

macy in a state by gerrymandering, and that, as now elected, United States Senators are not in touch with the wishes and will of the people.

Tuholski showed that by failing to elect, the present system has proved itself inadequate to the needs of even the smallest states, that by the present system State and National interests are injured by the strife which results from a Senatorial contest in the State legislature, that the people are better fitted to elect Senators because they are less likely to be influenced in their choice by political or financial prospects and by the fact that the people can perform this duty without serious conflict with other duties, while attempts on the part of the State legislature to elect a senator often renders the performance of other duties impossible, that popular election is simpler and less expensive than the present system, that popular election would lessen bribery, because, whereas there is a chance, under the present system, to bribe both the people and the State legislature to secure the election of a certain senator, under the proposed system there would be but one chance for bribery, the chance of bribing the whole people, and in conclusion that the efficiency of the Senate would be increased because such men as Quay, Hanna, Murphy, Clark, etc. would fail to be re-elected and would be replaced by men morally and intellectually better.

For F. and M., Hartz argued that a measure of conservatism was necessary, that by gradual and well defined steps Conservatism, Democracy, Communism and Anarchy appear in governments. That other nations have copied our method of electing Senators, that the present method of electing senators is a corner stone of our national greatness, that states were intended to be represented in the national government as states and that this would not be if senators were elected by popular vote, that the present system was wisely conceived and well discussed before it was adopted, and that the State legislature, being a body of