

picked men, is more capable of electing a senator than the mass of people.

Eyler contended that the present system was given great consideration in the constitutional convention, that the reasons for placing the choice of senators in the hands of the State legislatures have not changed, that the benefits of the present system were self evident to the members of the convention. That the Senate as now elected represents the people, and checks rash political tendencies, that election by the people would often bring misrepresentation which is worse than no representation, that good men are not re-elected by the people, and that the present system must be good because it has produced such men as Clay, Webster, etc.

Gernerd maintained that the present system of election is a corner stone of the constitution and should not be changed for trivial reasons, that state senators are not elected by direct popular vote, that popular election would hand the control of the Senate over to political bosses, that bribery would increase with a system of popular election, that the people do not favor a change, and that the conservatism of the senate would be destroyed.

The judges were Hon. C. R. Woodruff, of Philadelphia, Prof Wm. M. Alden, of U. P. and Rev. E. T. Jeffers, of the York Collegiate Institute. Their decision was in favor of the negative.

After each debate State's team was tendered a very pleasant reception, although they say they were not, at that time, in a very jovial state of mind.

Though twice defeated State is not entirely discouraged and she is already planning for next year's work.