawa, Team 1, vs. Kansas State Teachers College of Emporia, Team 2, (won).
11. Sterling vs. Bethany, Team 1, (won).
12. Kansas State Teachers College of Pittsburg, Team 2, (won) vs. Wichita, Team 1.
13. Bethany, Team 1, (won) vs. Kansas State Teachers College of Pittsburg, Team 2.

Round two:
14. Southwestern, Team 1, vs. Ottawa, Team 2, (won).
15. Kansas State Teachers College of Pittsburg, Team 2, (won) vs. Wichita, Team 1.
16. Kansas State Teachers College of Emporia, Team 1, vs. Sterling (won).
17. College of Emporia, Team 2, (won) vs. Friends, Team 1.
19. Ottawa, Team 1, vs. Washburn, Team 2, (won).
20. Washburn, Team 1, vs. Wichita, Team 2, (won).
22. Kansas Wesleyan, Team 1, (won) vs. Kansas State Teachers College of Pittsburg, Team 1.
24. Bethany, Team 1, vs. Kansas Wesleyan, Team 2, (won).
25. Kansas State Teachers College of Emporia, Team 2, vs. Southwestern, Team 2, (won).

Round three:
27. Kansas Wesleyan, Team 2, vs. Friends, Team 2, (won).
29. Southwestern, Team 2, vs. Kansas Wesleyan, Team 1, (won).
30. Washburn, Team 2, vs. Ottawa, Team 2, (won).
31. Washburn, Team 1, vs. Bethany, Team 1, (won).
33. Baker, Team 2, vs. College of Emporia, Team 1, (won).
34. Kansas State Teachers College of Pittsburg, Team 1, (won) vs. College of Emporia, Team 2.
35. Bethany, Team 3, (won) vs. Sterling.

Round four:
37. Baker, Team 1, (won) vs. Wichita, Team 2.
38. Southwestern, Team 2, vs. Bethany, Team 2, (won).
40. Ottawa, Team 2, vs. College of Emporia, Team 1, (won).
41. Kansas State Teachers College of Pittsburg, Team 2, (won) vs. Kansas Wesleyan, Team 2.
42. Bethany, Team 1, (won) vs. Kansas Wesleyan, Team 1.
43. Kansas State Teachers College of Pittsburg, Team 1, drew a bye.

Round five:
44. Bethany, Team 3, vs. Kansas State Teachers College of Pittsburg, Team 2, (won).
45. Baker, Team 1, vs. College of Emporia, Team 1, (won).
46. Kansas State Teachers College of Pittsburg, Team 1, vs. Friends, Team 2, (won).
47. Kansas Wesleyan, Team 1, vs. Bethany, Team 2, (won).
48. Bethany, Team 1, drew a bye.

Round six:
49. Friends, Team 2, vs. Bethany, Team 2, (won).
50. Bethany, Team 1, (won) vs. Kansas State Teachers College of Pittsburg, Team 2.
51. College of Emporia, Team 1, drew a bye.

Round seven:
52. Bethany, Team 2, vs. College of Emporia, Team 1, (won).

Round eight:
53. Bethany, Team 1, (won) vs. College of Emporia, Team 1. This left Teams 1 and 2 of Bethany still in the competition. These teams declared the contest a tie.

Women's Debate Tournament

Question: “Resolved: That the essential principles of the McNary-Haugen Bill should be enacted into legislation.”

Round one:
2. Kansas State Teachers College of Emporia (won) vs. Bethany, Team 1.
5. Bethany, Team 2, (won) vs. Sterling

Round two:
6. Bethany, Team 1, (won) vs. College of Emporia.
7. Ottawa vs. Kansas State Teachers College of Emporia (won).
8. Sterling (won) vs. Kansas State Teachers College of Pittsburg, Team 2.
COLLEGE OF EMPORIA WINNERS
John Young, Debater; Reggie Carter, Orator; Donald Pierson, Debater; and
Louise Lawrence, Orator.

Round three.
12. Bethany, Team 1, (won) vs. Kansas State Teachers College of Emporia.
17. Bethany, Team 3, (won) vs. Kansas State Teachers College of Emporia.

Round five:
18. Bethany, Team 2, vs. Sterling (won).

Round six:
20. Bethany, Team 3, (won) vs. Sterling. One of the judges of this debate had to leave to catch a train before the rebuttal speeches were completed. Sterling protested the decision. The debate was held a second time with the result that the decision was in favor of Sterling.
Men's Extempore Contest

General Subject: "The Policy of the United States in Central America."
First: "American interpretation of the Monroe Doctrine in the present policy towards Central America." Frank Morrison, Kansas State Agricultural College.
Second: "Kellogg's policy towards Central America." Floyd Sampson, Friends University.
Third: "Manifest destiny as a motive for our Central American Policy." Bentley Barnebas, University of Wichita.

Women's Extempore Contest

General Subject: "Race Relations."
First: "Value of diversity in racial qualities." Louise Pennington, Kansas State Teachers College of Emporia.
Second: "Race amalgamation in its relation to eugenics and quality of racial stock." Agnes Hyrup, Bethany.
A record of the other competitors in these contests was not kept.

Men's Oratorical Contest

First: Reggie Carther, College of Emporia.
Second: Kenneth Rock, McPherson College.
Twelve in all entered this contest. A record of the other speakers was not kept.

Women's Oratorical Contest

First: Louise Lawrence, College of Emporia.
A record of the other speakers in this contest was not kept.

FIFTY DEBATES FOR SOUTH DAKOTA STATE

South Dakota State has carried thru one of the most extensive forensic programs ever undertaken. Fifty debates, six extempore contests, and four oratorical contests were participated in. The men engaged in twenty debates and the women in fifteen, mainly no-decision contests before high school and community organizations. The freshmen took part in fifteen debates. Almost a hundred people entered the tryouts for these various lines of forensic activity. Actual experience was given to a large number of these students. —The Industrial Collegian.

WATCH US GROW

SUCCESSFUL CONVENTION IN PROVINCE TWO

Eighty-five delegates representing all of the fourteen chapters in the province assembled at Iowa Wesleyan, Mount Pleasant, March 24-26, for the convention of the province. Governor L. J. Graham, Culver-Stockton College, presided. Professor Roy H. Johnson, of Carthage College, served as secretary. The province transacted the usual business, held a banquet and a number of forensic contests. The results of these contests follow:

Men’s Debate Tournament

Question: “Resolved: That the essential principles of the McNary-Haugen Bill should be enacted into legislation.”

(The affirmative is mentioned first in each debate listed.)

Round one:
1. Des Moines, Team 2, vs. McKendree (won).
2. Culver-Stockton, Team 2, vs. Drake (won).
3. Iowa Wesleyan, Team 1, (won) vs. William Jewell.
5. Parsons, Team 2, vs. Missouri Wesleyan, Team 1, (won).
6. Central (Missouri) (won) vs. Iowa Wesleyan, Team 2.
7. Simpson, Team 2, (won) vs. Des Moines, Team 1.
8. Parsons, Team 1, vs. Central (Iowa) (won).
9. Culver-Stockton, Team 1, (won) vs. Missouri Wesleyan, Team 2.

Round two:
11. Simpson, Team 1, (won) vs. Iowa Wesleyan, Team 1.
12. Missouri Wesleyan, Team 1, vs. Central (Missouri) (won).
15. William Jewell (won) vs. Carthage.
17. Iowa Wesleyan, Team 2, vs. Parsons, Team 2, (won).
18. Des Moines, Team 1, (won) vs. Parsons, Team 1.

Round three:
20. Central (Iowa) (won) vs. Central (Missouri).
22. Missouri Wesleyan, Team 2, vs. Des Moines, Team 1, (won).
23. Iowa Wesleyan, Team 1, (won) vs. McKendree.
24. Culver-Stockton, Team 1, (won) vs. Missouri Wesleyan, Team 1.
25. Parsons, Team 2, vs. Simpson, Team 2, (won).

Round four:
26. Simpson, Team 1, vs. Central (Iowa) (won).
27. William Jewell (won) vs. Des Moines, Team 1.
28. Iowa Wesleyan, Team 1, (won) vs. Culver-Stockton, Team 1.
29. Central (Missouri) (won) vs. Simpson, Team 2.
Round five:
30. Central (Iowa) vs. William Jewell (won).
31. Central (Missouri) (won) vs. Iowa Wesleyan, Team 1.
32. Simpson, Team 1, vs. Drake (won).

Round six:
33. Drake (won) vs. Central (Iowa).
34. William Jewell vs. Central (Missouri) (won).

Round seven:
35. Central (Missouri) (won) vs. Drake.

Women’s Extemporaneous Speaking Contest
First: “Will the state have to assume the responsibility for the child if the tendency for women to enter industry continues to increase?” Eunice Gibbons, Central College, Missouri.
Second: “Will women in the world’s work result in a new type of home?” Mary Hartman, Park College.
Third: “Should women with husbands capable of supporting them be allowed to continue in industry?” Louise Leurs, Iowa Wesleyan.
Fourth: “Should women be barred from industry?” Maurine Miller, Culver-Stockton College.
Fifth: “What effect has women’s entrance into industry had on her health?” Edna Wood, Simpson College.

Men’s Extemporaneous Speaking Contest
General Subject: “Capital and Labor.”
First: “Should organized labor enter politics?” Paul Minear, Iowa Wesleyan College.
Second: “What has been the effect of the war upon the relations between capital and labor?” Carl McIntire, Park College.
Third: “Should Labor have a voice in the management of industry?” K. Eberhart, Simpson College.
Fourth: “What has been the effect of machine production on the relations between capital and labor?” Aldon Russell, William Jewell College.
Fifth: “Have wages kept pace with the increased cost of living?” R. G. Mudd, Culver-Stockton College.
Sixth: “What has been the result of the Company Union?” P. K. Crawford, Culver-Stockton College.
Seventh: “Has profit sharing proved successful in settling the problem of the relations between capital and labor?” Harold Beard, Des Moines University.

