

cent. in favor. But the vote for Presidential electors was 189,272, so that about one out of three who voted for the electors voted on the amendment." Then, take the State of Montana: "Only about one-third of the voters voted on the amendment." Then, take the State of Idaho (page 175): "You will observe from the above figures that the equal-suffrage amendment polled the most votes, but that less than 15,500 electors voted on it, while Presidential electors received in round numbers 30,000."

Now, sir, I could go on through the whole list of these States showing that in every case there was not only nothing but a mere majority of those voting required, but that in every case much less than a majority of the vote was polled, a much less vote, in other words, being polled for each of these questions submitted to the people by means of the referendum than in the general election, which my honorable friend, knowing full the effect of his condition, makes the basis and standard upon which this bill is to be fought and won or lost. (Opposition cheers.) Then, we have the State of Washington (on page 179), and the same state of facts occurred. In California the total vote cast for the Presidential election was 290,000, but only 71 per cent. of that number voted on the question referred to them at the same time by way of referendum.

Then the State of Michigan (page 185), there was this question, and it is the only one which refers to the question under discussion here, and therefore I shall read it: "In the year 1887 there was submitted on the ballots 'Amendment to constitution relative to the liquor traffic.' It was widely known that this amendment was for prohibition, and it was the chief issue at the election, which was a spring election, and at which no State officers or Presidential or party questions were voted upon, yet a vote was cast of 362,917 relative to this referendum as against the total Presidential vote last preceding of 401,186." Let us take Australia again. I have already shown that "the great fact about the Australian referendum is that it is not an attempt to constitute the people sovereign, but to substitute their assent for that of the upper House should the upper House continue to reject a bill passed by the lower House." "It will be noticed how very different the referendum as proposed in Australia is from the referendum in Switzerland. There the voting is chiefly on a bill which has passed both houses. Only in one case does the law provide for a referendum in case of a dispute between the two Houses—when they disagree as to the necessity for a revision of the constitution."

Then "To sum up. The referendum is to be introduced into the Australian Parliamentary system to settle questions of dispute between the two Houses. The people are not to be supreme legislators, but arbiters."

Here is what Hon. Geo. Reid, the distinguished Premier of New South Wales has said with regard to this question, and one sentence uttered by him will show you how utterly and completely the honorable gentleman is away from any understanding of the facts which have taken place in Australia. Hon Geo. Reid said, "If no referendum, then only a single chamber. It must be one of the two." Why, my learned friend said the other day we have no appeal from this House, we have only one legislative body, we have no authority to which to appeal in order to steady public opinion, instead of public opinion steadying us (Hear, hear), and he declared that the fact that we had only one House was a reason why the referendum principle should be adopted, while Hon. Geo. Reid said, that if they did not have the referendum he would only have one House; felt safe with one House, but if they had more than one House he felt safe with the referendum. I think I would be utterly unjustified if I attempted to use any more time of honorable gentlemen in order to show them either of two things; that every statement