

given. F. and M. was represented by Messrs. Hartz, Eyer, and Gernerd.

The question was "Resolved that U. S. Senators should be elected by the direct vote of the people," State having the affirmative.

Taylor showed that the present manner of electing U. S. Senators was a compromise adopted not because of its merits so much as because of fear entertained by the small states that they would be overpowered by the large ones, that the present system was adopted because at that time the people were thought incompetent to hold all electoral power and for these reasons the state Legislatures were given the power to elect senators.

He further argued that the people have proved themselves competent to elect Senators, that the people, the press, the State legislatures, the National House of Representatives, and some United States Senators now demand popular election, that the proposed change is in exact accord with numerous other changes in constitutions, state and national, in that it increases the power of the people, and that each State, by electing its own senators by popular vote, has shown the proposed system to be a success.

Landis maintained that the present system is an injustice to the American people in that it doubts their ability to elect United States Senators, that National questions are made the issue in State elections and that in this manner State issues are ignored, that the proposed change would separate State from National issues and thus benefit both, that the proposed system would prevent deadlocks and the consequent blocking of all State legislation, that the present system, by exposing State legislators to such strong temptations to cast their vote for the senatorial candidate having the most money, is responsible for much of the moral degeneracy in the State legislatures, that the present system tempts political parties to maintain their political supre-