Women’s Oratorical Contest
Third: “Reality,” Eugenia Ellis, Simpson College.
Also speaking:
“Speeding,” Laura Marie Crockett, Central College, Missouri.
“Mexico,” Mary Hartman, Park College.
“The Liberal Youth,” Ruth Power, Iowa Wesleyan College.
“We Will Walk in His Paths,” Lorona Dillener, Missouri Wesleyan College.

**Men’s Oratorical Contest**
First: “Tell it to the Marines,” Garrett Kell, Park College.
Second: “Man’s Commandment or God’s,” Lyle T. Quinn, Simpson College.
Also speaking:
“Leadership for World Peace,” Harry Brown, McKendree College.
“By the People,” Albert Reeves, William Jewell College.
“The Eternal City,” Burkett Herrick, Des Moines University.

**COLORADO AND NEBRASKA CHAPTERS MEET IN HASTINGS**

Seventy-five delegates from the nine chapters of Province Three met at Hastings, Neb., March 24-26, for their provincial convention. The opening event was a banquet. It was followed by a number of forensic contests. The provincial officers, Professor E. H. Wells, Nebraska Wesleyan University, President, and Leroy Lasue, Doane College, Secretary, were in charge.

The results of the contests follow:

**Men’s Debate Tournament**
Hastings College won the tournament, defeating Cotner in the finals. A full record of the contests was not supplied to THE FORENSIC.

**Women’s Debate Tournament**
Doane College affirmative won from Western State College negative in the final debate of the tournament. A full record of the contests was not supplied THE FORENSIC.

**Women’s Extemporaneous Speaking Contest**
General Subject: “Women’s Rights.”
Doane College Debaters, Champions of the Province of the Province of the Platte

Fourth: "Women and Jury Service," Verna Bruce, Western State College.

**Men's Extemporaneous Speaking Contest**

General Subject: "Present Day Intolerances."
First: "Intolerance of Youth," Andrew E. Nuquist, Doane College.

**Men's Oratorical Contest**


**Women's Oratorical Contest**

First: "Hamilton and the Constitution," Rani Getty, Western State College.

Point values were assigned to the various places recognized in the different contests. The results thus compiled were.

- Doane College . . . . . . 17 points
- Hastings College . . . . 15 points
- Nebraska Wesleyan University . 10 points
- Western State College . . . 8 points
- Cotner College . . . . . 4 points
CALIFORNIA CHAPTERS CONVEINED IN LOS ANGELES

Fifty-five delegates from the five chapters in Province Five assembled at The University of California at Los Angeles, April 1 and 2, for the provincial convention and contests. Professor Ray M. Untereiner of California Institute of Technology, governor of the province, was in charge. Miss Wilma Wells, of the host chapter, acted as secretary.

The convention had as its guests Professor E. R. Nichols, Redlands University, first national president; Dr. John R. Macarthur, California Institute of Technology, second national president; and Professor Charles R. Marsh, the University of California in Los Angeles, third national president; and Professor W. H. Veatch, national first vice president.

Men's Debate Tournament

Men's Debate Tournament

Question: “Resolved: That a department of Education should be established with a secretary in the president's cabinet.”

(The affirmative team is mentioned first in each debate listed.)

2. University of Redlands (won) vs. California Institute of Technology.
5. University of Redlands vs. College of the Pacific (won).
6. University of California in Los Angeles (won) vs. College of the Pacific.

Full accounts of the oratorical contests were not supplied to THE FORENSIC. “Wings of Progress,” Ward Foster, California Institute of Technology, was awarded first place in the men’s contest. “Beneath American Roofs,” Genevieve Temple, University of California in Los Angeles, was awarded first place in the women’s contest.

The extemporaneous speaking contest for the men was on the Latin-American situation. Frank Watson of the University of Redlands, speaking on the Nicaraguan situation, was awarded first in the men’s contest. Miss Virginia Shaw, University of California in Los Angeles, won first in the women’s contest. She spoke on Balkan conditions.
BUENA VISTA HOST TO PROVINCE OF THE SIOUX

Delegates of ten chapters of Province Six assembled at Buena Vista College, Storm Lake, Iowa, April 6-8. Governor F. W. Lambertson, Dakota Wesleyan University, presided over the convention. Professor W. H. Wollbert, Iowa University, was the guest of the convention and its chief speaker.

The following contests were carried thru:

Men's Debate Tournament

Question: "Resolved: That Congress should adopt the principles of the McNary-Haugen Bill."
(The affirmative is mentioned first in each debate listed).

Round one:
1. Northern State Teachers College vs. Western Union (won).
2. Yankton (won) vs. Morningside.
3. Dakota Wesleyan (won) vs. Huron.

Round two:
5. Morningside (won) vs. Northern State Teachers.
6. Western Union vs. Yankton (won)

Round three:
10. Yankton (won) vs. Western Union.
11. South Dakota State drew a bye.

Round four:
12. Morningside (won) vs. Yankton.
13. Dakota Wesleyan (won) vs. South Dakota State.

Round five:
15. Dakota Wesleyan (won) vs. Yankton.

Round six:

Women's Debate Tournament

Question: "Resolved: That the United States should adopt a uniform marriage and divorce law."
(The affirmative team is mentioned first in each debate listed).

Round one:
1. Morningside (won) vs. Huron.
2. South Dakota State College (won) vs. Buena Vista.

Round two:
5. Huron (won) vs. South Dakota State.

**Round three:**

7. South Dakota State vs. Dakota Wesleyan (won).
9. Huron drew a bye.

**Round four:**

10. Huron (won) vs. Morningside.
11. Dakota Wesleyan drew a bye.

**Round five:**

12. Morningside (won) vs. Dakota Wesleyan.
13. Huron drew a bye.

**Round six:**


**Men's Oratorical Contest**

Also speaking:
“Leadership in a Democracy,” Archie Illigdon, South Dakota State College.
“The Trial of Youth,” Clifford Clemens, Huron College.
“Experiments in Progress,” Milliard Jorden, Dakota Wesleyan University.

**Women's Oratorical Contest**

Third: “Are We Colorblind?” Lois Hickman, Morningside.
Also speaking:
“The Enemy Within Our Gates,” Elsie Rodeniser, Dakota Wesleyan University.

**Men's Extempore Contest**

First: “Should the United States and Mexico arbitrate the Land Laws’ dispute?” Mack Easton, Huron College.
Second: “Compulsory Military Training,” Jewel Pickett, Western Union College.
Also speaking:
“Should the United States join the League of Nations?” Otto Gruhn, Northern State Teachers College.
“Is America a dollar chasing nation?” Kendrick Grobel, Yankton College.
“A criticism of President Coolidge's foreign policy,” Gordon Fogg, Morningside College.
"Limitations of extra-curricular activities," Walter Crissey, Buena Vista College.

"Criticisms of the immigration policy of the United States," Donald Root, Dakota Wesleyan University.

Women's Extemporaneous Speaking Contest

Third: "What next in China?" Mildred Hickman, Morningside College.
Also speaking:
"Intercollegiate football, a sport or a business?" Mildred Mara, Northern State Teachers College.
"Is the United States Imperialistic?" Elinor Jones, Huron College.

CONVENTION OF PROVINCE EIGHT HELD IN KANSAS

Province Eight, which includes the six Oklahoma chapters and Kansas State Teachers College of Pittsburg, held its convention at the home of the one Kansas chapter. Delegates were present from all but one chapter. Northeastern State Teachers College of Oklahoma, was a guest. Professor N. W. Sawyer, Oklahoma Baptist College, is governor of the province. Professor Gilbert Garretson, Oklahoma City College, was elected to succeed to the governorship. Professor Herald, University of Tulsa, was elected secretary.

Twenty-four eligible members of the various delegations were initiated into membership in the society.

Men's Debate Tournament

Question: "Resolved: That the essential features of the McNary-Haugen Bill should be enacted into legislation."
(The affirmative team is mentioned first in each debate listed.)

Round one:
1. Tulsa vs. Oklahoma City (won).
2. Northwestern State Teachers College vs. Kansas State Teachers College (won).
5. Oklahoma Agricultural and Mechanic Arts, Team 2, vs. Oklahoma City University, Team 2, (won).

Round two:
6. Kansas State Teachers College, of Pittsburg, Team 1, (won) vs. Tulsa.
7. Oklahoma City University, Team 1, (won) vs. Northwestern State Teachers College.
8. Oklahoma City University, Team 2, vs. Northwestern State Teachers College (won).
9. Oklahoma Agricultural and Mechanic Arts, Team 1, (won) vs. Kansas State Teachers College, Team 2.
10. Oklahoma Baptist (won) vs. Oklahoma Agricultural and Mechanic Arts, Team 2.

Round three:
11. Oklahoma Baptist vs. Oklahoma City University (won).
13. Oklahoma City, Team 1, vs. Oklahoma Agricultural and Mechanic Arts, (won).
14. Kansas State Teachers College of Pittsburg, Team 1, drew a bye.

Round four:
15. Kansas State Teachers College of Pittsburg, Team 1, vs. Oklahoma City, Team 1, (won).
17. Oklahoma City, Team 2, drew a bye.

Round five:
18. Oklahoma City, Team 2, (won) vs. Kansas State Teachers College of Pittsburg, Team 1.
19. Oklahoma Agricultural and Mechanic Arts, Team 1, vs. Oklahoma City, Team 1, (won).
20. Kansas State Teachers College of Pittsburg drew a bye. This left two teams from Oklahoma City University and one from Kansas State Teachers College of Pittsburg still in the competition. As the hour was late, it was agreed that first place should go to Oklahoma City University and second to Kansas State Teachers College of Pittsburg.

Women's Debate Tournament

Question: “Resolved: That the United States should adopt a uniform marriage and divorce law.”
(The affirmative team is mentioned first in each debate listed.)

Round one:
1. Tulsa (won) vs. Oklahoma Agricultural and Mechanic Arts.
2. Kansas State Teachers College of Pittsburg (won) vs. Oklahoma City, Team 1.
3. Oklahoma City, Team 2, drew a bye.

Round two:
4. Oklahoma Agricultural and Mechanic Arts vs. Oklahoma City, Team 1, (won).
5. Oklahoma City, Team 2, (won) vs. Kansas State Teachers College of Pittsburg.
6. Tulsa drew a bye.

Round three:

7. Tulsa vs. Oklahoma City, Team 2, (won).
8. Oklahoma City, Team 1, vs. Kansas State Teachers College of Pittsburg, (won).

Round four:

9. Oklahoma City, Team 2, (won) vs. Tulsa.

Round five:


Men's Oratorical Contest

First: “Necessity of a New Democracy,” Eugene Dyche, Oklahoma City University.

Second: “Shackles of Intelligence,” Lawrence Curfman, Kansas State Teachers College of Pittsburg.

Also speaking:
Luther Williams, Tulsa University.
Bill Boyd, Northeastern State Teachers College.

Men's Extemporaneous Speaking Contest

General subject: “College Problems.”

First: “Is scholarship dropping in our colleges today?” Calvin Brous, Oklahoma City University.

Second: “Will the honor system work?” Harold Netherton, Oklahoma Baptist University.

Also speaking:
Garvey Bower, Kansas State Teachers College of Pittsburg.
Wayne Miller, Oklahoma Agricultural and Mechanic Arts College.
Guy Curry, Northeastern State Teachers College.

Women's Oratorical Contest

First: Phyllis Woodruff, Oklahoma City University.
Second: Ruby Owen, Oklahoma Agricultural and Mechanic Arts College.

Women's Extemporaneous Speaking Contest

First: “Does the student during his college course develop habits which will later be helpful?” Bettie Chamberlin, Kansas State Teachers College of Pittsburg.

Second: “Should extra curricular activities be curtailed?” Elizabeth Roberts, Oklahoma City University.

Third: “Should pledging to fraternities and sororities be prohibited until the end of the freshman year?” Mrs. Katheryn Armstrong, Tulsa University.

Fourth: “Should all high school students be admitted to college?” Thelma Goble, Oklahoma Agricultural and Mechanic Arts College.
GOOD CONVENTION AT EAST LANSING

Ten chapters were represented at the convention of the Province of the Lakes, Province Nine, April 13-14, at East Lansing, Mich. Professor H. Dana Hopkins, Heidelberg College, the governor of the province, presided. The competition in the contests was close.

**Women's Debate Tournament**

Question: “Resolved: That the United States should adopt a uniform marriage and divorce law.”

*Round one:*
1. Heidelberg (won) vs. Olivet.

*Round two:*

*Round three:*

*Round four:*

*Fifth round:*

**Men's Debate Tournament**

Question: “Resolved: That the Volstead Act should be modified to permit the manufacture and sale of light wines and beer.”

*Round one:*
3. Grove City vs. Hope (won).

*Round two:*
5. Michigan State Normal College (won) vs. Olivet.
6. Heidelberg (won) vs. Grove City.

*Round three:*

*Round four:*

*Round five:*
11. Heidelberg (won) vs. Hope.
**Women's Oratorical Contest**

First: "We The People," Bernice Denflel, Michigan State Normal College.  
Second: "On Such a Fool's Sea Are We Now Afloat," Sandrine Schutt, Hope.  
Also speaking:  
"The Stage as a Pulpit," Marian Eggstaff, Olivet College.  

**Men's and Women's Extemporaneous Speaking Contest**

General Subject: "The China of Today."

"The Situation around Shanghai," Baldwin-Wallace College.  
Winners: Men's, Olivet, first; Michigan State Normal College, second.  
Women's, Heidelberg, first; Kalamazoo, second.

**Men's Oratorical Contest**

First: "Still We Conquer," Russell Damstra, Hope College.  
Also speaking:  
"Crime," Robert Smiley, Detroit City College.  
"Which Way America," Alexander Campbell, Olivet College.  
"High Minded Men," Carl Kumler, Otterbein College.  
"Ideals of America," Lavern Roberts, Michigan State College.

Glenn Ginn, the modest Chinese student of Park College, who recently won the interstate oratorical contest, was met by the student body when he returned from Chicago and called upon to explain himself. He said that he could not understand how it happened unless it was because the judges were too full of Ginn when he got thru speaking to know what they were doing.
CONVENTION OF THE CAROLINA CHAPTERS

Delegates from the five chapters of the Carolinas gathered at Wofford College, Spartansburg, South Carolina, April 8-9, for the convention of Province Ten. Professor C. C. Cunningham, North Carolina State College, presided as governor of the province.

Debates between the institutions in each state had previously decided the state championships. These two winners, North Carolina State College and Presbyterian College of South Carolina met at the convention in a debate on the proposition to modify the Volstead Act to permit the manufacture and sale of light wines and beer. The affirmative, upheld by North Carolina, was awarded the decision.

Provincial Oratorical Contest


REPRESENTATIVES OF NORTH CAROLINA ALPHA
Champions of Province No. 11 in Debate and Oratory
Left to right: Prof. C. C. Cunningham, Coach; H. J. Oberholzer, Orator; C. L. Straughan and H. H. Rogers, Debaters.


---

PROVINCE TEN HAS EXTEMPORNE CONTESTS ....

All the chapters in Minnesota and Dubuque of Iowa were represented at the convention of Province Ten. Contests in extemporaneous speaking for both men and women were held. President Chas. S. Templer of Hamline University presided. The convention was held in St. Paul.

Miss Violet Johnson of Hamline and Miss Elsie Wick of Macalester won first and second in the women's contest. Albert Iverson of St. Olaf and Kenneth Hezlewood of Hamline won first and second in the men's contest.

---

The Oklahoma Aggies have had an active season. They have engaged in more than twenty debates, many of them of the audience decision type. They have organized three large literary societies on the campus which have increased interest in forensics. The II K Δ chapter has furnished judges for some thirty high school debates and carried on some high school extension work.

---

Kansas Aggies scheduled a debate with Oklahoma University before the Oklahoma State Legislature, with Louisiana University before the Manhattan Chamber of Commerce, and with Northwestern University in the Presbyterian Church of Manhattan.

---

EASTERN DEBATE CONFERENCE CALLED FOR OCTOBER

Last year the T K A chapters of the Eastern District held a debate conference at Williamstown. The conference was such a success that T K A has decided to enlarge it. This coming school year it plans to hold a debate conference probably at Union College, Schenectady, N. Y., the last Saturday in October. It will be an intercollegiate conference and not in any way a T K A association. All colleges in New England, New York, New Jersey, and Eastern Pennsylvania, are invited to attend. T K A has requested II K Δ and Δ Σ P to join with it in making this conference larger and better. Both men and women delegates are invited. Everything possible to make the visit of the delegates as pleasant and profitable as possible will be done.

This call is signed by William T. Hade, Hicksville, N. Y., chairman of the Eastern District of T K A.
Editor's Personal Page

Where inconsistencies cease from troubling and logic is at rest.

The editor was a guest of the Kansas Province during its recent convention at Ottawa. Kansas claims to raise the finest wheat in the world. It also produces some of the finest people in the world. Your editor had a wonderful time with them and enjoyed the whole convention. Somehow a false report had preceded him to the effect that there was a food shortage in Colorado. As a result there was none in Kansas. The editor returned bulging out of his suit in several places.

It was a real pleasure for him to visit the birthplace of ΗΚΔ. He stood again on the platform, where, as a student, he had spoken in a debate against Ottawa. One of the greatest pleasures of the whole visit was to be with Professor J. H. Lawrence of the College of Emporia who was the governor of the province. It was Professor Lawrence who started the editor on the forensic path, gave him a lot of splendid training and helped him to lower his voice about two octaves and to eliminate some of the tremulo.

It was this same Professor Lawrence, by the way, who produced the team which won the debate tournament at the last convention. His daughter, a freshman, won both the state and the provincial women's oratorical contest.

If all the speeches I have written
Were piled together in a pile,
And with a candle lit,
The flame could be seen for more'n a mile.

But all the gold that I have gotten
For all the speeches I have wrote
Would not harm a kitten
If poured moulten down her throat

With apologies to Bill Nye.

The editor recently received a diamond set ΔΣΠ key and a very kind letter from the national president of that organization informing him that he had been elected to membership in that society and this key conferred on him because of his work in advancing forensics. He wishes to acknowledge his pleasure in this honor. With the presidents of both of these societies holding membership in the other, the bonds of friendship between them should be strengthened.

Our national secretary is a man of very limited mental capacities. He has no clairvoyant powers at all. Unless the chapters send him the names of the newly elected officers, he will not know to whom to address the chapter mail next year. Please take pity on him and help him out. As soon as we can find one, we are going to get a national secretary who will know the names and addresses of all new chapter officers without having to be told.
WHAT OF THE YEAR?

The forensic history for this year has been about all made. An orderly view of what has taken place may help us to evaluate it and plan for next year.

It is interesting to note what questions were debated. Thru the central states the McNary-Haugen Bill was very widely discussed. In fact it was the most popular question of the year the country over. It did not prove of the widespread interest to the farming classes that it was supposed to. Most of the dirt farmers were indifferent to it. It did prove to be a good question however. The debaters who studied it learned much about agricultural economics.

Various statements of the prohibition question were also widely discussed. Some of the denominational colleges of the central West felt that it would be unwise for them to attempt to discuss this question, but other institutions in these states and denominational colleges even in other states found it possible to debate this proposition without bringing undue criticism on themselves. It was used in the southern states and was the official question of one California league. Northwestern University debated it with a number of institutions which it met on its rather extended trip.

The eastern and southern states also used the cancellation of the allied war debts as a debate question. This was discussed in the Carolinas, Kentucky, Tennessee, and Arkansas, as well as elsewhere. It may prove even more popular next year.

On the Pacific coast there were a number of debates on the Chinese question and our Latin-American policy. Both of these propositions proved even and popular. They should be carefully considered for next year’s debates.
The women debated the uniform marriage and divorce question a great deal, especially thru the central states. While the question is old it is very much alive. It was not widely used in men's debates.

Texas and California had a number of debates on the proposition of adding a secretary of education to the president's cabinet. This also is an even and profitable question, but it does not seem to arouse as much public interest as it should.

In Michigan, Mussolini's work in Italy was extensively debated. Much good educational work was done in these arguments. While Mussolini is a figure that has appealed to the popular imagination, the public is greatly lacking in information about him. He is one of the most interesting figures in Europe today. He may hold even more prominence next year.

The failure of democracy was used in Colorado and scatteringly all over the country. The proposition was too broad to be ideal for intercollegiate debating.

The Indiana colleges discussed the federal grants in aid to the states. While it was hard to win on the negative, the question was of interest.

Many of our old favorites, such as Philippine independence and the jury system, bobbed up here and there. In many places there was also a tendency to try more limited questions with greater local interest as the county unit system in school administration or campus questions.

One outstanding characteristic of the season was the tendency to carry debates to the audience. Some of the Wisconsin schools in particular did this, appearing before high school and civic groups in all parts of the state. South Dakota State and Kansas State employed this plan. It enabled them to get better audiences and prevented the tiresomeness of too many debates on the same question on the home platform. An institution which engages in fifty debates must arrange to have most of them off its own campus. Kansas Aggies planned to hold but one debate on the campus and that was to have been on a college question. The extension debate proved itself this season.

The decision debate has been losing favor for years. For one thing, with the increase in the number of debates it is getting to be almost impossible to get judges. With the extension debate the audience decision is used some, but an open forum discussion after a debate is of even greater value. The three judges system has fallen into disuse to a great extent. The single judge is much more popular.

There has been a tendency towards less formality in debating. A number of states, Kansas in particular, have been using the extemporaneous debate. Here institutions meet to discuss a proposition which has been given to the debaters only the day before the contest, in some cases even on the day of the contest. While no one will deny the value of such contests, they do not seem to be rivaling the older form with its more elaborate preparation.

There seemed to be less of a tendency to travel this year than there has been for several years past. While such institutions as Northwestern and
Wittenberg took long trips, there were fewer teams on long jaunts and more, perhaps, on trips of three days or a week. Perhaps some of the colleges were saving up for the big jaunt to Tiffin next year.

With the increase in the number of debates, colleges are preparing teams on more questions. Several institutions handled four and five questions during the season, one even used seven. This is a healthy tendency altho it is hard on the coach.

Oratory has kept pace with debating. There has been more college oratory this year than there has been any year for a long time. The old line interstate contests have continued. Kansas has dropped out, but fourteen other states continue the rivalry. This year there were three interstate preliminaries. The two winners from each of these contests met for the finals in Chicago, where Glenn Ginn, a Chinese student of Park College, won the highest honors with an oration entitled *The Yellow Peril*. This is the first time a ΠΚΔ institution has won this contest for some time. Seven of the fourteen states were represented by ΠΚΔ institutions.

The Peace contests seem to be growing in popularity. Contests were held in a number of states. The constitutional oratorical contest is better established than ever. Hundreds of college orators spoke in this contest. In addition there were contests in eight provinces. The opportunities for the orator are increasing.

Extemporaneous speaking contests have firmly established themselves. They were held in connection with all but one of the provincial conventions. A number of states have organized state contests of this type. Subjects from campus problems to the modern woman were studied and discussed. The interest in this work grows all the time.

Forensics has gained ground during the year. More students engaged in oratory and debate than ever before and forensic budgets were the largest they have ever been. The debater should be optimistic.

### ENTERTAIN VISITING DEBATERS

A number of chapters have adopted the custom of entertaining the visiting debaters at the time of forensic contests. This is a very commendable habit, one that pays in returns of increased fellowship and good will.

It need not be an expensive matter. One of the first things is to meet the visitors at the depot when they arrive. Usually it is possible to have some one there with a car. This establishes a friendly spirit before the contest. The visitors can be conveyed to their hotel and arrangements made to take them over the campus or to visit local points of interest if there is time. After the contest, an informal reception in one of the college buildings is usually very pleasant. Sometimes a dinner can be arranged for the visitors and the judges.

One of the Ohio chapters recently entertained visitors from eleven institutions of the state at the time of a state oratorical contest. Many of them
were not Π K Λ institutions, but this entertainment gave them a good impression of the society.

It is not necessary to spend any money to indicate your friendliness. All it takes is a little effort and the effort is more than paid for in the opportunity to meet people from another institution and to learn of their ways and interests. Incidentally you help to give your own institution a good name.

---

**REFLECTIONS OF THE PROVINCIAL CONVENTIONS**

Nine of the thirteen provinces of Π K Λ held conventions this year. In six of them every chapter in the province was represented. All but one chapter were represented in two of the others. There were four chapters missing at the ninth. The attendance varied from one hundred fifty to twenty. The attendance was best in those provinces which are holding their second or third convention and poorest in those which are holding their first.

Do these provincial conventions justify themselves? The best reply that can be made to this question is contained in the preceding paragraph. The chapters come back. The fellowship of kindred minds rekindles enthusiasm. Personality simulates personality. One institution profits from what another does and in turn contributes something to the common good.

“At the provincial convention we learned how the other institutions with which we have to compete finance their forensic program. When we presented this evidence to our own student body we had no trouble getting it to adopt a proposal to give a definite amount of the student body funds to forensics. We now have, for the first time, a forensic budget which will permit us to plan a real program.” This is what one institution wrote after a provincial convention.

---

**WHAT SHALL WE DISCUSS NEXT YEAR**

In actual life we are confronted by certain problems. We must debate them to settle them. In intercollegiate forensics we schedule arguments and must find a proposition to debate. The success of a forensic season depends largely upon the question selected. No one thing that we do is of more importance then the selection of our official question.

We should be considering the debates for next year. While not many will admit that the McNary-Haugen bill has been settled, I am sure that most of this season’s debaters are willing to drop it for awhile. It will be hard to get a question for next year which will have a more widespread interest.

It will be well to be looking for a question worth the study of the debaters. It must be a question of some real importance. It might be possible to get a question the discussion of which would benefit the American
public. We have found out that we know too little about our Latin-American policy or the situation in China. If thru debates over the country we did something to inform the country on these subjects, we should be doing a patriotic service as well as developing forensic abilities.

OUR PROVINCIAL OFFICERS

A number of people have served as provincial governors and secretaries. The success of the provincial organization and the provincial conventions and contests is due to their efforts. For their services they receive no reward other than the satisfaction of a task well done and the gratitude of their fellows.

The national officers wish to express publicly their appreciation of the work of these provincial officers. The provincial organization is doing much to strengthen the whole society. The fellowship between chapters fostered by the province helps to keep alive the forensic interest in each chapter.

Every chapter and every member who has attended a provincial convention should be sure to express directly by word or letter his appreciation of the efforts of the officers of his province.

THE BIG CONVENTION

From Maine to California. There is a certain magnificence in the statement. It includes the whole country and indicates its size. It applies to the next national convention at Tiffin, Ohio. Delegates will be there from Maine to California. Already the chapter in Maine has sent word that it is planning to be well represented. One California chapter alone is planning to send ten delegates. Probably every chapter in the state will be represented.

We are all more or less provincial. Not many of us have had the broadening experience of contact with people from other sections of our great nation. What an opportunity it will be to meet on the platform and off of it the forensic leaders of colleges in half the states of the nation. In one day at the last convention a small Missouri college met on the platform institutions from California, North Dakota, Illinois, Nebraska and its own state. At such a gathering one becomes cosmopolitan in a hurry.

One hundred institutions were represented at the Colorado convention. We should like to have every chapter at Tiffin. Every chapter can be represented if it will make the effort. Other chapters are raising their convention funds now. One institution has almost one thousand dollars towards that project. It earned this money by hard work. Your convention fund should be begun this year.
TIFFIN, THE PLACE OF THE NEXT CONVENTION, AN INTERESTING CITY

Tiffin, the place of our next convention, is an interesting Ohio city. Besides being the home of Heidelberg College, it has the distinction of having the largest orphanage in the United States, the National Orphans' Home of the Junior Order of United American Mechanics. It also has some large and interesting factories, including the National Machinery Co. The Sandusky River, which flows thru the city, is very beautiful and scenic.

A FEW OF THE COTTAGES, JR. O. U. A. M. HOME, TIFFIN, OHIO

Those who attend the convention in 1928 will have many interesting sights open to them when they are not engaged in forensic business. The Ohio B chapter is making plans now to do all that it can to provide entertainment for the guests. These good hosts are planning on six hundred guests. It is hoped that every chapter in the order will be represented.

EUREKA COLLEGE FRESHMAN-SOPHOMORE TEAMS WIN STATE CHAMPIONSHIP

The freshman-sophomore debate teams of Eureka College have won the state championship for this year by winning eleven out of twelve judges' votes in four debates, and winning another debate by forfeit. On Tuesday, March 1, Eureka's team defeated both the teams of Lincoln College in a dual debate, the affirmative winning a two to one decision and the negative a unanimous decision. On Friday, March 11, Eureka's freshman-sophomore teams won both contests in a dual debate with Carthage College by unanimous decisions. Illinois State Normal University had contracted to debate Eureka's freshman-sophomore negative team on February 21, but forfeited the debate because of inability to put a team in the field.
The affirmative team was made up of three sophomores: Olive Barker, Willard Harmon, Captain, and Orville Williams. The negative team consisted of two sophomores and two freshmen, Nedra Funk, Captain; and Howard Short, sophomores; and Everett Welker and Maurice Hadaway, freshmen. None of these debaters had ever had any intercollegiate experience before this year.

The membership of this freshman-sophomore squad is limited strictly to students of freshman or sophomore ranking. Eureka uses this squad as a means of training debaters for varsity teams and has found it very successful. Only a few other colleges in the state encourage freshmen and sophomores to participate in debate in this way.

In the last four years under the coaching of Professor Durward V. Sandifer, Eureka's freshman-sophomore teams have won nine debates and lost but two. It is believed that this record excels that of any other college in the state maintaining teams.

Professor C. T. Battin, one of the charter members of the first chapter of ΠΚΔ at Ottawa University, is now head of the Department of Business Administration at the College of Puget Sound.

Linfield on the negative of the Chinese question defeated Ashland Normal, College of the Pacific, and University of California in Los Angeles. It also appeared in Redlands in a no-decision contest and won from California Tech, on the negative of the repeal of the Volstead Act.—The Linfield Review.

Women of the University of California in Los Angeles won the conference debate title by defeating Occidental on the department of education question.—Daily California Bruin.

Linfield girls defeated Monmouth Teachers. They denied that the powers should get out of China.—The Linfield Review.

Henderson-Brown won from McMurray which spoke in favor of light wines and beer.—The Oracle.

College of Emporia sent a debate team into Iowa and Nebraska. It lost to Morningside, but won from Hastings and Grand Island.—College Life.

Redlands scored a double victory over Cal. Tech. in a post season contest.—The U. of R. Campus.

Harley C. Chiles, a sophomore at Georgetown College, won the Kentucky State Oratorical contest.

Texas Christian dropped debates to Baylor, McMurray and Texas Tech.—The Skiff.
Park Wins the Interstate Oratorical Contest

Glenn Ginn, of China, speaking on “The Yellow Peril” and representing Park College, Missouri, was awarded first place in the Interstate Oratorical Contest in Chicago, April 30. This is the first time a ΚΑ institution has won the interstate for some time and the second time Park has had this honor.

The other speakers were:
Second: “Beyond the Horizon,” Wingate, Carleton College, Minnesota.
Also speaking:
“U. S. No. 9653,” Horton Talley, Simpson College, Iowa.
“The Valley of Bones,” Albion College, Michigan.
“Labels,” Wooster College, Ohio.

Northwestern Teachers lost to Oklahoma City.—The Northwesterner.

Park co-eds lost to Kansas, the negative of the McNary-Haugen Bill winning.—The Park Stylus.

Morningside won from Drake in both ends of its dual on the McNary-Haugen Bill.—The Collegian Reporter.

Otterbein and Denison split a dual on the direct primaries question, both negatives winning.—The Tan and Cardinal.

Detroit closed the season with a victory over Marquette. Detroit favored light wines and beer.—The Detroit Collegian.


In a spirited debate at Wake Forest, Bucknell succeeded in proving that prohibition should be abolished.—Old Gold and Black.

Otterbein and Heidelberg met in open forum co-ed debates on the uniform marriage and divorce law question.—The Tan and Cardinal.

North Central and Illinois Wesleyan co-eds met in an open forum dual on the uniform marriage and divorce law question.—The College Chronicle.

Westminster met Wittenberg on the question of women entering the business and professional world. No decision was given.—The Fortnightly.

Park lost to William Jewell in a debate before one of the Kansas City churches. The William Jewell Girls’ Glee Club and the Park Men’s Glee Club furnished music.—The Park Stylus.
Wake Wores Frost and Wingate Junior College split a dual.—Old Gold and Black.

Iowa Wesleyan and Graceland split a dual, both negatives winning.—The Iowa Wesleyan News.

Wake Forest negative on the uniform marriage and divorce question won over Johns Hopkins.—Old Gold and Black.

Baylor's negative won from Texas Christian on the uniform marriage and divorce question.—Baylor College Bells.

Gustavus Adolphus, Hamline, and St. Olaf engaged in no-decision co-ed debates on the jury system.—The Gustavian Weekly.

Transylvania won twice from Wesleyan, but lost a third debate to Wesleyan and one to Georgetown.—The Crimson Rambler.

University of Southern California's affirmative defeated Puget Sound on the Chinese question.—The Puget Sound Trail.

Hamline co-eds closed their season with no-decision contests against Gustavus Adolphus and Macalester.—The Hamline Oracle.

Louisiana made it three consecutive wins when its negative defeated McMurray on the light wines and beer question.—The Wildcat.

Bradley and Illinois Normal University met in a dual no-decision contest on the uniform marriage and divorce question.—The Bradley Tech.

Altho its debates were no-decision contests, Dakota Wesleyan turned out fourteen teams which discussed three different questions.—The Phreno Cosmian.

St. Thomas on the affirmative of the farm relief question won from Luther and Morningside, and on the negative from Concordia.—The Purple and Gray.

University of California in Los Angeles successfully denied that Mussolini was helping Italy much in a debate with College of the Pacific.—Daily California Bruin.

Wesleyan and Midland tied for the conference title in Nebraska, each winning twelve debates and losing one, and each winning the same number of judges' decisions.—The Wesleyan.

Culver-Stockton took a trip across Missouri, losing to Central, but winning from Warrenton, William Jewell, Kansas City School of Law, and Missouri Wesleyan. Culver-Stockton maintained the affirmative of the McNary-Haugen Bill in all of its debates.—The Megaphone.

North Carolina has organized a state oratorical association which held its first contest this year. H. J. Oberholzer, a native of South Africa, who represented State College, won second. First place went to High Point. The winner spoke on "The Pledge of Youth," "The American Road," was the title of the second oration.—Old Gold and Black.
Otterbein won from Northern but lost to Heidelberg and Marietta—*The Tan and Cardinal*.

Redlands won from Cal. Tech. on the difficult side of the repeal of the Eighteenth Amendment.—*The U. of R. Campus*.

Culver-Stockton’s affirmative won from John Fletcher but lost to Carthage, while its negative defeated Shurtleff.—*The Megaphone*.

The Montana B chapter entertained the high school debaters and essayists who were competing in a state tournament at Bozeman.—*The Weekly Exponent*.

Park has met Ottawa and Baker in no decision and split team debates. The league to which these institutions belong is not using decision contests this year.—*The Park Stylus*.

“Our Shrinking World and Contracting Universe” is the subject of the oration Jack Finegan used in representing Drake in the Missouri Valley contest at St. Louis.—*The Drake Delphic*.

Puget Sound women met the University of British Columbia in dual international debates on the Mussolini question. The American girls won both contests.—*The Puget Sound Trail*.

Washburn defeated Oklahoma on the light wines and beer question. The Kansas people, contrary to what might be expected, were advocating something to drink.—*The Washburn Review*.

Western Union split a dual with Morningside on the McNary-Haugen Bill, both affirmatives winning. The contest lost is the only one Western Union has lost this year. It has won six.—*The Gleam*.

Southwestern’s co-ed affirmative team won from Wichita on the uniform marriage and divorce question while the men’s negative defeated College of Emporia on the McNary-Haugen Bill.—*The Southwestern Collegian*.

F. S. James won the oratorical contest at Wofford and will speak in the state contest.

The men of Kansas Teachers of Emporia invaded Nebraska, Missouri, and Iowa. They won from Creighton and Drake, by the decision of an audience of high school debaters in the last case, and met Ames in a no-decision contest.—*The Bulletin*.

DARROW AND PRESIDENT GREY OF BATES MEET IN A SERIES OF DEBATES

Clarence Darrow and President Grey of Bates College, Maine, met in three debates on the question, “Is man a machine?” The first contest was held in Symphony Hall, Boston, March 16; the second in Mechanics Hall, Worcester, Mass., March 18; and the third in Elks Auditorium, Providence, Rhode Island, March 20. Great interest was attached to these contests. Large crowds attended. President Grey donated the five hundred dollars he was to receive for the first debate to the building fund of the college.—*The Bulletin of Bates College*. 
St. Olaf met Ripon in a no-decision contest.—The Manitou Messenger.

Kansas Teachers of Hays lost a close debate to Wesleyan.—The K. S. T. C. Leader.

Bethany men dropped both ends of a dual to McPherson.—The Bethany Messenger.

Linfield won both ends of its dual with Monmouth Teachers.—The Linfield Review.

Tulsa women defeated Southwestern while the men lost to Phillips.—The Tulsa Collegian.


Huron met the School of Mines and the Northern Normal in extension debates at neutral points in the state.—The Huron Alphomega.

Kalamazoo co-eds on the negative of the uniform marriage and divorce question defeated Michigan State Normal.—The Kalamazoo College Index.

College of the Pacific women defeated the University of California on the question of condemning our Latin-American policy.—The Pacific Weekly.

William Jewell women, in their first year of forensics, lost to William Woods. The men dropped a contest to Central.—The William Jewell Student.

Morningside co-eds successfully upheld the affirmative on the uniform marriage and divorce question against Dakota Wesleyan.—The Collegian Reporter.

By an audience decision Akron’s affirmative won from Hiram on the question of condemning the governmental tendency to restrict personal liberty.—The Bucketeer.

University of California in Los Angeles, denying that the powers should get out of China, defeated Occidental. California changed 42 votes in the audience while Occidental changed on 4.—Daily California Bruin.

The chamber of commerce at Sioux City is trying to bring the Morningside and University of South Dakota debaters together before a joint meeting of all the luncheon clubs of the city.—The Collegian Reporter.

Kansas Wesleyan won four out of five debates held during one week on the McNary-Haugen Bill. St. Mary’s was defeated twice, the affirmative won from Hays but lost to Sterling while the negative won from the same institution.—The Wesleyan Advance.

Colorado people have a way of getting there. This is the way the forensic artists from Western State got to the provincial convention at Hastings, Nebraska. The coach’s car was shipped by freight from Gunnison to Salida because the passes over the mountains were blocked. The debaters went by train to Salida. At Pueblo another speaker joined them to take the place of one who was ill. In Denver they picked up still another one who had gone ahead to arrange plans. The party of seven then drove thru to Nebraska.—Top O’ the World.
Southwestern men won the Southern Division championship of the state league.—The Southwestern Collegian.

By an audience vote of 11 to 19 Baylor defeated Southwestern at Southwestern.—The Southwestern Collegian.

Presbyterian won from Citadel but lost to University of South Carolina in a triangular on the abolition of the primary system. University of South Carolina won on both sides.—The Blue Stocking.

Southwestern girls had four debates in Oklahoma, losing two by audience decision, one by a critic judge, and winning one. They met Tulsa, Oklahoma City, Oklahoma Baptist, and Teachers at Edmonds.—The Southwestern Collegian.

Heidelberg defeated Marietta and Otterbein in their triangle debates.—The Kilkilik.

Eureka's affirmative won from Cotner on the McNary-Haugen question.—The Eureka Pegasus.

Wichita men won from College of Emporia on both sides of the McNary-Haugen bill.—The Sunflower.

Texas Christian men on the affirmative of the proposal to modify the Volstead Act lost to Austin.—The Skiff.

Kansas Teachers of Pittsburg opened the season with a no-decision contest with Central on the McNary-Haugen Bill.—The Collegio.

Kearney women invaded Colorado and Wyoming, meeting Denver in a split team debate and Wyoming in a no-decision contest.—The Antelope.

Hastings closed the conference season with a double victory over Grand Island. This gives Hastings seven victories and five defeats for the season.—The Hastings Collegian.

The co-eds of the University of California in Los Angeles won both ends of their dual with University of Southern California of the same city. The question was in regard to a system of compulsory voting.—Daily California Bruin.

St. Olaf, by winning from Hamline and St. Thomas, won the conference debating honors on the McNary-Haugen Bill. Hamline, Macalester, and Gustavus Adolphus, won on the affirmative but lost on the negative. St. Thomas lost on both sides.—The Hamline Oracle.

Orville Parsons and Verna Bruce won the men's and women's extempore contests sponsored by Colorado Gamma at Western State. Prizes of ten dollars were awarded them and they will also represent the college at the provincial contests at Hastings, Nebraska.—Top O' the World.
Illinois Wesleyan lost to Normal on the negative but won from North Central on the affirmative of the McNary-Haugen Bill.—*The Argus.*

Morningside won on both sides of the McNary-Haugen bill against St. Olaf, lost to St. Thomas, but won from College of Emporia.—*The Collegian Reporter.*

On the affirmative of the modification of the Volstead Act, Howard Payne won from McMurray, but lost to the Sam Houston Teachers when it took the negative.—*The Yellow Jacket.*

University of California in Los Angeles maintaining that the powers should get out of China went down before Southwestern Law School.—*The Daily California Bruin.*

The South Dakota Δ chapter at State College is presenting Channing Pollock's "The Enemy."—*The Industrial Student.*

Oklahoma College of Women affirmative defeated Northeastern Teachers on the uniform marriage and divorce question.—*The Trend.*

Morningside and South Dakota University met in an open forum debate before the Sioux City Chamber of Commerce.—*The Collegian Reporter.*

Debating that the county unit system in education should be made compulsory in Texas, East Texas won from West Texas and Austin.—*The East Texan.*

Georgetown engaged in nine debates with teams from Kentucky and Tennessee, winning five of them. Most of the debates were on the debt cancellation question.

Arnold McClintock of the University of Wichita won first place in the Kansas Peace oratorical contest. William Rich of Bethel won second and Orville Holtz of Kansas Wesleyan third.—*The Wesleyan Advance.*

Huron debaters spoke to more than 4,000 people in the 30 debates engaged in this season. All but five were no-decision contests before high schools, civic and community organizations.—*The Huron Alphomega.*

Eighty guests attended the ΠΚΔ dance given by the Gamma chapter at California Institute of Technology. It was proclaimed the season's best. The dances were named in forensic terms instead of being numbered. The members of the chapter wore ribbons of the society's colors across their chests.—*The California Tech.*

**OUR NATIONAL COUNSEL SPONSORS DEBATING TOURNAMENT**

The law firm of Coon and Coon, of which our National Counsel J. D. Coon is a member, is sponsoring an interclass debating tournament at Sioux Falls College. At the end of tournament the Coon Debate prize of $25 will be awarded to the most outstanding debater.—*Sioux Falls Stylus.*
Baylor women have won four and lost one debate so far this year.—*Baylor College Bells.*

Jamestown negative won from Moorhead on the Volstead question.—*The Jamestown Collegian.*

Redlands’ freshmen won both ends of a dual with University of Southern California.—*The U. of R. Campus.*

Oklahoma City lost to Friends in a co-ed debate on the uniform marriage and divorce question.—*The Campus.*

Puget Sound, proving that the powers should get out of China, won from Whitman.—*The Puget Sound Trail.*

Ashlin Logan, for the second time, won second place in the Kentucky oratorical contest.—*Centre College Cento.*

McKendree won second place in the forensic contests of the Southern Illinois-Missouri league.—*The McKendree Review.*

Southwestern won from Southern Methodist but lost to Hendricks in a triangular on the Philippines question.—*The Megaphone.*

Wake Forest won from Presbyterian but lost to Wofford on the light wines and beer question.—*Old Gold and Black.*

Northwestern Teachers of Oklahoma took part in the provincial meet at Pittsburg and in the debates among the Oklahoma teachers colleges.

Redlands succeeded in proving that the Eighteenth Amendment should be repealed, against the opposition of Wittenberg.—*The U. of R. Campus.*

Nebraska Wesleyan won its sixth consecutive state oratorical contest when John Casteel was awarded first place in the Peace contest.—*The Wesleyan.*

Wake Forest’s affirmative team on the light wines and beer question lost to Roanoke but won from William and Mary and from Hampden-Sydney.—*Old Gold and Black.*

The Kansas Z chapter at Emporia Teachers is planning a big program of intramural forensics for next year. The first thing will be a debate tournament between all campus organizations. Cups are being offered as awards.—*The Bulletin.*

The debate on the secretary of education question given by the women of the College of the Pacific has been selected for publication in 1927 volume of “Intercollegiate Debates.” College of the Pacific won seventy-two percent of its debates this year as against eighty percent last year.—*College of the Pacific News Sheet.*

Westminster and Tarkio met in a forensic contest consisting of debate and oratory. Tarkio won the oratory. There was a misunderstanding over the debate. Both teams were prepared on the same side, it was discovered when they took the floor. The contest went ahead anyway with all the debaters speaking in favor of the McNary-Haugen Bill. Westminster was awarded the decision.—*The Tarkio Phoenix.*
Des Moines closed the season with ten victories and fifteen defeats.—*The Highlander.*

Culver-Stockton closed the forensic year with a victory over Mississippi University.—*The Megaphone.*

Oklahoma Baptist University defeated Louisiana College on the farm relief proposal.—*The Wildcat.*

Linfield women won while the men lost to Pacific University on the Chinese question.—*The Linfield Review.*

Grove City women lost to Geneva and Westminster on the uniform marriage and divorce law question.—*The Collegian.*

Carroll's negative won from Western Reserve on the question of cancelling the allied war debts.—*The Carroll Echo.*

Michigan State co-eds lost to Toledo University on the uniform marriage and divorce question.—*Michigan State News.*

Jamestown closed its season with an open forum co-ed debate with North Dakota University.—*The Jamestown Collegian.*

North Central closed the season with a dual with Lawrence on the farm relief proposal. Both negatives won.—*The College Chronicle.*

The twenty people who represented Kalamazoo in its nineteen debates this year traveled over 1,800 miles.—*The Kalamazoo College Index.*

The Cox and Bilderback team of Culver-Stockton finishes the season with twelve wins and three defeats out of sixteen debates.—*The Megaphone.*

Centenary won from Southwestern, Oklahoma Baptist, and Arkansas University on reducing the war debts and farm relief.—*The Conglomerate.*

Hundreds of letters have been received in regard to the debate on the McNary-Haugen Bill broadcasted by two Bradley teams.—*The Bradley Tech.*

Fort the second time in twenty-five years, one school has won both contests in the Southwestern-Trinity-Texas Christian triangle. Southwestern defeated both of the other schools on the uniform marriage and divorce law question. Trinity lost both debates, and Christian split even.—*The Skiff.*

Horton Talley of Simpson with the oration, "U. S., No. 9653," and Harry Wingate of Carleton, who spoke on "Beyond the Range," tied for first in the northern division of the interstate oratorical contest and will represent Iowa and Minnesota in the interstate finals. North Dakota, Nebraska and South Dakota were eliminated.—*The Simpsonian.*

The best claim to the title for the most ambitious forensic program comes from Bethany College, Kansas. The "Terrible Swedes," have this season engaged in fifty-one debates. Two were no-decision contests. Of the other forty-nine, Bethany won thirty-one and lost eighteen. The Swedes won first and second place in the men's debate tournament at the Kansas provincial contest, and won second, third and fourth in the women's. They have not been concentrating their efforts on a few speakers, but have put out a large group of consistent winners.—*The Bethany Messenger.*
Hope's negative defeated Olivet on the Mussolini question.—The Anchor.

Texas Christian defeated Simmons in a close debate on the Philippines.—The Skiff.

Wichita and Northwestern Normal of Oklahoma met in a no-decision contest.—The Sunflower.

Ypsilanti co-eds won from Heidelberg on the marriage and divorce law question.—The Normal College News.

McPherson for the second consecutive year won the Kansas Intercollegiate Debate League title.—The Collegio.

Baylor affirmative on the uniform marriage and divorce law question won from Simmons.—Baylor College Bells.

Centenary's affirmative won from University of Mississippi on the Curtis-Reid Education Bill.—The Conglomerate.

Southwestern of Kansas plans to hold debate try-outs in May so that the teams can get an early start on the season.—The Southwestern Collegian.

Dean W. A. Irwin of Washburn, because of achievements in debating while in college, was elected a member of the Kansas B chapter.—The Washburn Review.

Park of Missouri and Wabash of Indiana won the western division contest in the Old Line Interstate. Illinois and Wisconsin were eliminated.—The Park Stylus.

Tech freshman won on both sides of the proposal to do away with the California initiative and referendum laws in a dual with Southern California.—The California Tech.

Montana ended the season by winning over North Dakota Aggies. The Montana institution has won seven and lost two contests during the season. All of the debates were on the light wines and beer question.—The Weekly Exponent.

In her 185th intercollegiate debate, William Jewell closed the forensic season with a victory over the University of Mississippi. Over 400 attended the debate which was broadcasted. It was William Jewell's 134th victory.—The William Jewell Student.

Two Southwestern girls, accompanied by Dean Allen, made a 2,400-mile trip thru Oklahoma and Texas where they lost to Tulsa, Oklahoma City, Oklahoma Baptist, and Baylor, but won from Central Teachers of Oklahoma, Southwestern Teachers of Texas, Simmons, and Clarendon.—The Southwestern Collegian.

Under the direction of Coach Sandifer, Eureka has made great progress in forensics. During the three years he has been in charge, his teams have won thirty-one and lost sixteen contests. The forensic program has grown from two to twenty contests a season. Three years ago there were only five members in the Illinois B chapter. Now there are thirty. Professor Sandifer is leaving this year to take up graduate work at Columbia University.—The Eureka Pegasus.
Morningside dropped two debates to St. Thomas.—*The Collegian Reporter.*

Howard Payne lost a freshman debate to John Tarleton.—*The Yellow Jacket.*

Oklahoma City girls won from Tulsa by an audience decision at Tulsa.—*The Campus.*

Wake Forest, on the negative of the war debt cancellation, won over Emory.—*Old Gold and Black.*

Wesleyan, on the negative of the debt funding proposition, defeated Transylvania.—*The Kentucky Wesleyan.*

Macalester co-eds met Gustavus Adolphus, Carleton, and Hamline in no-decision contests on the jury system.—*The Mac Weekly.*

North Carolina State lost both debates in its dual with High Point on the proposition of recognizing Russia.—*The Technician.*

Wesleyan defeated Georgetown but lost twice to Transylvania on the Allied war debt revision question.—*The Kentucky Wesleyan.*

Eureka lost to Des Moines. This gives Eureka a record of eleven won, four lost, and five without a decision.—*The Eureka Pegasus.*

Kalamazoo invaded Indiana, losing to De Pauw and meeting Purdue in an open forum contest.—*The Kalamazoo College Index.*

Moringside has engaged in ten men’s debates on the McNary-Haugen Bill, winning seven and losing three.—*The Collegian Reporter.*

The home audience voted in favor of the Volstead Act and North Dakota University in a debate at Jamestown.—*The Jamestown Collegian.*

McKendree invaded Missouri, winning from Westminster and Wesleyan, and meeting William Jewell in a no-decision contest.—*The McKendree Review.*

Harley C. Chiles, Kentucky A, won the state oratorical and represented Kentucky in the divisional contest of the interstate. He did not place in this.—*The Georgetown Collegian.*

Central won from Mississippi on the McNary-Haugen Bill. Central has engaged in twenty debates, winning twelve, losing six, and having no decisions in the other two.—*The Central Collegian.*

Carthage broke even in duals with Shurtleff and McKendree, winning and losing on both sides of the farm relief question. It dropped both debates in the dual with Augustana and lost twice to Eureka in a freshman contest.—*The Carthage Collegian.*

Des Moines took a trip on which it lost to St. Thomas, won from Milton, and lost to Valparaiso. Just before starting, it met Northwestern. The first two contests were on the McNary-Haugen bill and the last two exhibition.—*The Highlander.*
Buena Vista defeated Western Union in a co-ed debate.—*The Buena Vista Tack.*

Eureka won from Shurtleff and McKendree and met Greenville in a no-decision contest.—*The Eureka Pegasus.*

Kansas Wesleyan defeated Wittenberg. Kansas spoke in favor of the McNary-Haugen Bill.—*The Wesleyan Advance.*

Bradley won from Lombard but lost to Normal on the McNary-Haugen Bill. In both cases the affirmative won.—*The Bradley Tech.*

Kearney co-eds invaded Colorado and Wyoming, meeting Denver and Wyoming Universities in open forum discussion.—*The Antelope.*

Southwestern’s affirmative won from the University of California in Los Angeles on the question of getting out of China.—*Daily California Bruin.*

Buena Vista and Gustavus Adolphus met Northwestern on the prohibition question. The debates were of the no-decision variety.—*The Buena Vista Tack.*

Redlands met Wyoming in a no-decision co-ed debate. It also dropped a co-ed debate to College of the Pacific in the Temple Baptist Church in Los Angeles.—*The U. of R. Campus.*

Central won from Tarkio but lost to Central Missouri State Teachers, winning on the affirmative but losing on the negative of the McNary-Haugen Bill.—*The Central Collegian.*

A recent study of the college careers of the members of the Hamline faculty reveals the interesting fact that a large number of them have had experience in intercollegiate forensics.—*The Hamline Oracle.*

To discover new forensic talent, the University of California in Los Angeles chapter is sponsoring a campus inter-fraternity oratorical contest. A cup is being offered for the winning organization.—*Daily California Bruin.*

The students at East Texas support their forensic teams. Over nine hundred were present when East Texas girls won from McMurray and over one thousand turned out to hear the men duplicate the victory.—*The East Texan.*

Montana State debating the light wines and beer question won from Colorado Teachers on the affirmative, and from Jamestown on the negative, but lost to North Dakota University on the affirmative.—*The Weekly Exponent.*

Baylor opened its forensic season with a victory over Southwestern. Miss Stewart, who was a member of the Southwestern team which lost to Baylor in the finals at the national convention, was final speaker for Southwestern. The Baylor chapel was crowded.—*Baylor College Bells.*

William Jewell has won fifteen, lost nine, and engaged in five no decision contests. It has won from Baylor, Washburn, Nebraska Wesleyan, Carthage, Culver-Stockton, Central of Iowa, Des Moines, St. Louis University, Park, and Missouri Wesleyan. It lost decisions to Iowa Wesleyan, Central of Missouri, and Culver-Stockton.—*The William Jewell Student.*
Dubuque closed the season with an affirmative victory over Luther on the McNary-Haugen Bill.—*The Blue and White*.

Transylvania, on the negative of the department of education proposal, defeated Emory-Henry in the first debate of the season.—*The Crimson Rambler*.

Bethany won a dual from Kansas Wesleyan and the affirmative defeated College of Emporia. All three debates were on the farm relief question.—*The Bethany Messenger*.

Kalamazoo College and the normal school located in the same town whip their debate teams into shape by pitting them against each other in practice debates, not just once but several times a week.—*The Kalamazoo College Index*.

Culver-Stockton lost a dual to Central.—*The Megaphone*.

Montana's negative defeated Redlands on the Volstead Act.—*The U. of R. Campus*.

Palmer Larson, South Dakota Z, was elected president of the student body.—*The Augustana Mirror*.

Puget Sound marked up its fifth straight victory at the expense of Reed College.—*The Puget Sound Trail*.

Culver-Stockton successfully invaded Illinois, winning from Normal, Eureka, and Wesleyan.—*The Megaphone*.

Transylvania affirmative defeated Centre on the question of reducing the Allied war debts.—*The Crimson Rambler*.

Augustana ended the season with victories over Southern Normal and Augsburg Seminary.—*The Augustana Mirror*.

Hays won a debate from College of Emporia but lost in the oratorical contest between the two schools.—*The K. S. T. C. Leader*.

Colorado Teachers sent a girls' team west into Utah where it debated the uniform marriage and divorce question with four colleges and universities. The men on another trip debated the Volstead Act with five colleges and universities in Wyoming, Utah, and Montana.—*The Teachers College Mirror*.

Connecticut Aggies lost both ends of their dual with New Hampshire on the question of compulsory military service in Land Grant colleges. The Oxford system was used in these debates, in that each speaker had fifteen minutes, but the first affirmative speaker was allowed to divide his time so that he had a chance to close the debate. While the judges' decision was two to one in favor of New Hampshire in each case, the audience vote as indicated by the shift of opinion, in each case favored Connecticut.—*The Connecticut Campus*.
Carthage lost to Augustana but won from Shurtleff and McKendree.—
*The Carthage Collegian.*

William Jewell won from Baylor, Drury, and Kansas City Junior College.
*The William Jewell Student.*

Culver-Stockton affirmative won over Eureka on the McNary-Haugen bill.—*The Eureka Pegasus.*

The debate club at Illinois Normal presented "The Man Who Married a Dumb Wife."—*The Vidette.*

Morningside defeated St. Olaf in both ends of a dual on the McNary-Haugen Bill.—*The Manitou Messenger.*

North Central lost to Illinois Normal and Wesleyan in their triangular contests.—*The College Chronicle.*

Oklahoma City women defeated Southwestern's negative on the uniform marriage and divorce question.—*The Campus.*

Lombard lost to Bradley and Macomb on the McNary-Haugen Bill. Lombard had the affirmative.—*The Lombard Review.*

Kansas Wesleyan co-eds closed the season with a double victory over McPherson on the McNary-Haugen Bill.—*The Wesleyan Advance.*

Heidelberg co-eds won on both sides of their debate with Adrian on the uniform marriage and divorce law proposal.—*The Killikillik.*

Former Vice President W. C. Dennis took his Tarkio debaters to his old school, Simpson, for a no-decision debate.—*The Simpsonian.*

H. J. Oberholzer won the North Carolina Peace Oratorical contest, the first time North Carolina State has won this honor.—*The Technician.*

South Dakota State debaters debated the Athenian Club of Sioux Falls before the Sioux Falls Chamber of Commerce.—*The Industrial Collegian.*

Missouri Wesleyan closed its season with a radio debate with Central and negative victories over William Jewell and Westminster.—*The Criterion.*

Monmouth and Normal women split a dual on the department of education question. The negative won in both contests.—*The Monmouth College Oracle.*

All of South Dakota State's co-ed debates, with one exception, have been no decision contests. Morningside won the one judged debate.—*The Industrial Collegian.*

A student audience voted two to one in favor of falsehood when California co-eds debated the question of the social lie with the Stanford men.—*Daily California Bruin.*

Huron met the Northwestern debaters on the prohibition question. A large audience turned out and took part in the open forum after the debate.
*The Huron Alphomeg.*
Puget Sound lost its last debate to Whitman.—*The Puget Sound Trail.*

Oklahoma City won twenty-two out of its thirty-one debates this season.—*The Campus.*

Ouachita lost to Baylor University in the final debate of the season.—*The Ouachita Signal.*

Ouachita’s affirmative defeated Harding on the light wines and beer question.—*The Ouachita Signal.*

East Texas won four out of its six debates. All the home contests were well attended.—*The East Texan.*

Edgar Reitz, Dakota A, was elected student body president at Dakota Wesleyan.—*The Phrenx Columbian.*

Baylor won five of its eight debates. Most of the girls this year were inexperienced.—*Baylor College Bells.*

Carl McIntire of Park won third in the regional constitutional contest in Nebraska.—*The Hastings Collegian.*

Michigan State Normal College men won while the women lost to Northern State Normal School.—*The Normal College News.*

Linfield engaged in sixteen debates, winning eight, losing one, and having no decisions in the other seven.—*The Linfield Review.*

Both negative teams won in the final debates on Mussolini in the dual between Hope and Michigan State Normal College.—*The Hope Anchor.*

The freshman squad at Des Moines ended the season with a debate among themselves, the losers providing a chicken banquet for the winners.—*The Highlander.*

Against the opposition of the State Teachers, Ouachita co-eds convinced the judges that we should adopt a uniform marriage and divorce law.—*The Ouachita Signal.*

Georgetown closed its season with four debates on the cancellation of the allied war debts question. The negative won in all debates. These debates were duals with Sewanee and Milligan.

Fourteen orators spoke in the preliminaries of the intramural oratorical contest sponsored by the California E chapter. Each orator represented some campus fraternity or organization.—*Daily California Bruin.*

South Dakota is considering adopting a forensic schedule which will make it possible for each institution to meet each of the other institutions each season in both men's and women's debates.—*The Phrenx Columbian.*

Franklin, debating the proposal to discontinue federal grants in aid to the states, won from Wabash and Notre Dame on the negative, and lost to Butler and DePauw. On the affirmative it lost to Butler, Earlham, and DePauw.—*The Franklin.*
Alabama Polytechnic Institute's affirmative lost to Mercer on the proposition of getting out of China.—*The Plainsman*.

Kansas Z initiated seventeen new members, bringing the total number of active members up to thirty-five.—*The Bulletin*.

Michigan State Normal College divided a dual with Hope and won twice from Ferris Institute.—*The Normal College News*.

B. D. Silliman, debate coach at Coe, is awarding sweaters with the college letter to all three-year debaters.—*The Coe College Cosmos*.

H. J. Oberholzer has won his third oratorical contest this year for North Carolina State. This time it was the state contest in the constitution oratoricals.—*The Technician*.

The largest number of initiates reported so far is twenty-three for William Jewell. The national secretary says that the order for keys was the largest single order he has ever received.—*The William Jewell Student*.

Wake Forest's affirmative on the proposal to cancel the allied war debts won from Emory and Henry, Milligan, and Carson-Newman, but lost to Colgate in a debate before the Southern Baptist Convention in Louisville.—*Old Gold and Black*.

Gilmor Brown, director of the Pasadena Community Playhouse and director of dramasics at California Institute of Technology, was initiated into the California I chapter because of his work in coaching the orators.—*The California Tech*.

Forty active and alumni members of II K A attended the banquet and initiation of the Michigan E chapter. Sixteen new members were initiated. President McKenny of the college presided. There was an interesting program.—*The Normal College News*.

Georgetown now selects an honor debater each year to whom is awarded a valuable medal. The record of the debater during the season counts for half in making the award and the showing in a special contest counts for the other half.—*The Georgetown Collegian*.

In the first state women's oratorical, a contest sponsored by II K A, East Texas, represented by Mary Louise Willard, won first with an oration entitled "Our Debt to the Longhorns." Trinity and Texas Christian tied for second. Baylor was third.—*Baylor College Bells*.

Cal Tech debaters went to San Francisco by boat for their debate with Leland Stanford. They upheld the affirmative of the proposal to bar reporters from court rooms during trials. The vote of the audience was one in favor of the home team.—*The California Tech*.

Bernice Dendel of Normal won the Michigan constitutional oratorical contest with an oration entitled "The Constitution and the Citizen." She received a prize of $75 from Senator Couzens. Detroit won second. This is the second state contest Miss Dendel has won this year.—*The Normal College News*. 
SOME GOOD POSITIONS OPEN

The editor of the Forensic has received calls for some debate coaches:
Position 1. Baptist College, salary $1,800 to $2,500. Candidate must be experienced and have graduate training.
Position 2. Presbyterian College. Salary around $2,000. Experience and graduate training expected.
Position 3. State School. Salary around $1,800. Experience and graduate training expected.

If you wish to apply for any of these positions, write to the editor for the names of the proper ones to address.

Lester Boone, Texas Christian College, won second place in the state contest.—The Skiff.

Gordon Dean of Redlands won second in the state peace contest. Ellsworth Meyer of Pomona won first.—The U. of R. Campus.

Central Missouri State Teachers of Warrensburg defeated the other four teachers' colleges of Missouri in a series of debates.—The Student.


Hazel Albers, speaking on "Abandoned Holes" won the women's oratorical at Hope and will represent her college in the state contest next year.—The Hope Anchor.

Trinity's co-eds, entering intercollegiate forensics for the first time, won from North Texas and Baylor but lost to East Texas and Simmons. The men lost both ends of their triangle.

Texas Christian defeated Southern Methodists and the Aggies in the newly formed triangle between these institutions. The independence of the Philippines was the question discussed.—The Skiff.

Walter Emery, Oklahoma Baptist University, won the regional constitutional oratorical contest and will represent Kansas and Oklahoma at the division finals in Sioux City, Iowa.—The Wesleyan Advance.

Miss Louise Lawrence, College of Emporia, who won the women's oratorical at the Kansas provincial contest, repeated her victory in the women's state oratorical. Friends was second, the Aggies third, Sterling fourth, and Emporia Teachers fifth.

The first Canadian debating team ever to go to England will invade Britain this summer when three picked debaters of McGill University make a tour of their mother country. Debates have been arranged with Oxford, Cambridge, London, Edinburg, and Bristol.—The Connecticut Campus.

Wayne Neely, who has been a fixture in Parson's forensics for several years, will return next year as a member of the faculty. Mr. Neely has won the state extemopore and oratorical contests besides taking active part in numerous debates. This year he has acted as debate coach. He finishes his college course in June.—The Portfolio.
VOLUME I, ΠΚΔ DEBATE ANNUAL

Winning Intercollegiate Debates and Orations, volume I of what we expect to make an annual publication, is now on sale. It was published during the summer. In it appear the debates, orations, and extempore speeches which won the national contests at Estes Park. Every chapter of ΠΚΔ and every library in a ΠΚΔ institution should have a copy. Each chapter should ask its library to order one. Individuals will want copies. As only a limited number of copies were published, the supply may run out. Order now. The price is one dollar. All orders should be addressed to

G. W. Finley, National Treasurer
Apartment 101, Bancroft Hall
509-515 West 121 Street
New York City.